COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Brandi D'Amore, Chair
Paul Barbosa
Mark Millner
George Skarpelos
Jim Van Dusen

HOLLYWOOD UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Certified Council #52,
P.O. Box 3272 Los Angeles, CA 90078
www.MyHUNC.org email us at Info@MyHUNC.org

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee
Thursday, July 2, 2026, 6:30 PM
Zoom Meeting Online or By Telephone
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85124766180 or Dial 1 (669) 444-9171 to Join the Meeting Then Enter This Webinar ID: 851 2476 6180 and Press

Welcome

6:30 PM start

1. Roll Call and Location confirmation

   All members indicate presence within LA City boundaries.
   Paul Barbosa and Brandi D'Amore indicate that their minutes will be taken for personal use and not as part of HUNC record.

DRAFT

2. Approval of April 2026 Minutes

   B. D'Amore makes the motion to include the primary and secondary movers of item #5 on April 2026 minutes that were missing on draft minutes. Primary mover was B. D'Amore; secondary mover was Mark Millner.

   Motion: Mark Millner **Second:** Paul Barbosa **Result:** Yes-3, No-0, Abstain-1, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

   Yes
   Brandi D'Amore Mark Millner Paul Barbosa
   Abstain
   Jim Van Dusen

3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda (2 minutes each)

   None

4. Discussion and possible recommendation for a Commercial Storefront License for Marijuana Dispensary Application No.: LA-R 26-321022-ANN Submitted by: Mecca Hospitality Group LLC at 6223- W FRANKLIN AVE LOS ANGELES, CA 90028 Activities Requested: Retail

   Also see Exhibits Folder

   Community Hearing Notice
   https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=db335c75f4&attid=0.1&permmsgid=msg-f:1867450300271220642&th=19ea8427675cd7a2&view=att&disp=inline&realattid=f_mq5h00es0&zw&acrobatPromotionSource=gmail_chrome-card

   Department of Cannabis Regulation (DCR) Rules & Regulations: https://cannabis.lacity.gov/sites/g/files/wph2341/files/2026-06/Rules%20%26%20Regulations%20%28Effective%2005_28_2026%29.pdf

   LA's Annual Licensing: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TERTM1rsAcSfSZMiCJG1q8goVMSQdEu4/view

   Hearing Process: https://cannabis.lacity.gov/sites/g/files/wph2341/files/2026-03/2.%20LIC-4001-PRO%20Administrative%20Hearing%20Procedures%20-%20rev%2012.4.24%20Final_0.pdf

   Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC): https://cannabis.lacity.gov/laws-policy/local-law#LAMC

   Chair gave summary of planning case before the committee.

Arian Jafari presented his case, starting with his personal and professional background. He's been in the cannabis industry for thirteen years. This would be the company's fifth location in LA, and they're all social equity licenses. He indicates the area is "underserved".

Arian and his business partner are owner/operators and claim not a big corporate chain. Arian lives in Hollywood and has been here for forty years.

Applicant states that the dispensary plans to have overnight security even though they're not required to. It will have extra security cameras. Indicates that other locations never had issues with LAPD. They haven't gotten calls from neighborhood liaisons. They don't have any outstanding debts with DCR. They take pride with being model owners. Arian is also the owner of a boxing gym in the community.

B. D'Amore left the meeting at 6:42pm
Committee paused the meeting at 6:43pm
B. D'Amore re-joined the meeting at 6:45pm and committee reconvened the meeting at 6:45pm

Applicant continued that per their lease, they have five parking spaces and four additional in the alley (clarification was made that those back spaces are public parking). Regarding the parking spaces, there is generally a pretty quick turnaround at the business.

At the conclusion of applicant presentation, Chair opened up questions. Chair asked the committee if any members wished to address the applicant first. After no response, Chair proceeded to ask questions of the applicant.

Chair asked regarding the equity owner's low-income status and confirmed that the applicant present was not the applicant in whose name the equity license would be issued. Applicant was advised that the committee could therefore not confirm that it qualified for equity status.

Chair asked applicant regarding the sensitive use review noting that multiple locations have potentially been identified as being within 700 feet of the location. Applicant indicated that the application did not identify these locations on its submission. Chair advised that it would need to advise DCR for them to review the locations noted.

Chair asked about the mural on the front and side of the building. AJ replied that he'd like to maintain the mural. He doesn't plan to put up weed paraphernalia. Chair asked about mandatory compliance issues including odor mitigation, particularly in terms of there being restaurants next door. AJ confirmed that there's a DCR checklist that he has to fulfill. In regards to ventilation they have high-grade filters. Also everything is pre-packaged now so it's not just open buds.

Chair asked about: mitigating lines running outside the building ; asked again about parking in the neighborhood and traffic mitigation

Chair asked about business hours. They will be open from 8am-10pm. Chair asked about their delivery structure. They don't have delivery here or at any of their locations yet.
Chair informed AJ about sidewalk sandwich board signs and spinning signs not being allowed. Chair informed AJ about the homeless population nearby.

J. Van Dusen asked about the community meeting on June 30 – the Argyle Civic Association filed an inquiry with DCR through HUNC because multiple residents in the 500 foot area of the location did not receive their mandatory notice of the community meeting or the DCR hearing and requested an review of mailing and possible postponement.

Applicant spoke regarding the meeting with the community.
J. Van Dusen asked regarding the business overall these days. He also asked what percentage of the store will be dedicated to medicinal marijuana. Applicant says that nowadays most clients won't get their medical card because they're allowed to just walk in. Chair asked AJ if he's reached out to LAPD regarding the location. AJ says that at each of his locations he reaches out to LAPD and he will at this location.

P. Barbosa asked applicant why he picked this location. Applicant said he's seeing it as a flagship location. It's a busy area in a great neighborhood. M. Millner asked when applicant opened up his first dispensary. He signed a lease in 2018. They opened in Sept 2022. Sept 1st will be their fourth year in that location.

Chair opened questions up to the public. There were none.

The board began discussion. Chair reminded committee that NCs are obligated to point out to the City the potential liabilities to the City, and J. Van Dusen highlighted reporting community input and the importance of verifying appropriate sending of notifications to community.

Instead of taking a position, it was decided to send a list of questions for DCR to verify including:
–Advising in regards to providing the Argyle Civic Association request for postponement in the event it was found accurate that due

DRAFT

notice was not provided to the community
–Traffic and transportation mitigation plans
–Sensitive Use locations within the 700-foot radius of the business

Committee notes that the proprietor indicates enthusiasm regarding following all of the structural compliance.

Motion passed.

Motion: Paul Barbosa **Second:** Brandi D'Amore **Result:** Yes-4, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Brandi D'Amore Jim Van Dusen Mark Millner Paul Barbosa

5. Discussion of Parking and Traffic Mitigation Methods and Consequences at Lake Hollywood and environs in relation to recent preferred parking district implementation to determine if and what board statement to move forward to board as official position

   Motion postponed due to need for verifying conflict of interest issues.

6. Committee Member announcements on items not on the Agenda

   None

7. Old/Ongoing Business

   Chair advised committee that the AT&T project at 2069 Argyle decision is under appeal as a homeowner at Alcyona has filed a legal appeal on the project. The City Attorney has determined that PLUM can hear the validity of the appeal.

   Chair advised of update on project at 1936 N. Bronson. The property on Bronson is still in process of a commercial zoning variance, yet the applicant hasn't fully submitted their paperwork and there's a concern it may intentionally be staying in limbo. So there may be a request for the Planning Department to give them a hard deadline.

8. New/Future Business

   Chair asked J. Van Dusen if he wished to be considered to renew his voting stakeholder status as his term expiration is coming up in October 2026. J. Van Dusen indicated desire to maintain.

Adjournment at 9:01 PM

DRAFT

Reconsideration: The Board may reconsider and amend its action on items listed on the agenda if that reconsideration takes place before the end of the meeting at which it was considered or at the next regular meeting. The Board, on either of these two days, shall: (1) Make a Motion for Reconsideration and, if approved, (2) hear the matter and take an action. If the motion to reconsider an action is to be scheduled at the next meeting following the original action, then two items shall be placed on the agenda for that meeting: (1) A Motion for Reconsideration on the described matter and (2) a [Proposed] action should the motion to reconsider be approved. A Motion for Reconsideration can only be made by a Board member who has previously voted on the prevailing side of the original action taken. If a Motion for Reconsideration is not made on the date the action was taken, then a Board member on the prevailing side of the action must submit a memorandum to the Recording Secretary identifying the matter to be reconsidered and a brief description of the reason(s) for requesting reconsideration at the next regular meeting. The aforesaid shall all be in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

MOTION

PLANNING & LAND USE MANAGEMENT

For over a year, community stakeholders and the City have been working collaboratively to identify and address unintended consequences arising from the implementation of recent state housing laws. These discussions have focused on potential reforms to existing housing statutes, including Senate Bill 1211 and related legislation that has expanded the circumstances under which detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) may be constructed, including provisions that can allow ADUs substantially larger than the traditional 1,200 square foot threshold.

