



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File No. 11-0262 Opposition

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:14 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <Plloyd57@aol.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 5:48 PM

Subject: Council File No. 11-0262 Opposition

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

Tomorrow you will review this ordinance and I ask you to vote against it. The Ordinance is poorly written and will not accomplish what it is trying to do and that is protect neighbors from unruly group homes in residential neighborhoods. The way it is written it is not enforceable and in the end may cost the City of Los Angeles many dollars in defending law suits if the City tries to enforce it. There are other ways to clean up the neighborhoods suffering from abusive situations which I believe are relatively few but still important rather than to take away the benefits of group homes which serve vast numbers. One organization has come to light which is doing just this very thing. That is the Sober Living Network which has been in existence for years and has set standards of operation and education for it's member homes. More can be accomplished working together than slapping another law on the books. We can and are willing to regulate our own. I believe more information is necessary before a final decision is made tomorrow.

Please reconsider an alternative.

Thank you Sir for your time and attention,

Pamela Lloyd

Owner Men's Sober Living San Bernardino County Big Bear Lake

951-312-9231

Member Sober Living San Bernardino County Coalition

Board Member Sober Living Network LA County



March 28, 2011

Councilmember Ed Reyes
200 North Spring Street, Room 410
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: COUNCIL FILE 11-0262, PROPOSED COMMUNITY-CARE LICENSING ORDINANCE

Dear Councilmember Reyes:

On behalf of the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), I am writing in opposition to the proposed ordinance regarding community care licensing to be considered by the Planning Land Use Management Committee tomorrow. CSH is a national non-profit that partners with developers, service providers, and property managers to create and sustain supportive housing (permanent housing affordable to people experiencing homelessness with housing-based case management, health, and vocational services). CSH in California has helped our non-profit partners develop over 11,000 supportive homes, at least half of which have been developed in Los Angeles County.

This proposed Community Care Licensing ordinance would restrict housing opportunities for homeless and formerly homeless people with disabilities within the City of Los Angeles. Under this proposal, to be located in a low-density residential zone (R1 or R2), a home must be occupied by a "family," redefined as a "single housekeeping unit." "Single housekeeping unit" would be defined, in part, as household members all living under a single lease. The ordinance would further redefine "boarding or rooming home" as a home with more than one lease. The latter would effectively limit any home with more than one lease to restricted density (RD) zones.

The City and County have dedicated resources to create shared permanent supportive housing for homeless residents. Residents of these units share common areas, bathrooms, and kitchens, but each occupies his/her own room and signs his/her own lease. The proposed ordinance would effectively prohibit shared permanent supportive housing in any zone other than RD zones, even though shared housing does not resemble a boarding, rooming, group, or sober living home, but is permanent housing for people to live independently. Shared permanent supportive housing tenants receive an array of services that allow them to remain stably housed and are *not transient*: the average length of residency of a permanent supportive housing tenant is the same as any other tenant. Studies prove supportive housing is a cost-effective approach to addressing homelessness that is linked to improved neighborhood property values and reductions in crime.

This ordinance would add barriers to the siting and availability of permanent supportive housing. Under the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Housing Program and the Los Angeles Housing Department's Notice of Funding Availability, every tenant of shared permanent supportive housing must have own his/her lease, a core component of permanent supportive housing. The County Department of Mental Health (DMH) has three MHSA Housing Program shared permanent supportive housing projects in development in the City of Los Angeles, totaling 39 units that will house as many as 78 residents. DMH also funds other mental health agencies, like SHARE!, which estimates overseeing approximately 30 shared permanent supportive housing homes for as many as 180 formerly homeless people with mental illness in City single family residential zones.

The proposed ordinance would cause homelessness or extend homelessness for hundreds of people who would otherwise live independently in permanent supportive housing, not to mention the thousands of City residents living in overcrowded housing who would be affected by the breadth of this ordinance. Though planning staff indicated homeless people could live in licensed community care facilities, permanent supportive housing is exempt from licensing requirements. In fact, federal courts have recognized permanent supportive housing as a less restrictive setting than licensed facilities. The ordinance would force existing and prospective tenants of shared permanent supportive housing into less independent licensed settings, contrary to City policy and federal and state law. Additionally, the proposed ordinance would discriminate against shared permanent supportive housing, in conflict with state law, which requires zoning laws to treat supportive housing in the same manner as any other dwelling of the same type.

