

THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

**Agenda Related Items - Meeting of September 27, 2022
Supplemental Packet Date: September 27, 2022**

2:30 p.m.

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically a minimum of two—one available on the Thursday preceding the City Council meeting and the second on Tuesday at the meeting. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection on the City's website at toaks.org/agendas or by contacting the City Clerk Dept at (805) 449-2151 during normal business hours [main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)].

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the City Clerk Department at (805) 449-2151. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask City Clerk staff if you desire to use this device. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet, can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist City staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

From: George Senko <gmsenko@pacbell.net>
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2022 1:41 PM
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>
Subject: The Rent Stabilization Ordinance(RSO)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

George M. Senko
111 Navajo Way
Thousand Oaks, CA91362
818-621-6656 or 805-719-7009

September 23, 2022

Dear Thousand Oaks City Council, City Staff and Legal Staff,

RE: The Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO)

Another perspective

Just because the Mobile Home Owners (MHOs) were suckered into a sham negotiation 11 years ago doesn't mean we should be again. The RSO is the City's ordinance. Therefore, the City should make it get the results for which it was designed. The last sentence of the second paragraph of Section 5-25.01 states: "Therefore, it is necessary and reasonable to continue to regulate rents to safeguard Mobile Home Owners, residents, and tenants from excessive rent increase and at the same time, provide landlords with a just and reasonable return on their rental spaces."

We, the MHOs, maintain that the announced 8.5% rent raise beginning Nov. 1 is excessive; and the Land Owners (LOs) are making excessive returns.

How did we get here?

We maintain that the City initiated the negotiations of 2011 because it feared being sued by LOs, if the City tried to enforce its RSO.

- The Thunderbird LO, in particular, put in a request to the RAC June 4, 2010 for a \$322.52/month rent increase.
- On October 8, 2010, a revised increase of \$260.62 was requested.
- On January 18, 2011, after the RAC did an analysis of the LO's MNOI (Maintenance of Net Operating Income), it determined that the \$260.62 was not justified; instead, only \$62/month over 2 years was justified. The City Council agreed with the RAC and approved that increase in Resolution No. 2011-013.
- On January 31, 2011, the LO appealed this determination to the full City Council. The landowner either then sued or threatened to sue the City over this determination.

- Rather than be sued, the City called for a negotiation in which the City, landowner lawyers, and a selection of MHOs representatives took part. It was not at the MHOs' request. It was because the city refused to enforce the ordinance.

The MHOs were outgunned by the LOs' lawyers (the landowners were never part of the negotiations, only their lawyers), and the City's so-called "mediators." The city had a vested interest in negotiations in that it did not want to get sued.

- On April 26, 2011, the city gained, passed, and adopted a covenant where the LOs agreed not to sue or ask for a rent increase for the next 10 years. In exchange, the MHOs lost a 75% CPI with a 7% cap.

Where we are now

Everybody in the negotiation assumed that in 10 years, the RSO would be looked at again, although this was not formally documented. When the 10 years was up, MHOs expected the RSO would be reexamined; and they asked for a cap at that time. The City, with a memory lapse, only focused on the expiration of the covenant that it had as a side deal with the LOs. It then rubber-stamped the RSO, only getting rid of the RAC because the covenant eliminated its need.

We, the MHOs, maintain that the City negotiated-RSO allowed the LOs to increase rents over the ten years so that they are making excessive MNOI at this time. It would take the City's examination of the LOs' books to prove this.

The RSO, as currently configured is not doing the job it is supposed to do. The RSO is the City's ordinance. The city's staff and legal staff have the onus on them to come up with solutions to the City Council members that will fulfill the aims of the RSO. Such solutions might include:

- a 5% cap
- a more appropriate CPI
- subsidy payments to the MHOs to offset the rent increases

The top 10 staff and legal employees together make over \$2M/per year + benefits! They should be capable of coming up with a range of solutions. It is not their job to cower in the corner because they fear lawsuits by the LOs. Rent stabilization has been held as legal and appropriate to put the City's affordable housing strategy into effect. MHOs invest a significant amount in their homes and this should be protected.