In particular, the ability to construct larger ADUs in connection with proposed multifamily developments has raised concerns about whether some projects remain consistent with the underlying purpose of ADU legislation as a means of facilitating incremental housing growth and the production of units that are accessible to households from an affordability perspective. The concern is not with ADUs themselves, nor with the State's broader effort to increase housing production. Rather, it is with ensuring that the statutory framework continues to function as intended and does not inadvertently create a pathway for development that circumvents limitations the Legislature established in the first place.

The State and local jurisdictions share a common interest in ensuring that California's housing laws create meaningful opportunities for additional housing while also allowing communities to address legitimate concerns related to scale, infrastructure, neighborhood compatibility, and responsible development. Where the implementation of State law reveals an unintended loophole, the appropriate response is to examine the statute, understand how the unintended outcome occurred, and work collaboratively toward a legislative solution.

The need for such a solution has now been acknowledged by Assemblymember Schiavo (AD-40). In a letter dated September 16, 2026, Assemblymember Schiavo stated, "I agree that the development is not in the spirit of the ADU legislation that has been passed in Sacramento that limited ADU sizes. This development has exposed an unexpected loophole…[and] my team has been working for the last couple weeks to research possible legislative solutions."

The Assemblymember's acknowledgment confirms what community stakeholders and local officials have been raising for nearly a year: the current statutory framework can produce an outcome that was not contemplated when the Legislature established limits on ADU sizes. Having identified the issue as an "unexpected loophole" and recognized that the development is not consistent with the spirit of the Legislature's own ADU limitations, the State should work to advance a clear and effective legislative solution that closes the loophole while preserving the broader objectives of California's housing laws.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Council instruct the Planning Department, in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare and process an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) to temporarily prohibit the issuance of any building permits for detached accessory dwelling units on multifamily developments that exceed 1,200 square feet.

I FURTHER MOVE that the ICO include an Urgency Clause, making it effective upon publication, and consistent with California Government Code § 65858, the ICO shall run for 45 days, with a 10 month and 15 days extension by Council Resolution, and can be further extended for an additional 1 year, or until the adoption of the appropriate land use regulatory controls have been prepared by the Planning Department, adopted by the Council and become effective, whichever occurs first.

PRESENTED BY: _____ SECONDED BY: _____

JOHN S. LEE
Councilmember, 12th District

OCT 0 2 2026

ORIGINAL

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An ordinance amending Section 41.18 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to make it unlawful for a person to sit, lie, or sleep, or to store, use, maintain, or place personal property near schools and daycare centers, and to amend LAMC Section 56.11 to align it with Section 41.18 and to remove references to "Bulky Items."

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Subsection 41.18(c)(1) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(c) Except as limited by Subsection (d), no person shall:

(1) sit, lie, sleep, or store, use, maintain, or place personal property, in or upon any street, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way within the distance stated on the posted signage (up to a maximum of 500 feet) of a property designated as a sensitive use. For a property to be designated as a "sensitive use," the property must be a Public Park, or Public Library, as those terms are defined in Section 105.01 of this Code;

Sec. 2. A new Subsection (e) is added to Section 41.18 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows and Subsection (e) is relettered as Subsection (f):

(e) No person shall sit, lie, sleep, or store, use, maintain, or place personal property, in or upon any street, sidewalk, or other public property within 500 feet of a School or Day Care Center as those terms are defined in Section 105.01 of this Code. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(f) Violations of this section involving a person who willfully resists, delays, or obstructs a City employee from enforcing this section or who willfully refuses to comply after being requested to do so by an authorized City employee shall be subject to the penalties set forth in Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.00. All other violations of this section shall be enforceable only as infractions pursuant to LAMC 11.00(m) or issuance of a citation pursuant to City's Administrative Citation Enforcement Program pursuant to LAMC Section 11.2.01, *et seq.*

Sec. 3. Subsection 2.(c) of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is deleted in its entirety and the remaining Subsections 2.(d) through 2.(r) are renumbered as Subsections 2.(c) through 2.(q).

Sec. 4. Subsection 2.(i) of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(i) **"Personal Property"** means any tangible property, and includes, but is not limited to, goods, materials, merchandise, Tents, tarpaulins, bedding, sleeping bags, hammocks, sheds, structures, mattresses, couches, chairs, other furniture, appliances, and personal items such as household items, luggage, backpacks, clothing, documents, and medication.

Sec. 5. Subsections 3.(d) and 3.(e) of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code are amended to read as follows:

(d) No Person shall Store any Personal Property in a Public Area in such a manner that it does not allow for passage as provided by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 328 (1990), as amended from time to time. Without prior notice, the City may move and may immediately impound any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, Stored in a Public Area in such a manner that it does not allow for passage as required by the ADA. Post-removal notice shall be provided as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), below. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(e) No Person shall Store any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, within:

(1) 10 feet of any operational or utilizable driveway or loading dock;

(2) 5 feet of any operational or utilizable building entrance or exit; or

(3) 2 feet of any fire hydrant, fire plug, or other fire department connection.

Without prior notice, the City may move and may immediately impound any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, Stored in a Public Area in violation of this subsection. Post-removal notice shall be provided as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), below. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

Sec. 6. Subsection 3.(i) of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(i) No Person shall Store any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in such a manner that obstructs or interferes with any activity in a Public Area for which the City has issued a permit. Without prior notice, the City may move any Personal Property Stored in a Public Area in violation of this subsection. With pre-removal notice as specified in Subsection 4.(a), the City may impound any Personal Property Stored in violation of this subsection. Post-

removal notice shall be provided as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), below. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

Sec. 7. Subsection 3.(j) of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is renumbered as 3.(m) and new Subsections 3.(j) and 3.(k) and 3.(l) are added to read as follows:

(j) No Person shall Store any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in such a manner as to obstruct any portion of a street or other public right-of-way open to use by motor vehicles, a designated bike lane or bike path, or other public right-of-way open exclusively to use by bicycles. Without prior notice, the City may move and may immediately impound any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of this subsection. Post-removal notice shall be provided as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), below. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(k) No Person shall Store any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of Section 41.18(c) of this Code. The City may move and may immediately impound any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of this subsection. Pre-removal notice and post-removal notice will be provided by erecting signage providing notice that Storage of Personal Property is a violation of Section 41.18, which may result in the removal or impoundment of the Personal Property. The signage also must provide information on retrieval of the Personal Property and provide notice that the Personal Property may be discarded if not claimed within 90 days. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(l) No Person shall Store any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of Section 41.18(e) of this Code. With pre-removal notice as specified in Subsection 4.(a) or posted signage, the City may impound any Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of this subsection. If the City has not posed signage, a post-removal notice shall be provided as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), below. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

Sec. 8. Subsection 7 of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

7. **Ban on Erection of Tents in Certain Public Areas and Regulation of Hours in other Public Areas.**

(a) No Person shall erect, configure, construct, maintain, use, occupy, or allow to remain erected any Tent in any Public Area in violation of Section 41.18 of this Code. Without prior notice, the City may deconstruct any Tent, whether Attended or Unattended, in violation of this subsection. With pre-removal notice as specified in Subsection 4.(a) or posted signage, the City may

impound any Tent in violation of this subsection. If the City has not posted signage, the City shall provide post-removal notice of any impounded Tent, as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), herein. A violation of this subsection is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(b) In any Public Area not covered under Subsection 7.(a), above, no Person shall erect, configure, construct, maintain, use, occupy, or allow to remain erected any Tent in any Public Area from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. (except during rainfall or when the temperature is below 50 degrees Fahrenheit). Without prior notice, the City may deconstruct any Tent, whether Attended or Unattended, located in any Public Area in violation of this subsection or in violation of Subsections 3.(c)-(h), hereof. With pre-removal notice as specified in Subsection 4.(a), the City may impound any Tent in violation of this subsection or Subsections 3.(c)-(h), hereof. The City shall provide post-removal notice for any impounded Tent, as set forth in Subsection 4.(b), herein.