The proposed ordinance was drafted without formal input of the State, the County, disability rights advocates, permanent supportive housing developers, legal and advocacy organizations acting on behalf of people with mental illness or addiction, or consumers. It does not include any mechanism for enforcing single lease requirements. City Building and Safety inspectors would be required to inspect lease agreements, violating tenants' privacy rights and promoting inequitable enforcement. City Planning staff did not indicate whether requirements included in the proposed ordinance will do anything to address City residents' specific concerns about sober living homes.

While some provisions of the ordinance are positive because they will increase opportunities to site licensed community care and alcohol and drug abuse programs, the ordinance's provisions are overbroad and therefore affect a much greater number of residents and tenants than intended. The Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) could dramatically strengthen the ordinance by eliminating the impact on supportive housing by—

- Removing proposed redefinitions of "family" and "boarding or rooming homes" from the ordinance;
- Excepting supportive housing from the single lease requirements; or
- Delaying enactment of this proposed ordinance unless and until consulting with impacted stakeholder groups and addressing the needs of all affected.

We appreciate your dedication to addressing homelessness in the City and hope you will oppose this ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jonathan C Hunter". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jonathan Hunter
Managing Director, Western Region



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: In Support of Quality Sober Living Homes and Opposed to Proposed Brdng Hse Ordinance

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:17 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **LA County Sober Living Coalition CPC Petition** <lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 2:07 PM

Subject: Fwd: In Support of Quality Sober Living Homes and Opposed to Proposed Brdng Hse Ordinance

To: councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, michael.espinosa@lacity.orgFrom: **Maurice DeYampert** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 9:10 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

We here in this Petition,

Oppose Ordinance CPC-2009-800-CA – Council File 07-34-27 as currently constituted, and find it to be discriminatory against Sober Living Homes and to the families that such institutions help to create and maintain. We wish to bring to the attention of the City Planning Commission and the City Council the following: Sober living homes provide housing and supportive family environments and resources to people in recovery from addiction. Sober living has been an integral, clinical part of recovery for over 75 years.

As presently constituted, this ordinance will have a disparate impact on groups of disabled persons, including those on parole and probation, seeking single family housing. We believe that this ordinance is supported by an illegitimate and discriminatory intent, ignoring fair housing and reasonable accommodation case law for “families of disabled persons living together in mutual support (Sober Living)”.

This ordinance cannot justify its proposed redefinition of family, single housekeeping units, and reclassification of penal institutions which will severely restrict the way unrelated people can live together in low density residential areas, (zones R1, R2, RD) since the principal means for this type of shared housing is through multiple leases or other individual financial arrangements.

We, the undersigned agree with the findings of the 1997 American Planning Association, Policy Guide on Community Residences (1) which include:

- 1) Community residences (sober living homes) are a legitimate residential use of property, and are not boarding houses.
- 2) Community residences have no effect on the value of neighborhood properties, established by over 50 studies, even for immediately adjacent properties.
- 3) Community residences have no effect on neighborhood safety. In fact residents of group homes are far less likely to commit crimes than members of the general population.

(1) American Planning Association – Policy Guide on Community Residences, 1997 Adopted by Special Delegate Assembly, September 21, 1997; Ratified by Board of Directors, September 22, 1997 . The full report can be downloaded at <http://www.planning.org/policy/guides/adopted/commres.htm>

We recognize and value the many benefits sober living homes can provide to the City including; reduced crime,

3/29/2011

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: In Supp...

reduced homelessness, reduced dependency on City and other public services, reduced family and neighborhood violence and other benefits. We also recognize that these benefits, unlike other social service programs, are provided at virtually no cost to the City and its residents.

By affixing our names to this document, we implore the City of Los Angeles to reject the proposed ordinance as presently constituted and to provide reasonable access to treatment and recovery for all families.

Maurice DeYampert
Los Angeles, CA

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/las-war-on-renters-opposed-to-boarding-house-proposal-and-supporting-quality-sober-living-homes. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

From: **Susan Dumont** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 9:25 AM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Susan Dumont
Granada Hills, CA

From: **Kimberly Childers** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 9:40 AM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Kimberly Childers
Lamy, NM

From: **christi stone** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:21 AM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

christi stone
lake elsiore, CA

From: **Scott Rabon** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:25 AM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Scott Rabon
Aliso Viejo, CA

From: **Susan Perkins** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:30 AM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Susan Perkins

3/29/2011

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: In Supp...

northridge, CA

From: **Brandon Alayon** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:35 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Brandon Alayon
Canoga Park, CA

From: **Michael Saffar** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:35 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Michael Saffar
northridge, CA

From: **Kerri Gore** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:35 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Kerri Gore
Lavergne, TN

From: **Misty Jurkiewicz** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:45 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Misty Jurkiewicz
Pomona, CA

From: **Marie Jim** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:50 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Marie Jim
Van Nuys, CA

From: **donald tafoya** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:50 AM

To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

donald tafoya
La Puente, CA

3/29/2011

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: In Supp...

