



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner
Director

October 3, 2016

TO: Patricia Hachiya
Hearing Officer

FROM: Carl Nadela, AICP
Zoning Permits East Section

SUBJECT: **Project No. 2016-000334-(4)**
Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL 2016002104
HO Meeting: October 4, 2016
Agenda Item: 20

The above-mentioned item is a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to authorize the continued operation of a 327-space mobilehome park.

Please find attached two more emails received from the public regarding this project.

If you need further information, please contact Carl Nadela at (213) 974-6435 or cnadela@planning.lacounty.gov. Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

**I, THE HEARING OFFICER, CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR CUP
RPPL2016002104 TO NOVEMBER 15, 2016.**

MM:CN

Carl Nadela

From: manyin <manyin37@163.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 01, 2016 3:14 PM
To: Carl Nadela
Subject: A Serious Matter
Attachments: Letter to Carl Nadela.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please Also See Attachment. It's the same.

To: The Planner of Project No. 2016-000334-(4), Condition Use Permit NO. RPPL 2016002104

From: Manyin Li, a resident/mobilehome owner residing at Space 61 in Rowland Heights Mobilehome Park.

Dated: Oct 1, 2016

Re: Unjust and unreasonable Seizure of Mobilehomes Happening in Rowland Heights Mobile Estate Park

Dear Mr. Carl Nadela:

I am writing to call upon your attention to a very serious matter. As far as I know, in the past 7-8 years, there were 3 evictions due to nonpayment of space rent in RHME Park. Evictions of nonpayment carried out by court order is legal. However, the seizure of mobilehomes by the Park from mobilehome owners who owed money to the Park is not only unreasonable but also illegal.

The practice in this Park is this: If a mobilehome owner who rents a space from the Park owes the Park money due to non-payment of the rent for whatever reason, the Park would file an unlawful detaining case to the court. Then the Park would take over the mobilehome and evict the mobilehome owner.

The first of such incidents I have known of is my former next door neighbor, an American-Korean who rented Space 60. He was evicted during the recession (I don't remember exactly in what year that happened) and his mobilehome was seized by the Park and then sold to my current neighbor. I heard such things happened before and the Park acquired quite a number of mobilehomes in this way.

Last year, a neighbor who rented Space 52 was also evicted by court order. The mobilehome owner, Mr. Cheng-Si Teng, told the court that he had the right to sell his mobilehome and pay what he owed, approximately \$7000, to the Park from the proceeds. I think Mr. Teng's request is legitimate, because he still owns his mobilehome. However, the Park prohibited the mobilehome owners who owed money to the Park to sell their mobilehomes and used the proceeds to pay the owed moneys. Even if the court says yes, you can sell your mobilehome,

the Park would not let anyone to buy their mobilehomes, because the Park has the power to approve or disapprove such transactions. Mr. Cheng-Si Teng was very angry, so he finally towed his mobilehome away even though he had to spend more than 10 thousand dollars to move it to elsewhere. Mr. Teng suffered great financial loss, but he just would not let the Park seize his property unreasonably and unlawfully. This is the first time the Park did not obtain a mobilehome and had gain by seizing the mobilehome.

Now, recently, this happened again to a neighbor who rented Space 81. The mobilehome owner is an African-American. He was evicted just a few days ago for owing money to the Park, and the Park took over his mobilehome. Just like Mr. Teng, he thinks that he has the right to sell his mobilehome, and the Park does not have the right to take over his mobilehome.

For any reasonable person, letting the mobilehome owner sell his mobilehome and pay the owed rent from the proceeds is the right and just way to solve the problem, unless the amount of money owed is greater than the market value of the mobilehome. The Park's practice on this matter is heartless and unjust and unacceptable. It takes advantage of mobilehome owners' hardship to gain unlawful profit. This practice is pure plunder.

Park residents are angry with this plunder. As the Park continuously increase the rent without an end, eventually, most of mobilehome owners who rent spaces in this Park could be evicted due to being unable to pay the rent, and the Park could eventually seize all the mobilehomes.

I plead our government to have pity on low-income mobilehome owners and stop this plunder. I want to express again that I am not opposed to granting CUP to RHME Park, because it is a nice mobilehome Park. I just ask the Department of Regional Planning to put some restrictions on RHME so they would be unable to plunder mobilehome owners in the future.

I was thinking to attend the Oct 4 public hearing and talk about this matter. But I got to know that Mr. Ken Meng, the mobilehome owner at Space 131 and the self-styled Chairman of 1441 Mobilehome Association, is going to take 70 people to the public hearing, and some of them may not be Park residents. Since I have direct communication with you, and you have shown that you really listen to my voice, I don't really have to attend the public hearing in person. I want to avoid the chaos that could happen at the Oct 4 public hearing. Please be prepared for the unexpected. That's why I send you this letter instead of going to the public hearing.

Sincerely,

Manyin Li

PS. You did not answer my question about why RHME needs a CUP to operate a Mobilehome park in R-3 zone, but Pearl of the East does not one to build a commercial plaza in C-3 zone. Will you please kindly answer this question?

Carl Nadela

From: 正峰 <cf520tw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 11:22 AM
To: Carl Nadela
Subject: Violation of Civil code (Mobilehome Residency Law) 98.75.5.
Attachments: 3621

Dear Mr. Carl Nadela:

Rhme Park never provided "798.75. 5. Mobilehome park disclosure *form*" to mobilehome owners renting spaces from this park, not to mention updating the information annually. This is a violation of Civil code (Mobilehome Residency Law) 98.75.5. (a) "The management shall provide a prospective homeowner with a completed written *disclosure form* concerning the *park ...*" and other section on 98.75.5. Please see attached Mobilehome Residency Law Page 37-38