Sec. 9. Subsection 8.(d) is added to Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(d) **Enforcement.** The enforcement of a violation of this subsection in any Public Area subject to Section 41.18 of the Code is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

Sec. 10. Subsection 10 of Section 56.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

10. **Unlawful Conduct.** Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 11.00 shall not apply to violations of this section except as follows:

(a) No Person shall willfully resist, delay, or obstruct a City employee from moving, removing, impounding, or discarding Personal Property Stored in a Public Area in violation of Subsections 3.(a)-(c) or (f)-(h). A violation of Subsections 3.(d)-(e), (i)-(l), 7.(a) or 8 (in any Public Area subject to Section 41.18 of this Code) is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(b) No Person shall refuse to take down, fold, deconstruct, or put away any Tent erected or configured at any time in violation of Subsection 7.(a) or willfully resist, delay, or obstruct a City employee from taking down, folding, deconstructing, putting away, moving, removing, impounding, or discarding a Tent, including by refusing to vacate the Tent. A violation of Subsection 7.(a) in any Public Area subject to Section 41.18 of this Code is governed by Section 41.18(f) of this Code.

(c) No Person shall refuse to take down, fold, deconstruct, or put away any Tent erected or configured between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., in violation of Subsection 7.(b), or willfully resist, delay or obstruct a City employee

from taking down, folding, deconstructing, putting away, moving, removing, impounding, or discarding the Tent, including by refusing to vacate the Tent.

(d) A violation of Subsection 9 prohibiting illegal dumping.

(e) If Subsection 3.(m) becomes operative by resolution in any area of the City subject to Section 41.18 of this Code, a violation of Subsection 3.(m) will be subject to Section 41.18(f) of this Code. If Subsection 3.(m) becomes operative by resolution in any Public Area of the City not subject to Section 41.18(f) of the Code, no Person shall willfully resist, delay or obstruct a City employee from removing or impounding any Personal Property that exceeds the limit on Essential Personal Property.

Sec. 11. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

Approved as to Form and Legality

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney

By _____
VALERIE L. FLORES
Senior Assistant City Attorney

Date June 27, 2022

File No. 20-1376-S1

M:\GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION\ORDINANCES AND REPORTS\ORDINANCES - FINAL\Ordinance LAMC 41.18 and 56.11 - A.docx

The Clerk of the City of Los Angeles hereby certifies that the foregoing ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles.

CITY CLERK

MAYOR

_____

_____

Ordinance Passed_____

Approved _____

TO CITY CLERK FOR PLACEMENT ON NEXT REGULAR COUNCIL AGENDA TO BE POSTED | #61

MOTION

Since 2023, street homelessness in Council District 13 has declined by more than 40%. During that period, permanent housing placements have increased, interim housing options have expanded, and Inside Safe has maintained a 98% acceptance rate for housing and services in CD13 — demonstrating that meaningful progress is possible when the City leads with housing, services, and sustained outreach.

That progress has also given our Council District an opportunity to evaluate what is working, and what is getting in the way. Our experience, along with feedback from service providers and experts, has made clear that enforcement under Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 41.18 does not prevent or resolve longstanding encampments in District 13. Instead, these enforcement actions can cause outreach teams to lose contact with people they are actively working to house, separate individuals from essential belongings, including prescription medications, and create legal complications from unpaid citations that can prevent people from moving into permanent housing.

I THEREFORE MOVE that in the matter of Council action of November 16, 2021 relative to designating 41.18 zones in Council District 13 (C.F. 21-4118-S14) THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE TO RESCIND all sites designated in the action, inasmuch as the Council Office does not wish to maintain these zones as designated 41.18 sites.

I FURTHER MOVE that the Council instruct the City Administrative Officer to report with any additional actions necessary to remove signage from these sites.

PRESENTED BY:

HUGO SOTO-MARTÍNEZ
Councilmember, 13th District

SECONDED BY:

ORIGINAL

AUG 1 1 2026

TO CITY CLERK FOR PLACEMENT ON NEXT REGULAR COUNCIL AGENDA TO BE POSTED #51

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, §41.18 of the Municipal Code provides that the Council by Resolution may designate specified areas for enforcement against sitting, lying, sleeping, or storing, using, maintaining, or placing personal property, or otherwise obstructing the public right-of-way, in order for a person to be found in violation of any of these prohibited behaviors; and

WHEREAS, the below listed locations are experiencing a need for enforcement against the above listed prohibitions; and

WHEREAS, the Council hereby finds that the public health, safety, or welfare is served by the prohibition, and further finds that sleeping or lodging within the stated proximity to the designated area(s) is unhealthy, unsafe, or incompatible with safe passage; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Council District 13 has submitted / posted to the File relevant documentation, as further detailed in the Code, that the circumstances at these locations pose a particular and ongoing threat to public health or safety:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to §41.18 (c) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code that the Council hereby designates the following locations for enforcement against sitting, lying, sleeping, or storing, using, maintaining, or placing personal property, or otherwise obstructing the public right-of-way, up to the maximum distance and effective for the maximum period of time prescribed, and as further detailed in the Code:

1. 6125 Carlos Avenue - Delaney Wright Fine Art Preschool – School

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Department(s) with jurisdiction over the identified locations are hereby directed and authorized to post appropriate notices of the above prohibitions at these locations, and to begin enforcement upon the expiration of any required posting period.

PRESENTED BY: _____
MITCH O'FARRELL
Councilmember, 13th District

SECONDED BY: _____

ORIGINAL

jr

JUN 21 2022

FOLLOWING THE EVIDENCE ON HOMELESSNESS

SINCE TAKING OFFICE IN 2022, THE COUNCIL DISTRICT 13 HOMELESSNESS TEAM IS ON THE GROUND EVERY DAY CONNECTING UNHOUSED RESIDENTS WITH OUTREACH WORKERS, CASE MANAGERS, MENTAL HEALTH + ADDICTION TREATMENT, AND HOUSING RESOURCES

3 consecutive years of decreased homelessness in **district**

Homelessness down by over 40%

Permanent housing placements +66%

98% Acceptance rate of housing & services with **Inside Safe**

Expanded interim housing options, **even with funding cuts**

TOOLS THAT TURN INTO OBSTACLES

As we've successfully reduced homelessness, we've also evaluated what helps, and what gets in the way. We've found that repeated enforcement under **LAMC 41.18** – can make it harder for outreach workers to find people and provide services to help them get back on their feet.

If a policy makes it harder to build relationships and get people indoors, we have to reconsider whether it's achieving the goal we all share.

What is LAMC 41.18?
the law that criminalizes people experiencing homelessness for sitting or sleeping in public

WHAT'S NEXT?

Councilmember Soto-Martínez is looking to introduce a motion that would remove the 12 revocable 41.18 zones in Council District 13, including in this area.

Visit **bit.ly/4118faq** to view the exact zones and FAQs.

WHAT THIS MEANS

- ✓ Focusing resources on strategies that work
- ✓ Eliminating obstacles to housing
- ✓ Increased attention to prevent longstanding encampments

WHAT THIS **DOES NOT** MEAN:

- ✗ Allowing unsafe conditions
- ✗ Reducing proven strategies to combat homelessness
- ✗ Any changes to school zones, which were established under a citywide law

LA CITY COUNCIL | DISTRICT 13
HUGO
COMMUNITY POWER

QUESTIONS?

Email us at **cd13homelessness@lacity.org** OR join us in-person for special "office hours" **August 24 4-6pm**
Echo Park Field Office - 1722 Sunset Blvd

SIGUIENDO LOS DATOS SOBRE LAS PERSONAS SIN HOGAR

EL EQUIPO PARA LAS PERSONAS SIN HOGAR DEL DISTRITO 13 TRABAJA CADA DÍA EN LAS ZONAS MÁS AFECTADAS DE NUESTRO DISTRITO PARA AYUDAR A LAS PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA Y CONECTARLAS CON TRABAJADORES SOCIALES, GESTORES DE CASOS, SERVICIOS DE SALUD MENTAL Y DE TRATAMIENTO DE ADICCIONES Y CON RECURSOS DE VIVIENDA

- **3 años de reducciones** en el número de personas sin hogar en el distrito
- El número de personas sin hogar se ha reducido **en más de un 40 %**
- Asignación de viviendas permanentes **+66%**
- **98%** Tasa de aceptación de viviendas y servicios con **Inside Safe**
- Más opciones de viviendas temporarias **aún con recortes de fondos**

HERRAMIENTAS QUE SE CONVIERTEN EN OBSTÁCULOS

A través de nuestra reducción exitosa del número de personas sin hogar, también hemos evaluado qué medidas son útiles y cuáles lo dificultan. Hemos encontrado que la implementación repetida de la medida **41.18 del LAMC** puede dificultar que los trabajadores sociales locales encuentren a las personas y les puedan brindar los servicios necesarios para que puedan salir adelante.