From: **Rodney Anderson** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 10:55 AM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Rodney Anderson
Duarte, CA

From: **Lynne Krasch** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 11:00 AM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Lynne Krasch
Woodland Hills, CA

From: **Steven Fuller** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 11:05 AM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Steven Fuller
Monrovia, CA

From: **Joe Carrillo, Sr.** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 11:10 AM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Joe Carrillo, Sr.
Torrance, CA

From: **john poleno** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 12:00 PM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

john poleno
Simi Valley, CA

From: **Sheila Hoff** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 1:01 PM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Sheila Hoff
Canoga Park, CA

From: **Alberta Cline-Scheibel** <mail@change.org>

Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 2:45 PM

To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Alberta Cline-Scheibel
Van Nuys, CA

From: **Bambi Black** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 3:00 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

there alot of benefits about having these sober living for certain individuals and there families, some with kids so it is good that these sober living be anywhere just like regular livable houses

Bambi Black
Los Angeles, CA

From: **Jared Held** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 3:40 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Jared Held
Simi Valley, CA

From: **JENNIFER MILLAR** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 4:00 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

JENNIFER MILLAR
WINNETKA, CA

From: **David Archey** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 4:35 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

David Archey
los angeles, CA

From: **tracy wasden** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 4:36 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

tracy wasden
north hills, CA

From: **Jonathan Moore** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 5:25 PM
To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Jonathan Moore
Los Angeles, CA

From: **donna weddle** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 6:00 PM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

donna weddle
woodland hills, CA

From: **Eddie Hodges** <mail@change.org>
Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 7:05 PM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Eddie Hodges
Hattiesburg, MS

From: **Dick Lee** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 6:40 AM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Dick Lee
Grand Rapids, MI

From: **Emanuel Martins** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 7:15 AM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Emanuel Martins
Sylmar, CA

From: **Alonzo bodden** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 7:30 AM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Alonzo bodden
burbank, CA

From: **Catherine Tewksbury** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 3:20 PM
To: lacs1ccpcpetition@gmail.com

Catherine Tewksbury

From: **Jennifer Triggs** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 6:48 PM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Jennifer Triggs
Arroyo Grande, CA

From: **Brian Murphy** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 6:57 PM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Brian Murphy
Palmdale, CA

From: **Jon Spinac** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 9:50 PM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Jon Spinac
New York, NY

From: **Peggie Maag** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2011 at 7:46 AM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Peggie Maag
Ventura, CA

From: **Adam Kennedy** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2011 at 11:21 AM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Adam Kennedy
Van Nuys, CA

From: **Iori weber** <mail@change.org>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2011 at 4:36 PM
To: lacscccpetition@gmail.com

Iori weber
johnson city, TN

From: **Lisa Caronelli** <mail@change.org>

3/29/2011

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: In Supp...

From: **Livia Coronelli** <mail@change.org>

Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2011 at 7:46 PM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Livia Coronelli
Winnetka, CA

From: **Laurie Bolin** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 7:21 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Laurie Bolin
Cottonwood, AZ

From: **Matthew Lloyd** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 7:25 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Matthew Lloyd
Los Angeles, CA

From: **Henry Gillespie** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 8:21 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Henry Gillespie
Bend, OR

From: **Stacey Rodriguez** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 10:21 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Stacey Rodriguez
Running Springs, CA

From: **Peter Santana** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 10:55 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Peter Santana
North Hollywood, CA

From: **Michael Ray** <mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 11:46 AM

To: lacs1ccppetition@gmail.com

Michael Ray
Reseda, CA

From: **marianna kozakov** <mail@change.org>
Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 12:30 PM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

marianna kozakov
birmingham, AL

From: **Allen Horwitz** <mail@change.org>
Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 1:21 PM
To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Allen Horwitz
West Hill, CA



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: I fully support the petition for Sober Living!!!

