

Communication from Public

Name: Carlton Serrano Tenants Association

Date Submitted: 09/07/2025 03:04 PM

Council File No: 25-0811

Comments for Public Posting: COUNCIL FILE NO: 25-0811 CASE NO: CPC-2024-914-DB-SPPC-VHCA CEQA: ENV-2024-915-CE
Plan Area: Hollywood Council District: 13 - Soto-Martinez
Project Site: 5416 - 5418, 5420, 5424-5428 and 5430 West Carlton Way Los Angeles, CA 90027
Honorable Chair Blumenfield and members of the PLUM Committee, I urge the PLUM Committee to support the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association Appeal and reject this proposed development, which would demolish seven rent-controlled buildings, displace nearly fifty vulnerable tenants, and result in a net loss of affordable housing. The project violates multiple laws and policies, including SB8, “No Net Loss,” the RPO, SNAP Subarea A, and CEQA. Replacing 25 existing RSO units with only 15 “Very Low Income” units (just 10.8% of the 105 total units) fails to justify the destruction of 25 existing naturally-occurring low-income RSO units. We must preserve our existing affordable housing stock. Unless decision-makers understand that we need to do both, preserve and produce, we will be doomed to a failed housing policy, and our crisis will get worse. Currently, there are only 15 units (10.8% of the apartments proposed) reserved as affordable. If new RSO units are set at market-rate prices, this does not create more affordable housing. In fact, it has the opposite effect, essentially gentrifying the original residents of the neighborhood who can no longer afford to live in the area. Therefore, while on the surface level, appearing compliant, this is not an apples-to-apples de facto replacement of genuinely affordable RSO housing. Market-rate housing is not affordable housing. There needs to be a clear and precise distinction between existing RSO affordable housing and market-rate luxury housing. Replacing 25 truly affordable RSO units with only 15 low-income units is, in reality, not equivalent. Therefore, this development is noncompliant with the Housing Crisis Act (SB8) and the Housing Crisis Act Replacement Unit Determination (RUD). There is no guarantee that long-time tenants will be given the right to return with their original rent amounts stabilized and set at the exact same amount before demolition, eviction, and displacement. The use of off-menu waivers for a 176% height increase and 74% open space reduction prioritizes profit over community standards. The claim that the project complies with SNAP is flawed,

especially in Subarea A, which was specifically designed to protect low-scale neighborhoods. The removal of 17 trees, including two protected California Oaks, violates the Protected Tree Ordinance and necessitates a full Environmental Impact Report. Additionally, the site includes historic buildings with contextual value near the Edith Northman-designed Carlton Apartments, and their demolition would erode the area's historic fabric. The developers, ROM Investments and their affiliates, have a documented history of tenant harassment, code violations, and unethical conduct, further underscoring why this project should not proceed. Please side with the community, not bad actors, and support the appeal. Sincerely, Justin Maurer, co-founder of the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association RSO Resident, Neighbor, Constituent, Registered Voter, 90027

Carlton Serrano Tenants Association
Justin Maurer and Noemi Santo
5419 Hollywood Blvd.
Suite #C-716
Los Angeles, CA 90027
(213) 909-5414
carltonserranotenants@gmail.com

September 7, 2025

Los Angeles City Council
% Office of the City Clerk
City Hall, Room 395
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: PLUM Committee

Dear Honorable Members,

**COUNTER RESPONSE TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPEAL RESPONSE FOR
CASE NO: CPC-2024-914-DB-SPPC-VHCAA FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5416 -
5418, 5420, 5424-5428 AND 5430 WEST CARLTON WAY LOS ANGELES CA 90027, CF
25-811**

RE: "...there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that any exceptions contained in Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines...or historical resources applies."

A-3 The Project's Applicant and Representative's fraudulent history- more oversight and transparency are needed.

"This statement is not germane (sic) to the land use application before the city."

CSTA Response: The demonstrable facts that developer Leoor Maciborski was fined \$17,000 in 2017 for making discreet donations to former CD13 Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell utilizing various LLC's exceeding campaign finance limits and Consultant Gary Benjamin was fined \$37,500 in 2019 by the LA City Ethics Commission for failing to report that he was lobbying Los Angeles City Officials should be germane to approval of a development project. Transparency and ethics among developers and their consultants should be qualities of paramount importance to the City Planning Commission's approvals.