Si una medida dificulta construir relaciones y conseguir que las personas tengan un techo bajo el que vivir, debemos evaluar si realmente está logrando el objetivo que todos compartimos.

¿Qué es 41.18 del LAMC?
una ley que criminaliza a las personas sin hogar por sentarse o dormir en lugares públicos

¿QUÉ SIGUE?

El concejal Soto-Martínez tiene prevista la propuesta de una moción para eliminar las 12 zonas 41.18 revocables del Distrito 13, incluyendo esta zona.

Visita **bit.ly/4118faq** para ver las zonas exactas y las dudas frecuentes.

QUÉ SIGNIFICA ESTO

- ✓ Dedicar los recursos a estrategias que funcionen
- ✓ Eliminar los obstáculos a la vivienda
- ✓ Más atención a la prevención de los campamentos de larga permanencia

LO QUE ESTO **NO SIGNIFICA**

- ✗ Permitir condiciones inseguras
- ✗ Eliminación de las zonas escolares
- ✗ Reducción de las estrategias para combatir falta de vivienda que han tenido éxito

LA CITY COUNCIL | DISTRICT 13
HUGO
COMMUNITY POWER

¿TIENES ALGUNA PREGUNTA?

Envíanos un correo a cd13homelessness@lacity.org o acompáñanos en persona el 24 de agosto, de 4 a 6 p. m.
Oficina de Echo Park - 1722 Sunset Blvd

Frequently Asked Questions

Reconsidering 41.18 Enforcement Zones in Council District 13

What are 41.18 enforcement zones?

41.18 enforcement zones are designated areas where people experiencing homelessness can be cited or arrested for sitting, sleeping, or lying down in public spaces.

Why is the Councilmember considering removing revocable 41.18 zones?

CD13 has made historic progress reducing homelessness three years in a row by focusing on outreach, housing, and services.

As we've evaluated what works, we've found that some 41.18 enforcement zones can make it harder for outreach workers to consistently engage people experiencing homelessness and connect them to housing.

How will removing these zones help?

We've found that when law enforcement arrests and displaces unhoused residents, outreach workers can lose contact with them before they complete the housing process. Reducing unnecessary displacement allows outreach teams to build trust, maintain relationships, and help more people access housing and services.

Why focus on outreach and housing?

Our work decreasing street homelessness in CD13 by over 40% has shown that long-term reductions in homelessness come from connecting people with housing, case management, mental health/addiction treatment, and other supportive services rather simply moving people from one location to another.

That's why we've invested in dedicated outreach teams and resources like the Hollywood Services Hub — a centralized location where residents can receive direct services.

Will this affect school safety?

No. School-related 41.18 zones were established through a citywide ordinance and are not part of this proposal.

How can I share my thoughts?

We want to hear from you. Reach out to our homelessness team directly at cd13homelessness@lacity.org.

LA CITY COUNCIL | DISTRICT 13
HUGO
COMMUNITY POWER

Questions? Email cd13homelessness@lacity.org

Real Experiences from Frontline Outreach

Names and identifying details have been changed to protect participants' privacy.

"Maria": A Citation That Didn't Lead to Housing

"I can't pay this. And I have nowhere else to go."

Maria had been staying in the same location for more than a year when she received a citation under LAMC 41.18. Weeks later, the citation arrived at the mailing address she used through a service provider. She barely remembered receiving the original citation, and it carried a $233 bail amount.

Fortunately, her case manager connected her with Los Angeles County's HEART program before the citation resulted in a warrant. Without that support, the unpaid citation could have led to an arrest during a future interaction with law enforcement. For the outreach team, the citation created new legal complications and anxiety without moving Maria closer to housing.

"David": Losing Contact, Losing Momentum

When outreach workers first met David, he needed help replacing his identification documents – an critical step before accessing housing, employment, and other services. Over the next several weeks, outreach staff stayed in contact as they worked through the process. But before the next appointment, David's belongings– including his phone, were lost during a 41.18 enforcement action.

Without a phone or his personal belongings, the outreach team lost contact with him. It took many months until they finally reconnected in another neighborhood. He still hoped to replace his identification documents, but he had to the entire process from the beginning. Outreach workers also noticed a significant change in his demeanor – he appeared quieter, discouraged, and much less hopeful than when they had first met him.

Common Challenge: Missed Housing Opportunities

Outreach workers have seen people lose permanent housing placements–or miss opportunities to enter interim housing–after being arrested on warrants related to unresolved citations. Housing placements often depend on strict timelines. Missing a lease signing or shelter intake appointment can mean losing a housing opportunity that may take weeks or months to replace.

Common Challenge: Losing Essential Medications

Outreach workers also report that when people are repeatedly displaced, they sometimes lose the few belongings they rely on every day–including prescription medications. For people living with serious mental illness or chronic medical conditions, losing medication can interrupt treatment, worsen health conditions, and make it much harder to stay engaged with outreach workers or complete the steps needed to move into housing.

District 13 Revocable 41.18 Zones



CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Los Angeles Housing Department

Karen Bass, Mayor

1200 West 7th Street, 9th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-0340
Tel: 213.808.8600
lahd.gmhearings@lacity.org

Notice of Hearing

In accordance with Chapters XV and XVI of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), this hearing concerns whether further enforcement action is necessary to obtain compliance to an outstanding Notice or Order to Comply for this property. A determination may also be made concerning the acceptance of this property into the Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP) and the corresponding rent reduction(s).

Property Address: 5977 W FRANKLIN AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA, 90028
Units Affected: General
Assessors Parcel # 5586014006
Date of Hearing: 9/16/2026
Time of Hearing: 10:00 AM

Location: This hearing is being conducted telephonically. For assistance, please contact the Hearings unit at lahd.gmhearings@lacity.org

OFFICIAL NOTICE DO NOT REMOVE

For Additional Information You May Call:	(844) 864-REAP	DATE POSTED:
Regional Office:	Central	8/26/2026
Case Number:	956926	

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tony Zimbardi

Robert Morrison

Brandi D'Amore, Vice Chair

Michael Connolly, Chair

HOLLYWOOD UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Certified Council #52,
P.O. Box 3272 Los Angeles, CA 90078
www.MyHUNC.org email us at Info@MyHUNC.org

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Public Safety & Emergency Preparedness Committee
Monday, September 27, 2021, 6:30 PM
Webinar ID:945 9331 3243
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/94593313243

Welcome

6:33 PM start

1. Roll Call

Attending

Robert Morrison Brandi D'Amore Michael Connolly Tony Zimbardi

2. Approval of Minutes

#9. 41.18, not 41.19

Motion Made: Motion to approve of Minutes

Motion: Tony Zimbardi **Second:** Michael Connolly **Vote:** Yes-0, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda

Stakeholder Ana Kar said that she of course wants to be helpful to unhoused people, but suggested that the committee be better about outreach in general.

4. Discussion and possible motion to recommend to full Board a community impact statement (CIS) for CD 13 Resolution Council File 21-4118-S1 (see link) as it pertains to City Ordinance 41.18 to determine recommendations for implementation of the Council File: https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=21-4118-S1 . City Ordinance 41.18 link is provided below: https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=20-1376-S1

Brandi D'Amore explained that public comments will be limited to one minute per person on this agenda item, and moved Neighborhood Prosecutor Ethan Weaver and LAPD Senior Lead Officer Heather Mata to panelists to explain the motion.

Ethan Weaver said it was good to see such a big turnout, and explained that there are two laws that deal with homelessness in the municipal code: 5611, and 4118, which regulates where people can be on the sidewalk. Section A and B have been on the books for years prohibiting sleeping in doorways and entryways, and now City Council has approved adding section C, which provides a list of sensitive locations that the City Council has power to prohibit camping around, including schools, daycares, freeways, and over and underpasses. But the new law, Section C, doesn't prohibit sleeping and camping outright, it requires City Council to vote to prohibit it. So the motion comes from CD13 to prohibit camping, etc. around them, and the City Council will have to vote to pass it or not. If they pass it, it triggers a set of things that needs to be done: after outreach is completed, no-camping signs need to be posted at those locations for 14 days, and after 14 days, it will be a misdemeanor to camp at those locations.

Michael Connolly asked how RV's are seen in that category since there is so much sidewalk. Mr. Weaver said that since 4118 governs sidewalks and not rights-of-way, the previous ordinance has lapsed; his sense is you would need a separate ordinance for right of way, but that's a different issue. On behalf of him and SLO Mata, it's up to stakeholders as voters to decide how they feel about the laws the City Council passes. Mr. Weaver said that he and SLO Mata are just enforcers.