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:18 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rebecca Koski** <rkoski@ndvets.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 1:51 PM

Subject: I fully support the petition for Sober Living!!!

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Thanks,

Best regards,

Rebecca Koski, MFTT

New Directions, INC.

11303 Wilshire Blvd., VA Bldg. 116

Los Angeles, CA 90073-1003

"Be the change you wish to see in the world." Mahatma Gandhi

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail at the address shown. This e-mail transmission may contain confidential information. This information is intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is intended even if addressed incorrectly. Please delete it from your files if you are not the intended recipient. Thank you for your compliance.



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: FW: Shared housing needed for recovery from Mental Illness

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>
To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:22 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Shirley Cabeen** <scabeen@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 9:13 AM
Subject: FW: Shared housing needed for recovery from Mental Illness
To: councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, michael.espinosa@lacity.org

From: scabeen@hotmail.com
To: councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org; councilmember.huizar@lacity.org; councilmember.reyes@lacity.org;
councilmember.zine@lacity.org
Subject: Shared housing needed for recovery from Mental Illness
Date: Fri, 25 Mar 2011 11:33:43 -0700

Dear Councilman,

Please join me in keeping shared housing more available for the mentally ill by not allowing the R1 and R2 zoning to disallow shared housing. It would violate the policies and some laws as the current "best practice" for aiding the mentally ill is the housing FIRST concept. Living in a small group in a neighborhood is the best housing for recovery. We need to expand shared housing, not restrict it. As you know housing for the mentally ill is the biggest hurdle for their recovery.

They are unable to speak for themselves, but we can. They need our help, and especially yours!

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. William Cabeen
Los Angeles



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: 11-0262

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:22 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Urban** <rurban@tarzanatc.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 6:59 AM

Subject: 11-0262

To: "michael.espinosa@lacity.org" <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>**Subject:** Community Care Ordinance - Council File No. 11-0262 – OPPOSED to Community Care Ordinance

From: Concerned residents of the City of Los Angeles and supporters of Quality Sober Living Homes

We, along with The Sober Living Network oppose the Community Care Ordinance, for a number of reasons. Detailed here below are the highlights of our objections and requests.

1. This ordinance will destabilize communities, increase homelessness and increase overall crime in the City of Los Angeles:

- Homelessness will increase significantly
 - Sober living homes are life-saving resources for thousands of newly sober people who rely on supportive sober environments to become productive citizens.
 - Approximately 95% of our sober living homes are in low density residential zones supporting thousands of people each year. This ordinance will deny needed supportive housing to an estimated 7,000 people annually, just in Network-affiliated homes..
 - This number does not include those from quality sober living homes accredited by other certifying organizations.
 - Does not include the thousands of persons with mental health conditions also made homeless.
- Crime increases when thousands of addicts, alcoholics and the mentally ill persons now currently in stable and supportive housing are cast adrift in the community.
- This ordinance reverses the City's positive directions in its partnerships to deal with housing for the homeless in endeavors such as Home for Good.

2. This is not a legally sustainable ordinance—discriminatory intent is transparent and on the record.

- It violates civil rights laws by seeking to ban types of households (small group homes) from low density residential zones without inclusion of reasonable accommodation protocols for disabled households.
- It is not supported by any data that objectively measured that these homes targeted by the ordinance are indeed the homes that actually cause problems for communities.
- This is a new legal theory creating a conflict with California Supreme Court precedents.
- The City Attorney is defending this ordinance using incomplete and inappropriate case law:
 - One case is currently on appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals
 - Precedents cited on the record are not applicable to disabled households.
 - California Supreme Court case law was not addressed.

3. The potential financial risk to the City from litigation costs and penalties is significant.

- The Obama administration is taking an active role in pursuing housing civil rights violations that the previous administration largely overlooked.
- Many member homes are already preparing legal remedies available to them:
- HUD is actively encouraging providers to file complaints, at no cost to filers.
- The DOJ is actively monitoring several similar cases in Southern California..

4. This ordinance is unnecessary

- Focus of the Council should be on strengthening nuisance abatement protocols
- City has current capability of successfully shutting down problem homes without this ordinance
- Even City code enforcement personnel state that group homes for persons with disabilities are not the source of nuisance problems.