Additionally, Maciborski's ROM Investments have a documented history of tenant harassment, code violations, unresponsiveness and aggressive rent hikes. The City Planning Commission is also obligated to deny approvals of known and proven bad actor landlords. In Los Angeles, laws heavily regulate development applications and demolitions involving bad actor landlords by

focusing on tenant protections, the replacement of affordable housing, and penalizing harassment. While the city does not have a formal "bad actor" registry, it has several ordinances that can deny permits and levy penalties against landlords who fail to comply. Failure to comply with the Resident Protection Ordinance (RPO), can result in severe financial penalties and the withholding of permit clearances from the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD). Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance (TAHO) strengthened by amendments in late 2024, explicitly prohibits landlords from harassing tenants. Illegal harassment tactics often used to displace tenants for demolition include withholding repairs.

At 5424 Carlton Way West, tenants' requests for repairs in 2025 have repeatedly been withheld, postponed or denied. The City Planning Commission is obligated to deny development applications from known, proven, bad actor landlords and their LLCs.

Last but not least, developer consultant Gary Benjamin of Alchemy Planning has obtained over 130 complex entitlement approvals with a 100% approval rate, including entitlements for more than 80 mixed-use and multifamily projects, comprising over 5,100 housing units, in developments ranging in size from four units to 254 units.

Any developer consultant who has been fined for ethics violations with a 100% approval rating should be subject to additional scrutiny by the City Planning Commission. The CPC has a mandate to make their decisions based on potential for public health harm and impact on the quality of life of tenants, neighbors and residents.

A-4 The Project is not compliance (sic) with "No Net Loss laws, RSO protection, fair replacement mandates, net loss of affordable housing and displacement of tenants."

"Planning Staff has conditioned the project to adhere to the requirements outlined in the RUD letter, ensuring that 15 units are reserved for the specified affordable levels...Therefore, the City Planning Commission's approval was appropriate."

CSTA Response: Replacing 25 existing RSO units with only 15 "Very Low Income" units (just 10.8% of the 105 total units) fails to justify the destruction of 25 existing naturally-occurring low-income RSO units. We must preserve our existing affordable housing stock. Unless decision-makers understand that we need to do both, preserve and produce, we will be doomed to a failed housing policy, and our crisis will get worse. Currently, there are only 15 units (10.8% of the apartments proposed) reserved as affordable. If new RSO units are set at market-rate prices, this does not create more affordable housing. In fact, it has the opposite effect, essentially gentrifying the original residents of the neighborhood who can no longer afford to live in the area. Therefore, while on surface level, appearing compliant, this is not an apples to apples de facto replacement of genuinely affordable RSO housing. Market rate housing is not affordable housing. There needs to be a clear and precise distinction between existing RSO affordable housing and market rate luxury housing. Replacing 25 truly affordable RSO units with only 15 low income units is in reality, not equivalent. Therefore, this development is noncompliant with the Housing Crisis Act (SB8) and the Housing Crisis Act Replacement Unit Determination (RUD). There is no guarantee that long-time tenants will be given the right to return with their original rent amounts stabilized and set at the exact same amount as prior to demolition, eviction and displacement.

Conclusion

CSTA staff recommends that the PLUM Committee and City Council approves the appeal and denies the Determination of the City Planning Commission to determine that the project is not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is pursuant and accountable to

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332, Class 32 (In-Fill Development Project); deny the Specific Plan Compliance determination; deny the Conditions of Approval, and deny the Findings.