Robert Morrison asked if Mr. Weaver knew what teams would be doing outreach to each site and what the City's capacity for that is.

Mr. Weaver said he did not know, but Councilmember Raman was very engaged in what pre-prohibition outreach would look like.

Ms. D'Amore said that Hannah Cho had another meeting, and that CD13 has done extensive outreach to the Hollywood/Bronson, Gower, and Yucca areas for several weeks. They've been able to locate some housing for some. She asked Mr. Weaver if he could speak to what happens when housing's refused. Mr. Weaver said his recollection of the debate was that a genuine offer of housing was a part of the enforcement and what CD4 was fighting for, but that would be something they would want to nail down with their council office.

Ms. D'Amore thought that did not answer the question, asking how that would impact relocation if outreach was rejected. Mr. Weaver said the reason the offer of housing is important is a city can prohibit camping in the city if there's a genuine alternative because of the Boise Supreme Court decision. Before they consider a criminal filing, that will be an important factor.

Mr. Connolly asked how many City councilmembers need to vote for the motion to pass, and Mr. Weaver said it needed a simple majority of 8 yes votes out of 15 councilmembers, plus the Mayor's signature. Ms. D'Amore asked if the locations are being voted on individually, and Mr. Weaver guessed that it is a single motion which needs to be voted on holistically. Mr. Connolly asked when the vote on the resolution was, and Mr. Weaver did not know when it's being scheduled.

SLO Mata explained that they do not know what enforcement looks like moving forward, and LAPD has not provided protocols for how that will look. As soon as that happens, she will relay that to HUNC and the community.

Mr. Connolly asked if the CD4 representative on the Zoom could talk about outreach procedures the councilmember from CD4 thinks are important. Ms. D'Amore noted that the motion addresses CD13, but Mr. Morrison thought it was relevant if she has info about resources required for outreach.

Helene Rotolo from CD4 explained that she was there for agenda item 5 as it relates to her district, and does not feel comfortable offering comment on this item number. The info she can provide is that the City Council did vote to approve the recommendation from the Energy Climate Change and Environmental Justice committee for what the emergency outreach framework is and sanitation framework is, and the Council File is 20-3076. The report that was adopted is a CLA report from 2021. CD4's office's understanding of the process is that appropriate outreach means an offer of interim housing or shelter for the client must be offered before any kind of enforcement can happen. In most Council Districts there will not be enough shelter to be able to be offered to every person in every encampment. Mr. Morrison asked if there was a concern about being able to have enough housing from each district, which Ms. Rotolo confirmed.

Public Comment:

Ms. D'Amore clarified that there is no back and forth in public comment, and that their goal as a committee is to determine whether or not they support this resolution and what questions the committee/board are asking CD13 regarding this.

Mr. Morrison raised a point of order, saying that the agenda lists item A and B for item 4: A is for this issue and B is about adding additional locations. Ms. D'Amore said that they are voting on two things, so they will do public comment twice. She suggested they could do item 4.B. first, and find out whether or not the community should think we should add anything in terms of location. Mr. Morrison noted that the way the item was written was weird, and Ms. D'Amore clarified that it was hard to explain to the board president Sheila Irani how they wanted to address the issue, which is why it was split out. She clarified for the public that they would currently take comments on item 4A, on whether or not they support this resolution.

Ms. D'Amore said that she and several stakeholders present asked CD13 if the terminology of "underpass" affected this resolution, and asked Mr. Weaver to confirm. He did not think so, and said that he thinks it comes to how CalDOT classifies different vehicle classes. His read on it is it is not material.

Stakeholders Cheryl and Jerry Davis said that they understand the unhoused need a place to stay, but they walk throughout the City every day and are forced to walk on the street because the unhoused take up the entire sidewalk, and they are tired of walking in the street.

Stakeholder Laney said she is for this proposal, but would like to make sure the language regarding underpasses/overpasses is clarified. She believes the overpasses do need to be addressed in this issue. She agrees that the unhoused need a place to go; however, in the camp across from her house, there is a homeless person who has been offered housing several times, and refused because he does not like the curfew. She feels if you are offered housing but have not taken it, you do not deserve to just camp there. Other neighbors have reached out to him too.

Stakeholder Ana Kar said that if the problem continues, Hollywood's reputation will slowly be eroded. It is an iconic destination, but the problem is embarrassing, and there are no more excuses. She also believes there is a church in the area and Salvation Army building that are enabling it. She thinks well-intentioned people are bringing down their furniture and siphoning off her water, and she has had to disconnect her sprinkler situation from there.

Stakeholder David Gadd introduced himself as president of the Argyle Civic Association, and said they want to congratulate

Councilmember O'Farrell for putting together his list. They generally approve of his motion, but were appalled to find Gower overpass was not on the list. He spoke to Hannah Cho about this, and she said they want to tackle easier places before tackling the most entrenched encampment in Hollywood. Mr. Gadd also wants language about the underpass/overpass on Bronson to be made clear.

Stakeholder Todd Warner said he is in support of this proposal. Like people said before, adding the Gower underpass is crucial. He has a store, Tailwaggers, at Gower and Bronson, and many of my employees take public transit, and he has had two employees quit recently because they've had to cross the Gower/Bronson underpass/overpass and it's been too dangerous. It's a big concern and he appreciates all the committee's support on this.

Stakeholder Amie Quigley introduced herself as a staff member at Hollywood Presbyterian Church and clarified they have 3 homeless programs, they do not feed on the street, they have engagement programs and support a shelter. They are 100 percent supportive of the resolution, since they cannot operate the church or their children's programs if safety issues persist. They also have rats the size of cats near their church and dumpsters that they have to pay for to haul trash away from the homeless.

Stakeholder Augusta Johnson said she has been a resident of the area her entire life and has seen the ups and down through many years. She is in favor of the resolution regarding 4118, and encourages the City to put Gower encampment on the top of the list. Ms. D'Amore clarified that Gower being added must be a separate agenda item.

Stakeholder Rob also wanted Gower added to the list. He also asked in regards to how much space is allowed to be on the sidewalk from a tent if they are taking into consideration parking meters and tentpoles that don't allow a wheelchair to pass, because he saw a bad situation related to that recently.

Stakeholder Sandy said she is in favor of 4118 and seconds everything the people before her have said, and said the issues with some of these areas is a public health problem. With the rats she has lived in this community on Canyon drive for 46 years. And there are dead rats in the gutters, so you can't walk in the community feeling safe.

Stakeholder Zoe Bannon said that she understands all the outreach that different organizations are doing, but a lot of these people are refusing the help/housing, meanwhile, every time the stakeholders need help, they can't have help. The unhoused can't be arrested, several people have been chased, just today, several transients tried to start fires. And many stakeholders have little children that are scared to walk around their neighborhood.

Stakeholder Andrew Chadsey said he was in favor of 4118 and having Gower added. He wishes it was not so divisive, and thinks people are refusing housing because of mental issues. He would like to see them have more services, and more enforcement of what they can do for the unhoused and for neighbors. If they have housing and they offer it, that would meet the criteria.

Stakeholder Soren wanted to quote Helen Rotolo: "'Before any site can be declared a sensitive area, the outreach would have to have happened.' And her statement is, they know it won't work because there's not enough housing. So ipso facto, they won't play."

Stakeholder Missy Kelly supported the motion, and said the issue that people want fixed is not a question of housing, people on the street do not want the city's housing, and also wanted to add Gower to the list.

Stakeholder Alli White said she is speaking out in favor of the motion, and is calling on behalf of a lot of parents at Delany Wright preschool, all 4 sides are surrounded by encampments and they are unable to safely walk. She is also speaking out in favor of safe and sanitary conditions around the preschool.

Stakeholder Anne Ovsepyan said her issue is a solution to the issue is too late when the encampments are already around their schools and children and doing drugs early in the morning. They cannot walk by them safely. At night she hears a lot of screams and there are a lot of cars parked with people doing drugs and people running around naked, and she is tired of living in a neighborhood like this and wants them to move.

Stakeholder Lena Artunian said she has lived at Franklin and Cerrano for 20 years, and the surroundings have changed drastically. With the RV's on Franklin, apartment owners cannot park their cars. They have seen drugs around their schools, and they cannot walk safely. They finally got one person cleared from the bus stop with a mattress but there needs to be more done. The surrounding beautiful Los Feliz has become trash, and just the other day she saw a gang member dealing drugs.

Stakeholder Christine Rothman lives in Bronson Canyon and is fairly active on the Nextdoor app. She agrees with the motion, and thinks the overpass/underpass on Bronson needs to be addressed immediately, as it is a peril for all stakeholders. Her main concern is there is a guy running around their neighborhood trying to set fires, and thinks there should be an all-out manhunt for this guy.