Respectfully,

George M. Senko
Thunderbird Oaks Resident

From: J N <midyr91@yahoo.com>

Date: September 26, 2022 at 14:08:03 PDT

To: Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>, Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>

Subject: Homeless shelter on Lawrence blvd

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

hello Mr. Engler and Ms Bill de la Pena

I live in Rancho Conejo Village and saw the proposal to build 30 small housing units at 1205 Lawrence Blvd. I would urge you both to reconsider other sites further distant from our neighborhood as well as what appears to be a couple of schools. In the same spirit of converting the Quality Inn on Conejo Blvd as a homeless shelter, could not the America's Best Value Inn on 2850 camino dos Rios on also be repoposed for similar use? I believe this facility had some law enforcement issues in the past and conversion may benefit that area while serving the homeless with diligent onsite supervision. While NIMBY is understandable for residents who toiled a lifetime to live in our own homes in this city, perhaps a further look into what may be more appropriate sites can be performed. But whether another, better site can be found in Newbury Park, or this current proposed site is eventually approved, Newbury Park cannot be the go to area for more such sites when every other area of Thousand Oaks has not participated in homeless remediation, i.e. Westlake and south T.O.

John Lee

Name	City	Item #	In favor/ Opposed	Comment
Resident Home Owner at	Newbury Park	6	Opposed	<p>As a resident home owner of Rancho Conejo Village in Newbury Park, I am opposed to the Re-zoning of the Industrial parcel at 1205 Lawrence Drive in Newbury Park for the purpose of a new-build of temporary or any homeless shelter housing. I believe a solution to shelter housing can be found in other parts of the city or in Simi Valley or in Santa Maria, that would not impact the residential community of Rancho Conejo less than .5 miles away from the proposed site. I believe this re-zone and rebuild will likely impact security to our community, as well as negatively impact housing values. Alternate shelter locations are available, and can be purchased or leased by the City for the project at other industrial zoned locations that could also be re-zoned for the purpose of a shelter. The current city-owned property at 1205 Lawrence could be sold, or ground leased, and I may have a client interested. As a licensed commercial real estate agent, I would be happy to work with the board to source another Industrial location that would not negatively impact the Rancho Conejo Community. In addition, in the spirit of sourcing suitable housing for homeless, I would offer a reduced Real Estate rate fee for the transactions. I feel confident I can find a suitable location within same budget that would not negatively impact a residential community such as Rancho Conejo. Please reply to the email provided and I will be happy to follow up from my work email with a meeting to provide options. Thank you for recognizing there are other location options that could be implemented as offered here.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the Negative impact this shelter-plan will cause at the entire Rancho Conejo Community of homes.</p> <p>Respectfully, ROI4RealEstate@gmail.com</p>
Charles Pitcher	Thousand Oaks	6	Opposed	<p>This is regarding the emergency homeless shelter on Lawrence Drive. I'm sorry, but I don't want this in my back yard. What is the City trying to do to my neighborhood? A few months ago, there was a push to have a parking facility for the garbage trucks a few blocks from my home. Now it's a homeless shelter. There's a lot of other places to put something like this. How about putting this in Somis or Moorpark or Simi Valley? There's a lot of open land out there. The City wants to put grungy things like garbage truck parking and homeless shelters near my home and they discourage Costco from building a warehouse store at the current Lowe's location. Why are you people doing this? Why don't you try to make this area nicer instead of making it worse?</p>
		7	Opposed	<p>I believe you intend to change the zoning at Los Robles parking lot at the corner of Lynn and W. Janss as part of this project. No. No. No more projects that will increase traffic on Lynn until you do a traffic study and hire more patrol officers,</p>
Lily	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	<p>Strongly oppose to this proposal, the major concern is residents safety. Residents are walking kids, dogs in this area, it is very dangerous to set up homeless shelter eat our neighborhood.</p>
Faye	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	<p>There are a lot of kids activity centers near the Lawrence Drive and many students live nearby walking to school or taking buses every day. It's not safe for them.</p>