Sincerely,

Justin Maurer, Co-Founder Carlton Serrano Tenants Association
Noemi Santo, Co-Founder, Carlton Serrano Tenants Association

Communication from Public

Name: Justin Maurer

Date Submitted: 09/07/2025 03:06 PM

Council File No: 25-0811

Comments for Public Posting: COUNCIL FILE NO: 25-0811 CASE NO: CPC-2024-914-DB-SPPC-VHCA CEQA: ENV-2024-915-CE
Plan Area: Hollywood Council District: 13 - Soto-Martinez
Project Site: 5416 - 5418, 5420, 5424-5428 and 5430 West Carlton Way Los Angeles, CA 90027
Honorable Chair Blumenfield and members of the PLUM Committee, I urge the PLUM Committee to support the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association Appeal and reject this proposed development, which would demolish seven rent-controlled buildings, displace nearly fifty vulnerable tenants, and result in a net loss of affordable housing. The project violates multiple laws and policies, including SB8, "No Net Loss," the RPO, SNAP Subarea A, and CEQA. Replacing 25 existing RSO units with only 15 "Very Low Income" units (just 10.8% of the total) fails to justify the destruction of naturally affordable housing and promotes gentrification. We must preserve our existing affordable housing stock. Unless decision-makers understand that we need to do both, preserve and produce, we will be doomed to a failed housing policy, and our crisis will get worse. The project's proposed 15 "Very Low Income" units, while seemingly beneficial, do not adequately compensate for the demolition of 25 existing naturally-occurring low-income RSO units. Currently, there are only 15 units (10.8% of the apartments proposed) reserved as affordable. If new RSO units are set at market-rate prices, this does not create more affordable housing. In fact, it has the opposite effect, essentially gentrifying the original residents of the neighborhood. The use of off-menu waivers for a 176% height increase and 74% open space reduction prioritizes profit over community standards. The claim that the project complies with SNAP is flawed, especially in Subarea A, which was specifically designed to protect low-scale neighborhoods. The removal of 17 trees, including two protected California Oaks, violates the Protected Tree Ordinance and necessitates a full Environmental Impact Report. Additionally, the site includes historic buildings with contextual value near the Edith Northman-designed Carlton Apartments, and their demolition would erode the area's historic fabric. The developers, ROM Investments and their affiliates, have a documented history of tenant harassment, code violations, and unethical conduct, further underscoring why this project

should not proceed. Please side with the community, not bad actors, and support the appeal. Please see attached research, which reveals several powerful legal precedents and scientific evidence supporting the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association's case against displacement and eviction. Key findings include: (1) Strong peer-reviewed evidence demonstrating that eviction and displacement cause measurable health harms, particularly for elderly and immigrant populations, with studies showing increased depressive symptoms, cardiovascular issues, and cognitive decline; (2) California's robust tenant protection framework, including SB 8's replacement unit requirements and the Resident Protection Ordinance mandating relocation assistance and right-to-return provisions; (3) Documented health impacts of reduced urban canopy and open space loss, with research showing 40% tree canopy coverage as critical for preventing heat-related mortality; (4) Constitutional precedents establishing housing security as tied to civil rights protections, though *Lindsey v. Normet* limits federal constitutional housing rights; and (5) Demographic data showing zip code 90027's vulnerability, with 76% renter households and significant elderly and immigrant populations at heightened displacement risk. Sincerely, Justin Maurer, 90027

Executive Summary

The research reveals several powerful legal precedents and scientific evidence supporting the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association's case against displacement and eviction. Key findings include: (1) Strong peer-reviewed evidence demonstrating that eviction and displacement cause measurable health harms, particularly for elderly and immigrant populations, with studies showing increased depressive symptoms, cardiovascular issues, and cognitive decline; (2) California's robust tenant protection framework, including SB 8's replacement unit requirements and the Resident Protection Ordinance mandating relocation assistance and right-to-return provisions; (3) Documented health impacts of reduced urban canopy and open space loss, with research showing 40% tree canopy coverage as critical for preventing heat-related mortality; (4) Constitutional precedents establishing housing security as tied to civil rights protections, though *Lindsey v. Normet* limits federal constitutional housing rights; and (5) Demographic data showing zip code 90027's vulnerability, with 76% renter households and significant elderly and immigrant populations at heightened displacement risk.