5. This ordinance is classist, favoring affluent over less affluent communities.

- While claiming to protect low density residential communities it throw higher density residential communities under the bus by shifting this perceived problem to those areas already taxed with a lack of housing. Pushing perceived problems “downhill and east” is not good policy.
- Claiming to preserve the “residential character” of low-density residential areas, the ordinance does so by shifting a perceived problem to less affluent, denser neighborhoods already taxed with a lack of housing. “Residential character” is often a code phrase for discrimination against people “not like us.”

6. Neighborhood groups will not be satisfied with the ordinance in its current form.

- o Many endorsements demand changes which are even more discriminatory.
- o Many of these changes are prohibited by existing California and Federal law.

Current and potential role of the Sober Living Network

Legal, ethical and cost-effective means exist to address legitimate neighborhood problems. We ask that the City formally engage the Sober Living Network in seeking solutions. The Network performs several functions which are of value to communities with respect to sober living homes, including addressing and mitigating problems. Our activities include:

- o Defined standards for homes in areas of health, safety, recovery support, management, ethics and good neighbor policies,
- o Enforcement of standards through annual inspections and complaint-driven grievance processes,
- o Monthly meetings of member homes to share information and address problems,
- o Listing of approved homes on our website.

We have a few specific requests for the City of Los Angeles:

1. The City needs to recognize the Sober Living Network as a legitimate accrediting agency for sober living homes,
2. The City should assist us in implementing our Problem Home Information Line, a public service which community residents may use to register complaints about problem residences.

Thank you for your consideration

Concerned Citizen

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This email message, including any attachments, is solely intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that may be confidential, privileged, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law.

[This email message and any attachments should not be disclosed to any persons without the express written consent of the sender and at sender's request, all electronic copies should be deleted and all hand copies returned to the sender.]

If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited.

Please notify us immediately by reply email that you received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: 11-0262

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:22 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Urban** <rurban@tarzanatc.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2011 at 6:54 AM

Subject: 11-0262

To: "michael.espinosa@lacity.org" <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Just an e-mail to let you know of my opposition to 11-0206, the community care ordinance..

Richard Urban CDS
Counselor II
Tarzana Treatment Center
18646 Oxnard St
Tarzana CA 91356
818 996-1051 ext 1210
rurban@tarzanatc.org
www.tarzanatc.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This email message, including any attachments, is solely intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that may be confidential, privileged, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law.

[This email message and any attachments should not be disclosed to any persons without the express written consent of the sender and at sender's request, all electronic copies should be deleted and all hand copies returned to the sender.]

If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited.

Please notify us immediately by reply email that you received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File No. 11-0262 – OPPOSED to Community Care Ordinance

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>
To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:24 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **ryan valencia** <valencia.ryan@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 12:26 PM

Subject: Council File No. 11-0262 – OPPOSED to Community Care Ordinance

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org, councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Los Angeles and oppose the above noted community care ordinance for the following reasons:

This is not a legally sustainable ordinance—discriminatory intent is transparent and on the record. It violates civil rights laws by seeking to ban types of households (small group homes) from low density residential zones without inclusion of reasonable accommodation protocols for disabled households. It is not supported by any data that objectively measured that these homes targeted by the ordinance are indeed the homes that actually cause problems for communities. This is a new legal theory creating a conflict with California Supreme Court precedents. The City Attorney is defending this ordinance using incomplete and inappropriate case law: One case is currently on appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Precedents cited on the record are not applicable to disabled households. California Supreme Court case law was not addressed.

This ordinance is classist, favoring affluent over less affluent communities. While claiming to protect low density residential communities it throw higher density residential communities under the bus by shifting this perceived problem to those areas already taxed with a lack of housing. Pushing perceived problems “downhill and east” is not good policy. Claiming to preserve the “residential character” of low-density residential areas, the ordinance does so by shifting a perceived problem to less affluent, denser neighborhoods already taxed with a lack of housing. “Residential character” is often a code phrase for discrimination against people “not like us.”

I am a resident of the Eagle Rock area and if council member Huizar will allow not (1) but (10) medical marijuana dispensaries and illegal massage parlors in my tiny community, i do not understand why the city wants to shut down beneficial homes that will save peoples lives.