Mr. Connolly noted that some people who have spoken previously are not muted.

Stakeholder Stephen said that they have written about the issues to a number of City councilmembers, and a large percentage of students of Cheremoya have to walk through Gower, and the area has been terrorized with crime. He has called about that arsonist and the police have not responded. He said stakeholders are also worried about the traffic issues and small business issues.

Stakeholder Rita Noravian said they do not know how this is going to be implemented, and that Helene Rotolo's statement is ridiculous, asking what they are going to do when something happens to their kids. She added that they just got rid of the person outside of Immaculate Heart, but it took two months.

Stakeholder Randy Howell said he supports 4118, his neighbors, and adding the Gower area, and thanked the neighbors for their help who got the person at the bus stop removed.

Stakeholder Robert J. Sexton said he is located in CD4 a couple blocks away from the various encampments and approves of 4118, except for Cahuenga and Danger Island which are not located in CD13. He already heard from the council rep of not going along with this, but if this happens in CD13, there will be no place for these people to go except for Cahuenga and Danger Island, and he would just rather they find a way to all play together.

Ms. D'Amore asked the committee if they have general support or lack of support for 4118. Mr. Connolly said he is generally in favor of this, adding that the issue has evolved into something not sustainable for anybody. As a parent of two young children he does not want them being exposed to the things they are being exposed to. He added that it will have a direct negative effect on businesses in the area. The item coming up later is specifically about that. He understands that COVID slowed down the city in terms of what they could do and what was safe, but it also gave leeway to these encampments. He left work the other day and hit Bronson and Gower and it was shocking. These areas are surrounding a lot of schools and children and they are vulnerable and don't have an option. And this has evolved from a homeless issue to a rampant mental health and drug crisis.

Mr. Connolly explained that he lives deep in the oaks, you have to get lost to get here, and the cops have been there twice in as many weeks, and something has to happen. He has to applaud CD13 for taking this initiative, and does not approve of the laissez faire approach of CD4. There seems to be an attitude in the encampments of, "We can do whatever we want and we suffer no consequences". They have to take care of those who need help, but they have to take care of everybody. He thinks there is a reckoning coming, and this can't all happen at one time: he believes the situation is a pressure cooker about to explode, and inaction or excuses or saying it isn't the perfect scenario are unhelpful. He is in favor of this proposal and encourages his fellow board members to present a CIS to the full board to support the actions of CD13.

Mr. Morrison thought it was important to center his experience for a moment. He has worked in homeless services for the past 11 years and currently works in a place where they operate permanent supportive housing for 600 people who were chronically homeless before they helped them. He has seen the encampments and knows the sanitation and safety issues, and he thinks they are all legitimate concerns they need to address. He does think this strategy is premature and will be ineffective. He thinks the sense that there are enough resources out there for people on the streets, be it health services or drug services is just not the case in his experience. There are only 15,000 shelter beds in LA and there are over 30,000 people who are homeless. So as they look to enforce this strategy across LA, those beds are already full. He also thinks that as they work to make encampments in one area, as someone mentioned, what's going to happen is just musical chairs and what they will see is movement and coalescence in different areas. They saw this in LAPD's enforcement of the Skid Row area. He also thinks it is worth noting that people that are African American are overrepresented in LA's homeless population by 4 to 1 so any decision will disproportionately affect them. CARE sweeps and tickets will adversely affect homeless people's ability to find housing in the future. And SLO Mata said LAPD does not have an enforcement mechanism, so they should probably wait until they have an actual mechanism to enforce it. And homelessness is a function of larger problems: he thinks that this strategy will address symptoms but not larger problems. He thinks some of the tools they have in their belt can be used to address this without moving to this extreme step.

Tony Zimbardi said he is with the college around the Yucca and Capitol Records area. Even their college age students grapple with this every day. The college has shuttle vans just to drive students from one building to the next, whereas their NY campus has students walking dozens of blocks. Their students still have a hard time getting around the neighborhood, and they need to get something moving to make this better.

Ms. D'Amore acknowledged that this is not an easy topic to discuss. She asked Mr. Weaver how the Judge Carter ruling affects 4118, and he said he is not an expert in the appellate case striking Carter's ruling down. Had that order remained in effect, his read is basically that all of LA's homeless related resources would be redirected to Skid Row. So he does not believe it affects the matter before the committee tonight, but it reduces the uncertainty of how LA can use its resources moving forward. In his opinion, this ordinance was written anticipating Judge Carter's ruling, and the inclusion of under/overpasses was written in anticipation of his case. He thinks that that's what the city council was trying to be ready for, and if Judge Carter was looking to clear the city of homeless, it would be with the underpasses and overpasses.

Ms. D'Amore thought that unless they support it, the ordinance does not make any momentum to pass the practicalities. They deeply appreciate the people coming out, but they are mostly CD4 residents, not CD13. She has spent time trying to reach out to CD13 and reaching out to CD13 homeless and has learned that they have a tremendous amount of their population who have been released from recent incarceration. They have given them information on the Housing Is Key program. She also happened to sit on PLUM, and noted that if people are living in a building within 500 feet of a freeway, the developer is supposed to provide low-income housing. She also found it interesting that people supporting them being moved are not recognizing that many of them may be dying of black lung disease, or mental illness caused by traffic fumes. They have also talked to women who are homeless in the Villas. Being a homeless woman is dangerous and they are vulnerable; they will sometimes take drugs to stay awake, because they may be victimized if they're asleep. They may not go to shelters, because they may be sexually abused there.

In Bronson, the committee knows they have arson problems, siphoning electricity problems, and a prostitution problem, and a gang problem, and she has walked there with Senior Lead Officer White. They have talked to people who were relocated from Bronson because people took their tents and wouldn't let them back in. So she supports 4118, but they need to clarify reports of what outreach is actually done. She thinks they need to find where the 500 feet goes and they need to hold the city accountable, but there needs to be clarification about the enforcement. So she would urge that if the committee votes to do this, they should put in language to make sure it's enforceable and make sure they have done their due diligence. Because whether stakeholders realize it or not, even the homeless are HUNC stakeholders. So she urges the committee to pass this, but to tell Mitch O'Farrell that they hold him accountable to some respect. The language will not yet include the possible expansion until the committee votes on item 4.B.

Mr. Connolly asked if they need to come up with that other language on this Zoom, and Ms. D'Amore said they need to come up with what they agree that Mr. Connolly will modify before October 11th. They need to clarify underpass/overpass, whether any one location will be killed/passed depending on the city council vote on the resolution, and she believes there needs to be some documented proof of outreach to the NC's that the resolution involves. Mr. Morrison said he would not vote in support of anything of this motion as it is, but would vote in support of asking CD13 for clarification. Ms. D'Amore suggested that Mr. Connolly add Mr. Morrison's questions.

Mr. Connolly laid out the areas of clarification, adding points from Mr. Morrison, who was interested in the LAPD enforcement protocol, and how the city will provide additional capacity for housing across the city, as well as being interested in the definition of what appropriate housing is and who determines that definition for each person. He also wanted to know how this intersects with CARE+ sweeps. Ms. D'Amore added regarding the CARE+ sweeps, as of September 6 they can give notice to a location within 72 hours, and residents of a location need to remove all their belongings for the location to be cleaned and sanitized, and anything left behind will be disposed of. Some of the sanitation issues may be resolved.

Mr. Connolly moved to vote to support this with the bullet points laid out by Ms. D'Amore and Mr. Morrison.

Motion Made: Motion to recommend to full Board a community impact statement (CIS) for CD 13 Resolution Council File 21-4118-S1 (see link) as it pertains to City Ordinance 41.18 to determine recommendations for implementation of the Council File with requests for clarification https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=21-4118-S1 . City Ordinance 41.18 link is provided below: https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=20-1376-S1

Motion: Michael Connolly **Second:** Tony Zimbardi **Vote:** Yes-3, No-1, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes
Brandi D'Amore Michael Connolly Tony Zimbardi
No
Robert Morrison

A) Discussion and possible motion to recommend locations within CD13 and HUNC for CF 21-4118-S1 including, but not limited to Gower Underpass, Argyle Ave., Yucca St., La Baig Ave., Carlos Way, and Bronson Ave. https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-4118-S1_mot_09-14-21.pdf

Brandi D'Amore explained that the next part is to determine whether to add areas to the request. Because of the 4118 is live, nothing is implemented or planned yet and because of the sensitivity of Gower, they want to make sure it can be added at a later time. That specific area is State property, so it's multi-departmental, partly CalTrans.