Name	City	Item #	In favor/ Opposed	Comment
Rosa	Thousand Oaks	13A	Opposed	I am highly opposed to build homeless shelter at 1205 Lawrence Dr, it will effect of public security in our community, and there are daycares, victory gymnastic, sports academy, bobbies dance school close to shelter place, I concern about kid's security also. please consider other place.
Tian wang	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	For the safety of the neighborhood, no homeless center
		13A	Opposed	Many kids walk by this site to school bus, to sports academy! Can't have homeless committee!
	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	Unsafe
Ning	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	There are a lot of kids in Rancho Conejo community and also a lot of after school programs nearby. Bus stop is there too. Can you please find the other places?
		13A	Opposed	There are daycare, kids places nearby. A homeless shelter is not safe for the kids!
kim		13A	Opposed	please change to another place
Robin Yi	Thousand Oaks	13A	Opposed	The proposed homeless center is close to Canejo Valley community with more than 1000 families, and many small businesses like Victory gymnastic, sports academy, Bobbies dance school, to which many children often walk to take classes, and many people like to walk around that area. The proposed homeless center will greatly threaten the safety of so many people including children. I strongly oppose such a proposal!!!
Jonathan Yan	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	I strongly oppose to the construction of emergency homeless center on Lawrence drive. * Rancho Conejo community & Arroyo Villa apartment complex are within half mile of the intended location, the community & apartment complex consist of over 1000 families with lots of young kids, and the kids are attending to school, going to gym and attending other activities in the close vicinity, I see lots of kids riding scooter, bike or just walking by themselves, as father with kid in elementary school living in the community, I am greatly concerned that adding a homeless shelter will pose security risks to the kids and community. * the intended location is also surrounded by industrial complex, biotech companies, distribution centers etc. adding a homeless shelter will negatively impact future business' willingness to open up new locations / office in the area, which in turn will drive down employment in the area & cause area to deteriorate. * intended location is on a very busy street with lots of traffic from amazon distribution center & UPS, and it is very far away from grocery stores and convenient stores, for the people living in the homeless shelter, who mostly will be walking in the surrounding area, both factors will pose danger to them too. with all above mentioned consideration & concerns, I strongly oppose to this proposal of building a home emergency shelter at 1205 Lawrence drive in Newbury Park.
	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	1 It's a burden for us. No one wants to live in a neighborhood with homeless houses in the backyard. 2 There is a new business center on Lawrence Dr., and how do they rent their space if there the shelter is built here. Thousand Oaks needs more jobs and needs to protect small business. 3 We worry about the children, the community and local economy. Certainly, no community can be thrilled about such a project, but in this instance the consequences could be dire for a neighborhood that has long been struggling to improve itself from pandemic.

Name	City	Item #	In favor/ Opposed	Comment
Jing Chen	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	<p>1 It's a burden for us. No one wants to live in a neighborhood with homeless houses in the backyard.</p> <p>2 There is a new business center on Lawrence Dr., and how do they rent their space if there the shelter is built here. Thousand Oaks needs more jobs and needs to protect small business.</p> <p>3 We worry about the children, the community and local economy.</p> <p>Certainly, no community can be thrilled about such a project, but in this instance the consequences could be dire for a neighborhood that has long been struggling to improve itself from pandemic.</p>
Di Mo	Thousand Oaks	13A	Opposed	<p>This will bring a growing population of homeless near this area and it will cause lots of security issues to our Rancho Conejo community. As a new father, I want my child growing safe here.</p>
	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	<p>No no no no no. A shameless money grab at the peril of the safety and tranquility of the neighborhood in which we choose to invest. My young adult children are working as hard as they can to earn and save enough money to live in our amazing town, which will mean having to share a house with roommates, and yet this proposal will provide an entire small house to someone who doesn't even have to work for it. Incidentally, what are the chances that drugs and/or alcohol abuse has something to do with their homeless situation? Most importantly, where in the world has this type of policy solved the "homeless" problem? Please enlighten me.</p>
David Zhang	Newbury Park	13A	Opposed	<p>1 It's a burden for us. No one wants to live in a neighborhood with homeless houses in the backyard.</p> <p>2 There is a new business center on Lawrence Dr., and how do they rent their space if there the shelter is built here. Thousand Oaks needs more jobs and needs to protect small business.</p> <p>3 We worry about the children, the community and local economy.</p> <p>Certainly, no community can be thrilled about such a project, but in this instance the consequences could be dire for a neighborhood that has long been struggling to improve itself from pandemic.</p>
		13A	Opposed	<p>There are a couple of kid activities classes nearby. Building the shelter will introduce potential safety risk to kids attending classes.</p>
		13A	Opposed	<p>1 It's a burden for us. No one wants to live in a neighborhood with homeless houses in the backyard.</p> <p>2 There is a new business center on Lawrence Dr., and how do they rent their space if there the shelter is built here. Thousand Oaks needs more jobs and needs to protect small business.</p> <p>3 We worry about the children, the community and local economy.</p> <p>Certainly, no community can be thrilled about such a project, but in this instance the consequences could be dire for a neighborhood that has long been struggling to improve itself from pandemic.</p>
Zhibang Duan		13A	Opposed	<p>1 It's a burden for us. No one wants to live in a neighborhood with homeless houses in the backyard.</p> <p>2 There is a new business center on Lawrence Dr., and how do they rent their space if there the shelter is built here. Thousand Oaks needs more jobs and needs to protect small business.</p> <p>3 We worry about the children, the community and local economy.</p> <p>Certainly, no community can be thrilled about such a project, but in this instance the consequences could be dire for a neighborhood that has long been struggling to improve itself from pandemic.</p>