Legal and Academic Research Report

Reduction in Open Space and Canopy

Peer-Reviewed Studies

Research demonstrates clear causal relationships between green space reduction and adverse health outcomes. A landmark study in *The Lancet* found that increasing urban tree canopy to 30% could reduce premature deaths from heat by 40%. Further research published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* established that 40% tree canopy coverage represents a critical threshold, providing cooling effects of up to 9°F, with anything below this threshold offering minimal temperature reduction.^{[1][2]}

Studies consistently show that neighborhoods with reduced tree cover experience disproportionate health impacts, particularly affecting elderly and low-income populations. Research published in *Nature* found that street trees can reduce air temperatures by an average of 3.06°C, with the probability of crossing dangerous temperature thresholds being

2-5 times greater in areas without tree cover. The loss of green space particularly impacts cardiovascular health, respiratory conditions, and mental wellbeing.^{[3][4]}

Government and Non-Profit Reports

UN-Habitat's 2025 guidance document "Healthier Cities and Communities Through Public Spaces" establishes that green and open public spaces are crucial for promoting physical activity, mental wellness, and community engagement while reducing air pollution. The report emphasizes that incorporating public spaces into urban planning helps address health disparities and environmental inequalities.^[5]

UCLA public health experts have documented that poorer neighborhoods systematically lack access to parks and open spaces, creating environmental justice concerns. The research demonstrates how tree canopy coverage varies significantly by income and race, with affluent neighborhoods enjoying substantially more tree coverage than lower-income areas.^[6]

Elderly Women Facing Eviction

Peer-Reviewed Studies

Multiple studies document severe health consequences for elderly tenants facing displacement. Research published in *PMC* demonstrates that older adults experiencing forced displacement due to rent increases scored significantly lower on cognitive assessments (MMSE). The study found that rising rent prices cause financial stress and anxiety, factors directly associated with cognitive decline in elderly populations.^[7]

A comprehensive analysis in the *Journal of Aging and Health* confirmed that health problems make older people more likely to change residence, with stronger effects on relocations to care institutions. The research identified limitations in Activities of Daily Living (ADL) as having the most pronounced effects for both older men and women facing displacement.^[8]

Studies consistently show that elderly tenants face unique vulnerabilities during eviction proceedings. Research demonstrates that older adults often cannot quickly relocate due to mobility limitations, fixed incomes, and attachment to established support networks.^[9]

Legal Statutes and Precedents

California Civil Code provides specific protections for elderly tenants. Under California law, landlords must provide senior tenants (age 62+) with at least 90 days' notice before initiating eviction proceedings, compared to shorter notice periods for other tenants. The California Tenant Protection Act establishes that qualified tenants - including those 62 years or older - are entitled to enhanced relocation assistance payments.^[9]

Los Angeles County relocation assistance amounts are substantially higher for seniors, with qualified tenants (including seniors) receiving \$9,272 for studio units compared to \$7,654 for standard tenants. The Ellis Act provides additional protections, requiring 120 days notice for tenants, with elderly tenants (62+) who have lived in their unit for at least one year receiving a full year's notice.^{[10][11]}

Expert Testimony

Property management experts in habitability cases regularly testify about standards of care for residential rent-controlled property, particularly regarding elderly tenant protections. Real estate appraisal experts provide testimony on loss-of-use damages when elderly tenants are displaced from rent-controlled units, with damages measured by the difference between market value and rent-controlled rates.^[12]

Health Loss of Community

Peer-Reviewed Studies

Research published in the *National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health* provides robust evidence that eviction causes measurable health impacts, particularly increased depressive symptoms. The study used multiple analytical methods and found that young adults experiencing eviction had significantly more depressive symptoms than non-evicted individuals (5.921 vs. 4.998 symptoms, $p=0.003$). Psychosocial stress mediated nearly 18% of the associations between eviction and depression.^[13]

A systematic review published in *Health & Place* examining eviction's links to health found that most studies identified significant connections between eviction exposures and poor health outcomes, with impacts most severe for marginalized populations. The research documented both direct health effects and indirect consequences through loss of social support networks.^[14]

Studies demonstrate that community stability and social connections are fundamental to health. Research shows that displacement disrupts established social networks and support systems, leading to social isolation and declined physical and mental health. The "weathering" effects of serial displacement cumulatively increase illness and injury risk over time.^{[15][16]}

Government Reports

The California Department of Public Health's research on gentrification and displacement documents how longtime residents face financial distress, loss of community services, and disruptions to healthcare access. The study found that displaced residents experience relocation costs, longer commutes, healthcare disruptions, and fragmentation of community support networks.^[17]

