



Date: 3/20/12  
Submitted in PLUM Committee  
Council File No: 11-0262  
Item No.: 1  
Deputy: Comm. from Public

March 13, 2012

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Los Angeles City Hall  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles California, 90012

Case No: CPC-2009-800-CA  
CEQA: ENV-2009-801-ND  
Council File No: 11-0262  
Community Care Facility Ordinance (CCFO)

RE: **Opposition** to the 3/8/12 Planning Report suggested revisions to the proposed CCFO

Honorable Councilmembers Reyes, Englander and Huizar:

The safety, health and wellbeing of many of the citizens within the entire city of Los Angeles have been compromised because of poorly written zoning codes and the needless delays in enacting legislation that would offer some protection. In our opinion, some of the proposed stipulations within the City Attorney's Report, 9/13/11, provide clearer definitions and objective mechanisms that allow for more effective enforcement and regulation.

After careful review and consideration of the Planning Report, 3/8/12, we strongly urge you to reject all recommendations and suggestions within this document. It is our firm belief that the following recommendations (underlined) have been put forth to disable, disarm and render the proposed CCFO immaterial:

1. "...it (City Council) may wish to remove the lease limitation altogether and rely solely on "markers" in addition to precluding it from being a boarding/rooming house business..."  
The option of "markers" listed, such as "relatively permanent or non-transitory" is subjective and very vague. Enforcement would be severely hampered. Clearer guidelines are required. The lease agreement designation solves enforcement challenges because it is simple, objective and explicit. ***The 2 or more lease stipulation is the key component that defines a Boarding/Rooming House Business and must be maintained.***
2. "Regulating licensed facilities of seven residents and over as public benefits."  
Public benefits or "by right" determination violates the fundamental principles of fairness, due process, and shuts out public comment and review. ***Because of the significant impact that a large facility (as many as 100-200 residents) could have on the surrounding community, a Zoning Variance must be required as a means of regulation.***
3. "...the Department recommends that the City Council remove the parolee/probationer definition and conditional use from the proposed ordinance and resolve these issues at a later date."  
Considering that the State early prisoner release program is under way, the issue of parolee/probationer housing is an urgent matter that must be dealt with immediately. Many group and sober living homes have upwards of 50% of the residents that are parolees/probationers. The LAPD has warned us that there is such an onslaught of these types of dangerous houses opening up that they are impossible to track or monitor. Many cities have ordinances that regulate parolee/probationer houses. ***There is no viable explanation or justification for the removal of the parolee/probationer definition from the proposed ordinance.***

For five years, the citizens of Los Angeles have been waiting for the passage of an ordinance that will regulate group houses and community care facilities in a manner that will offer protection to the surrounding communities as well as safeguarding the residents within those facilities. ***Therefore, we strongly urge you to consider our above recommendations (italicized) along with the recommendations made within the City Attorney's Report, 9/13/11.***

Respectfully,

Dave Beauvais, President  
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group

Maria Fisk, Board Member  
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group