The stakeholder numbered 373406 raised their hand to talk, but did not unmute and did not comment.

Stakeholder David Gadd said it seems they were discussing in their last motion in a vote of confidence or not in 4118, and thinks they were supposed to vote on the locations. Also, he thought Robert Morrison's livelihood seems to depend on homeless people existing in LA. They have cell phones, they could come to the meeting. Ms. D'Amore said she has actually spent time doing outreach to the homeless, and some of them think the deck is stacked against them already, so they didn't attend. Nor all of them have cell phones. Michael Connolly noted that the previous item was a CIS to support or not support O'Farrell's resolution of 4118. He added that Mr. Morrison is an extremely noble person and asked attendees and panelists to refrain from personal attacks.

Stakeholder Sandy believed they should add the Gower underpass to the list now. She appreciates that they are saying they can add other locations later, but believes if they do not put something down, they will not have any money to add something else, and since Gower is such an egregious location, they should get the really dangerous and public-health-wise locations on the list now.

Stakeholder Randy Howell understood the sensitivity of the Gower underpass, but thought it was important to understand the sensitivity of the people in this community who have to avoid or go through it, and it should be added now rather than throwing it onto a pile later. Ms. D'Amore added for clarity that the Hollywood Wilton encampment cannot be added to this list. She noted that it will have to be part of the outreach and CARE+ list. Mr. Connolly noted that CARE+ hasn't been in business for a year and a half, so once that comes back into rotation, there are very specific locations that do not fall into the sensitivity categories including Argyle, Gower, and Lebaig. Those were the locations that they had picked that fit the criteria that fell under the resolution that may not have been requested under Councilmember O'Farrell's resolution.

Stakeholder Augusta Johnson asked if Gower cannot be added to the list whether they can request to have a CARE+ sweep ASAP, and Ms. D'Amore confirmed it was already on the CARE+ list.

Stakeholder Amie Quigley wanted to echo the sentiment of adding the Yucca, Carlos, etc. and would greatly appreciate the council's advocacy to that area.

Mr. Connolly asked if Carlos, Yucca, etc. fall into the sensitive area category, and Ms. D'Amore said they do. Mr. Connolly asked if it was a CalTrans issue and Ms. D'Amore said the issue is some people are living on the embankment. Also, Hannah Cho said there is one sanitation truck for CD13. Their areas, believe it or not, have been on a regular CARE plan, so when CDC guidelines were in effect, they had regular peripheral cleaning in effect. So what they might define as "regularly" may not be what they define as regularly. But the area is due for several CARE+ cleanups. Mr. Connolly noted that the squeaky wheel gets the grease and they should bombard them with requests. Ms. D'Amore said that Ms. Cho noted that bombarding them actually makes it harder to get stuff done. Mr. Connolly expressed a desire to push back on that point, and Ms. D'Amore asserted that they would not debate the material of what Ms. Cho said, noting that other people have engaged with her in a racist manner, and it makes it harder for her to get things done and interact with people.

Mr. Morrison noted as a point of order that they are doing public comment, but should not respond to public comment.

Stakeholder Zoe Bannon said that everything being talked about right now is about how to make their unhoused neighbors more comfortable on the street and it is really making her upset because no one is addressing the safety issue.

Stakeholder Laney agreed with what Ms. Bannon said, adding that she appreciated the new language. She said she was sorry that Mr. Morrison was accosted earlier and that she appreciated his work and the board's work.

Stakeholder Ana Kar noted that the problem is not just one of housing, it's also one of drugs and mental health, and there has to be an integrated approach. She agrees with the previous people, it does not seem like the stakeholders have rights, they seem to be at the mercy of homeless people. They are talking about rats, and a guy sleeping in her doorstep with an axe in his hand, and they need to address it.

Stakeholder Todd supported adding Gower to the list, saying it is one of the most dangerous ones and should be top of the list; that said, he is grateful for all of the committee, especially Mr. Morrison, and acknowledged that there are a lot of questions they should look at.

Stakeholder Brandon Malone said he heard a lot of people speaking to action and a lot of concern, Hollywood Presbyterian Church is carrying out cleanups partnering with friends experiencing homelessness, and their biggest thing to tackle is sanitation. If they are able to partner and help their people clean up this trash, it won't end homelessness, but will make things cleaner and safer. He is in favor of expansion, but thinks they need to talk about immediate solutions. Ms. D'Amore confirmed that the city will bring new wire trash cans and will be implementing some kind of new sanitation policy.

Stakeholder Stephen Cragg supported expansion, but as a point of clarification wondered about the area by Immaculate Heart. Ms. D'Amore noted they cannot speak about that topic since it is not on the agenda, which listed the areas qualified for expansion. But she is very familiar with that area by the staircase, and if they want to have a conversation about that in Transportation and Works, they will be back in October.

Stakeholder Andrew Chadsey supported expanding and including more locations.

Stakeholder Marco DiMaccio thanked Mr. Morrison for his work, but wanted to question the logic about pushing the problem around the city, saying in that case, it would make more of the city aware of the problem, and he does support including Gower.

Stakeholder Alli White wanted to support the expansion. Ms. D'Amore noted that people supporting the expansion need to delineate what they're in favor of expanding. Mr. Connolly suggested including the areas of expansion on the agenda in the motion and supported adding Argyle, Gower, Carlos, Yucca, and LaBaig on their list.

Mr. Morrison thanked everyone for their comments and anybody who supported him, and encouraged Mr. Gadd and anyone who wants to talk about homelessness to reach out to him at MyHunc.org. He thinks this issue is an extension of the prior vote, and that Gower reinforces his prior point of this kind of enforcement being premature, and this committee could keep a list of encampments in an organized way to act as a liaison between them, the board, and the council.

Ms. D'Amore added that she has been engaged with these areas in a different way from Mr. Morrison, and since they all qualify, she thinks it's unfair to highlight Bronson without including the others. There were some territory wars that pushed people to different areas, and she thinks all the areas need to be addressed. They have several members from the community discussing how problematic Hollywood and Bronson is, it's now a traffic obstruction coming off the freeway going South, and there are open drug sales taking place, so she would ask that they include the Hollywood and Bronson encampment.

Mr. Connolly motioned to expand the list to include Hollywood and Bronson, Gower, Carlos, Argyle, LaBaig. Mr. Morrison

seconded, and thought it be good to have HUNC on the record looking for ways to get more.

Motion: Michael Connolly **Second:** Tony Zimbardi **Vote:** Yes-3, No-1, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Brandi D'Amore Michael Connolly Tony Zimbardi

No

Robert Morrison

5. Discussion with community stakeholders and City agencies about recent security issues at Gelson's on Franklin Ave.

Brandi D'Amore explained that LAPD Senior Lead Officer Heather Mata has been in talks with executive members at Gelson's, and there are now 2 security members on call at any time. There are some things that Gelson's staff cannot do; in terms of denying access to property based on somebody's appearance, that will most likely not happen. Officer Mata has requested that the two tents on the canyon side move further south. That location has been found to meet all the ADA regulations.

Michael Connolly said there will be a community meeting October 5th with HOA's and Gelson's corporate staff. He also wanted to point out that Gelson's should never turn anyone away based on appearance. Criminal activity is one thing; profiling is another thing. As Ms. D'Amore pointed out, the LAPD is well aware. Mr. Connolly has seen the two new security guards. He thought "encampment" was also a strong word for the unhoused there, saying they are very compliant and it's a model unhoused area. So this agenda item is a precursor to people coming to the community meeting to meet with Gelson's. He added that there is also a tendency to over exaggerate on things like NextDoor, and they do not need everybody terrified to go to Gelson's. Ms. D'Amore added that Officer Mata advised people to stop engaging with NextDoor until they actually engage with an LAPD officer. Also, we've been advised that this falls within other HOAs' jurisdiction.

Helene Rotolo from CD4 added that she reemphasized with Officer Mata, as far as the folks encamped with this area, they have made themselves compliant with 4118, and continue to comply, and their office has engaged with them and are trying to meet supportive housing needs for them. They had a quarantine under their bridge home for the last month and a half and their Project Roomkey place is full with other people needing homes. So they will continue to work with people in this area on maintaining 4118 compliance and ADA compliance and getting their trash collected with their LACCT team.

Robert Morrison asked about a pilot program in the area called CIRCLE, and Ms. Rotolo explained that the CIRCLE program was funded in this year's budget, and the areas it's funding are more in the CD13 side. The contract was awarded to Urban Alchemy, so she does not know if anyone in their office has received a firm date when those services will start, but she does know this contract was awarded. There was a request for expertise in de escalation, without having an armed response, so hopefully this will free up LAPD for more criminal investigations.