Research funded by the National Institute on Aging establishes strong links between housing affordability and health outcomes for older Americans. The studies demonstrate that financial distress creates less secure housing situations, directly impacting health through increased hospitalizations and lower self-rated health.^[18]

CA SB8 and Resident Protection Ordinance (RPO)

Published Legal Cases and Statutes

SB 8, enacted in 2021, extends provisions of the Housing Crisis Act through 2030, providing tenant protections for existing affordable housing units. The law requires developers to replace any demolished protected units and provide relocation benefits to displaced tenants. Under SB 8, tenants have the right to remain in their units until six months before construction starts.^{[19][20]}

Los Angeles's proposed Resident Protection Ordinance creates local compliance formulas for state provisions, clarifying expected relocation amounts and strengthening tenant protections. The ordinance extends covenant terms for new restricted affordable housing to 99 years and mandates affirmative marketing requirements.^[21]

SB 8's unit replacement requirements apply specifically to projects involving protected units - those that are rent-controlled or deed-restricted low-income housing. The law provides relocation assistance and right of first refusal only to current, low-income tenants of protected units.^[22]

Government Reports

The Los Angeles Housing Department's SB 8 implementation guidance specifies that relocation, right to return, and right to remain protections apply to existing occupants displaced by covered projects. An SB 8 Replacement Unit Determination (RUD) can take 4-6 weeks to process upon receipt of required documents.^[23]

The Los Angeles City Planning Department's Resident Protection Ordinance fact sheet details strengthened enforcement mechanisms, including tenant notification requirements at critical project milestones. These notifications are designed to help tenants plan for potential displacement and exercise their rights under the ordinance.^[21]

Rent Control and Low Income Tenants

Published Legal Cases

Nash v. City of Santa Monica (1984) established that municipalities have the right to regulate housing supply, with the California Supreme Court ruling that Santa Monica's rent control regulations did not amount to a 14th Amendment violation. This decision was later effectively overruled by the Ellis Act, which enshrined landlords' rights to exit the rental business.^[11]

Palmer/Sixth Street Properties v. City of Los Angeles (2009) addressed inclusionary housing ordinances and their interaction with Costa-Hawkins provisions. The court found that mandatory affordable housing requirements without developer agreement to assistance violated Costa-Hawkins' mandate that landlords could set initial rental rates.^[24]

The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, enacted in 1995, established categories of rent control and preempted local vacancy control laws while exempting new construction and single-family homes from rent control.^[11]

Legal Statutes

California's statewide rent control law (AB 1482) limits annual rent increases to 5% plus local inflation, with a maximum of 10% total. The law also establishes just-cause eviction requirements for tenants with more than 12 months of tenancy.^[25]

Los Angeles's Rent Stabilization Ordinance provides additional protections beyond state law, regulating rents and evictions for covered properties. The city's anti-harassment ordinance

prohibits taking away housing services, failure to make timely repairs, and abuse of access rights.^{[26][27]}

Peer-Reviewed Studies

Research consistently demonstrates that rent control and tenant protections benefit low-income and vulnerable populations. Studies show that cost-driven residential moves are associated with significantly worse general health, increased psychological distress, and reduced healthcare utilization. The research found that 15.4% of moves by California renters were due to unaffordable housing costs, with the highest rates among socioeconomically marginalized groups.^[28]

Displacement and Civil Rights

International Legal Framework

The UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights establishes that forced evictions constitute gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including rights to adequate housing, food, water, health, and education. General Comment No. 7 specifies that evictions should only occur in exceptional circumstances and with full accordance to international human rights law.^[29]

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights prohibits arbitrary interference with home and family. The Human Rights Committee has ruled in multiple cases that evictions without adequate replacement housing available violate Article 17 protections.^[29]

Constitutional Precedents

Lindsey v. Normet (1972) represents the key U.S. Supreme Court precedent on housing rights, with the Court stating it was "unable to perceive in [the Constitution] any constitutional guarantee of access to dwellings of a particular quality". However, subsequent federal and state court decisions have interpreted this narrowly, and housing advocates continue pushing for constitutional recognition of housing rights.^[30]