Respectfully,

Ryan Valencia



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd:

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Tue, Mar 29, 2011 at 8:35 AM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **George Feghali** <mckaybrazil@msn.com>

Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Subject:

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

In Support of Quality Sober Living Homes and Opposed to Proposed Brdng Hse Ordinance

We here in this Petition

Oppose Ordinance CPC-2009-800-CA – Council File 07-34-27 as currently constituted, and find it to be discriminatory against Sober Living Homes and to the families that such institutions help to create and maintain. We wish to bring to the attention of the City Planning Commission and the City Council the following: Sober living homes provide housing and supportive family environments and resources to people in recovery from addiction. Sober living has been an integral, clinical part of recovery for over 75 years.

As presently constituted, this ordinance will have a disparate impact on groups of disabled persons, including those on parole and probation, seeking single family housing. We believe that this ordinance is supported by an illegitimate and discriminatory intent, ignoring fair housing and reasonable accommodation case law for “families of disabled persons living together in mutual support (Sober Living)”.

This ordinance cannot justify its proposed redefinition of family, single housekeeping units, and reclassification of penal institutions which will severely restrict the way unrelated people can live together in low density residential areas, (zones R1, R2, RD) since the principal means for this type of shared housing is through multiple leases or other individual financial arrangements.

We, the undersigned agree with the findings of the 1997 American Planning Association, Policy Guide on Community Residences (1) which include:

- 1) Community residences (sober living homes) are a legitimate residential use of property, and are not boarding houses.
- 2) Community residences have no effect on the value of neighborhood properties, established by over 50 studies, even for immediately adjacent properties.
- 3) Community residences have no effect on neighborhood safety. In fact residents of group homes are far less likely to commit crimes than members of the general population.

(1) American Planning Association – Policy Guide on Community Residences, 1997 Adopted by Special Delegate Assembly, September 21, 1997; Ratified by Board of Directors, September 22, 1997 . The full report can be downloaded at <http://www.planning.org/policy/guides/adopted/commres.htm>

We recognize and value the many benefits sober living homes can provide to the City including; reduced crime, reduced homelessness, reduced dependency on City and other public services, reduced family and neighborhood violence and other benefits. We also recognize that these benefits, unlike other social service programs, are provided at virtually no cost to the City and its residents.

By affixing our names to this document, we implore the City of Los Angeles to reject the proposed ordinance as presently constituted and to provide reasonable access to treatment and recovery for all families.

George Feghali

3/29/2011

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd:

6069 Pickford Pl

Los Angeles, Ca 90035

American citizen.



Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File No. 11-0262-OPPOSED to Community Care Ordinance

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>
 To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 3:08 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Michael Ray** <incogmike@gmail.com>
 Date: Fri, Mar 25, 2011 at 3:07 PM
 Subject: Fwd: Council File No. 11-0262-OPPOSED to Community Care Ordinance
 To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Good day,

My name is Michael Ray.

I am a resident and registered voter in Northridge CA 91325 along with my wife and 2 children.

I strongly oppose the Council File No. 11-0262 – Community Care Ordinance.

It is discriminatory, will result in class action law suites, will have huge negative financial impact and cause thousands of recovering people in recovery to become homeless. Stronger nuisance abatement laws are a better option. Thank you for hearing my one small voice.

It violates civil rights laws by seeking to ban types of households (small group homes) from low density residential zones without inclusion of reasonable accommodation protocols for disabled households.

- **It is not supported by any data that objectively measured that these homes targeted by the ordinance are indeed the homes that actually cause problems for communities.**
- **This is a new legal theory creating a conflict with California Supreme Court precedents.**
- **The City Attorney is defending this ordinance using incomplete and inappropriate case law:**

§ **One case is currently on appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals**

§ **Precedents cited on the record are not applicable to disabled households.**

§ California Supreme Court case law was not addressed.

The potential financial risk to the City from litigation costs and penalties is significant.

- The Obama administration is taking an active role in pursuing housing civil rights violations that the previous administration largely overlooked.
 - Many member homes are already preparing legal remedies available to them:
 - HUD is actively encouraging providers to file complaints, at no cost to filers.
 - The DOJ is actively monitoring several similar cases in Southern California.
-



Shelter Partnership

www.shelterpartnership.org

523 West Sixth Street, Suite 616 ■ Los Angeles, California 90014 ■ Fax (213) 689-3188 ■ (213) 688-2188

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHAIR

John A. DeFazio, CPCU ARM
Senior Vice President
Heffernan Insurance Brokers

VICE-CHAIR

J. Martin Willhite
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP

TREASURER

Daniel J. Morefield*
President & CEO
Leads360

SECRETARY

Louise Oliver
Regional Operations Officer
Goodwill Southern California

Alan S. Adler
Senior Vice President
Oaktree Capital Management, L.P.