Mr. Connolly asked if someone calls a different phone number to engage that service, and Ms. Rotolo did not know since there are a couple programs being funded in the city. Ms. D'Amore has an update, saying Shannon Prior is heading up this program, and plans on coming to HUNC meetings in October. Her understanding is stakeholders can call 911 and indicate it's an unarmed response and CIRCLE can respond.

Stakeholder Todd thanked the board and thought Gelson's is a problem which sometimes overflows. He was hoping there would be other possible solutions, but does appreciate what they have done so far.

Stakeholder David Gadd noted that the person Mr. Connolly referred to as a "model homeless person" spent a night in jail last week for open drug use.

Stakeholder Zoe Bannon said that with the Gelson's situation, the homeless person keeps his area tidy, but has said he will not take City outreach because he does not want a curfew. And it was kind of insulting to say stakeholders shouldn't use Nextdoor.

Stakeholder Christine Rothman wanted to speak to what Ms. Bannon said, and Ms. D'Amore reminded stakeholders that they need to keep it to the agenda topic to security around Gelson's. Ms. Rothman said she has lived in this area for years and been terrified to walk past that structure there, and Gelson's could definitely do more. She has seen drug deals go down in the parking lot. She grew up in New York, and has nevertheless seen things in the Gelson's parking lot that terrify her.

Ms. D'Amore noted that stakeholders seemed to have problems with the security, and explained that Gelson's will not screen who will come into the property. Perhaps they can ask them to patrol the property more often, and maybe they can have a trespass filing. Also, open drug use, and defecation are not arrestable offenses anymore, they are misdemeanors. She also asked SLO Mata to make sure that if somebody feels they are being followed, etc. that someone escorts them around the store. So they need to be concrete about what we want them to do.

Mr. Connolly added that Gelson's is a corporation, and they are going to do what any corporation wants to do. So if the community wants to come in and raise an issue, they will respond to it. They can bring in an agency. Ms. D'Amore said she can tell that Gelson's staff wants to take a more laissez-faire approach, and Mr. Connolly said that is when they should bring in another agency like ACS. Ms. D'Amore noted that it is a different situation on private property. Mr. Connolly noted that they need active solutions to move the ball forward even if it's only slightly, and noted that on Bronson it's not a housing issue, it's a drug/sobriety issue, and he would rather

have unhoused neighbors like the ones on Canyon with decorum that follow some rules.

Ms. D'Amore noted as a pedestrian at that market that she has seen as security stop all types of people for shoplifting, and those that are doing it recreationally will return the items at the time of being caught. The more violent interactions are by those who are stealing out of need. And the committee has no ability to do an actionable item on this.

Mr. Morrison thought a lot of the issues they have talked about tonight are connected, and they are challenging. It is worth continuing to talk about safety in their neighborhood. He himself was across from Gelson's a week ago while getting ice cream with a friend, and they were followed by someone talking to themselves.

.

6. Committee Member announcements on items not on the Agenda

Brandi D'Amore noted she has not heard from many of the board about the Vaccination Proof email, which is mandatory from board members. Notice still hasn't bene received if a vaccination is subject to PRA, and if it applies to voting stakeholders.

Robert Morrison noted that the redistricting continues in LA, and there's a presentation that's happening tomorrow evening, if attendees google it, they can participate since there could be significant changes to the council district stakeholders in.

7. Old/Ongoing Business

8. New/Future Business

Brandi D'Amore said that she and Robert Morrison talked about attending a workshop with the encampments to prevent fire to work with the individual bottle extinguishers. They wanted to do a workshop for the encampments to enable them to extinguish fires.

Robert Morrison thought centralizing the list of encampments in the area would be good to follow-up, and Ms. D'Amore thought Sheila Irani was doing that at her committee. Ms. D'Amore noted that if several of the board are talking about the PCH encampment about the same thing, they potentially violate the Brown Act. She noted that she wants to make sure that whatever they do is actually actionable, and to remember that previous board members invalidated action by discussing at multiple boards. She also recommended people attend the Homelessness and Social Services committee, and that they are still looking for candidates for their Youth Representative seat on the board.

Adjournment at 9:21 PM

Reconsideration: The Board may reconsider and amend its action on items listed on the agenda if that reconsideration takes place before the end of the meeting at which it was considered or at the next regular meeting. The Board, on either of these two days, shall: (1) Make a Motion for Reconsideration and, if approved, (2) hear the matter and take an action. If the motion to reconsider an action is to be scheduled at the next meeting following the original action, then two items shall be placed on the agenda for that meeting: (1) A Motion for Reconsideration on the described matter and (2) a [Proposed] action should the motion to reconsider be approved. A Motion for Reconsideration can only be made by a Board member who has previously voted on the prevailing side of the original action taken. If a Motion for Reconsideration is not made on the date the action was taken, then a Board member on the prevailing side of the action must submit a memorandum to the Recording Secretary identifying the matter to be reconsidered and a brief description of the reason(s) for requesting reconsideration at the next regular meeting. The aforesaid shall all be in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Removing Bronson Bridge anti-camping zone restriction: Madness

susan@counterpointla.com <susan@counterpointla.com> Fri, Aug 28, 2026 at 6:34 PM
To: info@myhunc.org

With no notice, by request of Hugo Soto-Martinez, the L.A. City Council voted to remove 12 anti-camping zones from CD 13 in Hollywood, Silver Lake and Echo Park. There was no consulting the residents or businesses in these areas. I belong to both categories and keep myself informed. Any protest From CD-13 that there was outreach is deceptive, and was done in such a way to keep people uninformed until a vote was taken. There was a reason that Councilmember O'Farrell had these areas declared no camping zones: fire safety, children's safety and motorist safety. I'm not even including the impact to the economic driver that is rapidly leaving Hollywood and LA, filming!!! Or the continued impact to small businesses and restaurants that employ the residents who live in Hollywood, Silver Lake and Echo Park.

Below is just a small list of what we can expect from this short-sighted attempt to move the homeless camps back into zones that were designated too dangerous to the Community for good reasons. I will pick just the zone I know best to enumerate the dangers:

The Bronson bridge serves as one of only 2 ways for school children to walk to Cheremoya Ave. Elementary around the 101 freeway: across the up Bronson ave. across the bridge or under the freeway at Gower, which is also frequented by encampments, and is another ½ mile walk away for little kids. I've witnessed violence in the encampments and inevitably children and /or parents will be injured trying to walk their kids to Cheremoya Ave. Elementary up Bronson Ave. to Franklin Ave. if encampments return.

Public schools serve low income communities, so walking kids to school is paramount, and asking small children to go into the street to avoid the encampment or injured by those in the encampments is insane. I walk everywhere and that is what I have to do around encampments. There is a Senior center on Carlos, around the corner from the Bronson bridge. Bronson Ave. is the Senior's only walking access to Gelson's market at Franklin and Bronson. That access will now be blocked by the return of encampments. Seniors can't be asked to walk through encampments to access groceries. There are already many homeless services at the 7th Day Adventist at Hollywood and Canyon and the Salvation Army Center on Carlos, right next door to the Senior housing. Finding the unhoused to give them services is not a problem in this area. Oh, and don't forget objects tossed over the Bronson bridge will land on motorists driving on the 101 freeway below.

Fire Station 82's overflow lot and staging for emergencies and fires in the Hollywood Hills is on Bronson and across the street from the Bronson Bridge. How will emergency access work with active encampments if we are ever faced with evacuations and fire danger as seen last year? Fire engines leaving the main station on Hollywood Blvd. use Bronson to go north to the Hollywood Hills and Franklin Ave. to answer most of their calls. That is where the light is. The City will be liable for the increased fire danger by bringing added encampments so close to the hillsides. More people will camp in the hills and light open fires. We all saw what happened in the Palisades. CD13 abuts the Hollywood Hills, Silver Lake Hills and Echo Park Hills and all are extreme fire danger areas. It is a short walk from the Bronson Bridge to Bronson Park.

Do you think people will stay in designated areas, not light open fires? What did the Fire Department and Police Department have to say about removing these zones from anti-camping? Yes it's about crime, it's about the mentally ill who already run across Franklin Ave.in moving traffic and put themselves and motorists in danger, but it's about much, much more. This endangers all of us, including those in the encampments. There was a reason for these areas to be designated anti-encampment zones. Visibility is not what is keeping the homeless unhoused. This is again about

poor decision making by our City Council and we all, including the unhoused, will suffer for it.

Susan Polifronio

Counterpoint Records & Books 5911 Franklin Ave. since 1979

Resident Hollywood since 1982