Peter Barker

President
Barker Management Incorporated

Roxanne E. Christ
Partner

Latham & Watkins LLP

Ann Marie Hickabottom
Manager, Strategic Development
YWCA of Greater Los Angeles

Diann H. Kim, Esq.*
Scheper Kim & Overland LLP

G. Allan Kingston
Vice President
National Community Renaissance Corp.

Thomas M. Lane
Retired
Unisource Worldwide, Inc.

Michael S. Manigault
Community Relations Manager
Bank of America

D. Reed Maughan
PricewaterhouseCoopers, L.L.P.

Gary J. Melsel*
Senior Vice President
Corporate Business
Development & Strategy
Warner Bros.

Mark A. Mozilo, CMB
Principal
CALCAP Real Estate Advisors

Marti Ortiz
Senior Vice President, Director of Sales
Management
City National Bank

William Poulsen
Aon Risk Services

Lt. Edward C. Ramirez
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

David C. Scheper, Esq.
Scheper Kim & Overland LLP

Keith A. Sharp, Esq.
Falk & Sharp

John A. Weissenbach
Partner
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

William A. Witte
President & Managing Partner
The Related Companies of California

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FOUNDER

Ruth Schwartz

FOUNDING BOARD MEMBERS

Dennis Albaugh
(1941-2004)

Ann Reiss Lane*
Chair Emeritus

*Past Chairperson

March 25, 2011

Councilmember Ed Reyes
Chair, Planning and Land Use Management Committee
City Hall
200 North Spring Street, Room 410
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: March 29, 2011 PLUM Committee Meeting
Council File: 11-0262
Opposition to Proposed Community Care Facilities Ordinance

Dear Councilmember Reyes:

Shelter Partnership, Inc. is dedicated to alleviating, preventing and ending homelessness by assisting in the development of short-term and transitional housing programs, affordable housing, and supportive services for the homeless and potentially homeless throughout Los Angeles County. We have been following closely the Planning Department's development of the Community Care Facilities Ordinance. While we are pleased with the proposed treatment of large licensed community care facilities as "public benefits," we are concerned with one of the ordinance's main provisions.

Shelter Partnership has serious concerns with the City's proposed changes to the definitions of "family" and "boarding/rooming house" through the addition of a "single housekeeping unit" definition. The inclusion of this "single housekeeping unit" term has the potential to constrain the siting of housing for people with disabilities, including the homeless.

Requiring a single lease agreement in order to be considered a family for zoning purposes directly contradicts a number of local programs designed to combat homelessness through the provision of permanent supportive housing in shared housing situations. This ordinance would restrict group homes and shared housing in single-family homes, which largely operate with separate lease agreements, to high-density residential zones by classifying them as a boarding house. The February 2011 Planning Department staff report attempts to address this issue, as it was raised previously at the October 2010 hearing on this ordinance, but fails to do so adequately (p. 5).

Councilmember Ed Reyes
March 25, 2011
Page 2

Under the Mental Health Services Act, the State expressly allows shared housing for persons with mental illness, highlighting it as a way for extremely low-income mentally ill individuals with otherwise limited options to access and maintain permanent housing. Separate lease agreements are also required in order for clients in shared housing situations to be eligible for the City's Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program (HPRP). The County's General Relief (GR) Housing Subsidy Project, in which eligible GR recipients receive a \$400 rental subsidy, also depends on shared housing with separate rental agreements for its success.

Furthermore, unlicensed group homes are often an appropriate housing type for people with disabilities; the proposed revised definition of family will restrict the development of such housing and effectively remove one type of housing option for the disabled and homeless.

This attempt by the City to handle a small number of problematic group homes will in fact have a detrimental impact on the development of permanent supportive housing in low-density residential zones. We encourage the City to instead consider revising its nuisance abatement procedure in order to effectively control those improperly managed group homes.

It is our hope that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee will refer this proposed ordinance back to the Planning Department for further revision to ensure that the City continues to treat housing for persons with disabilities equitably. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by email at rschwartz@shelterpartnership.org or telephone at 213-943-4580.

Sincerely,



Ruth Schwartz
Executive Director

cc: Councilmember Jose Huizar, Vice Chair, PLUM Committee
Councilmember Paul Krekorian, Member, PLUM Committee