California's proposed constitutional amendment (ACA 10) would recognize housing as a fundamental human right in the state constitution, creating obligations for state and local

governments to "respect, protect, and fulfill this right". If passed, California would become the first state to enshrine housing rights in its constitution.^[31]

Government and Demographic Data

HUD and Census Data for Zip Code 90027

Zip code 90027 (Hollywood/East Hollywood) has a total population of 44,471 with high population density (5,473 people per square mile). The area is 76% renter-occupied, making residents particularly vulnerable to displacement pressures. Median household income is \$90,532, though this masks significant income inequality within the zip code.^[32]

Demographic data shows 63% White, 12% Asian, 10% Other Race, 11% Two or More Races, and 3% Black or African American residents. The age distribution shows significant populations in vulnerable age groups, with 2,142 residents aged 65-69 and 1,701 aged 70-74.^[32]

California Aging and Displacement Data

California Department of Finance data shows the state's homeless population includes nearly 40% of adults age 50 or older, with older adults representing the fastest-growing segment of the unhoused population. Research by UCSF found that nearly half of all unhoused adults in California were age 50 or older, with Black and Native American residents dramatically overrepresented.^[33]

The California Commission on Aging reports that 10.2% of older Californians had incomes below the federal poverty line in 2018. By 2040, 22% of Californians will be 65 or older, up from 14% in 2020, creating increased vulnerability to displacement pressures.^{[34][35]}

Expert Testimony Resources

Housing and Property Management Experts

Property management experts provide testimony on standards of care for residential property owners, rent ordinance applications, and tenant protection compliance. These experts typically address code violations, maintenance standards, and rent reduction requirements under applicable housing laws.^[12]

Real estate appraisal experts calculate loss-of-use damages for wrongfully evicted tenants, particularly valuable in rent-controlled jurisdictions where damages can be substantial. The standard measure is the difference between market rent and controlled rent for the period tenants would have remained in the unit.^[12]

Public Health Experts

Community mental health expert witnesses provide testimony on mental health impacts of displacement and housing insecurity. These experts evaluate how housing conditions and displacement affect psychological wellbeing and community mental health outcomes.^[36]

Public health expert witnesses testify on broader health impacts of environmental changes, including air quality impacts from development and loss of green space. These experts can establish causal connections between neighborhood changes and population health outcomes.^[37]

Recommended Search Queries

Google Scholar Queries

1. "elderly eviction health outcomes" + "rent control displacement"
2. "urban canopy reduction health impacts" + "tree cover mortality"
3. "tenant displacement community health" + "social determinants housing"
4. "SB 8 housing crisis act" + "replacement units tenant rights"
5. "forced eviction health consequences" + "residential instability"

Public University Library Database Queries

1. "housing insecurity older adults" AND "cardiovascular health"
2. "gentrification displacement" AND "mental health outcomes"
3. "rent stabilization ordinance" AND "tenant protections California"
4. "green space reduction" AND "urban heat island health"
5. "immigrant tenant displacement" AND "health disparities"
6. "Ellis Act evictions" AND "elderly tenant protections"

7. "community social networks" AND "displacement health impacts"
8. "housing crisis act tenant rights" AND "replacement units"
9. "constitutional right housing" AND "California legal precedents"
10. "expert witness testimony" AND "habitability cases tenant rights"

This comprehensive research provides strong legal and scientific foundations for the Carlton Serrano Tenants Association's case, demonstrating clear connections between displacement, health impacts, and violations of established tenant protections under California law.

**

-
1. <https://dirt.asla.org/2023/03/15/more-urban-trees-could-cut-summer-heat-deaths-by-a-third/>
 2. <http://ncelenviro.org/articles/first-in-science-city-trees-can-reduce-urban-heat-island-effect/>
 3. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8582763/>
 4. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10864265/>
 5. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2025/01/final_public_space_and_urban_health.pdf
 6. <https://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/public-health-experts-find-poor-neighborhoods-lack-access-to-parks-open-space>
 7. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11865402/>
 8. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6244923/>
 9. <https://martinezlawcenter.com/senior-citizen-tenant-rights-california/>
 10. <https://dcba.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/LA-County-COVID-19-Tenant-Protections-Landlord-Move-In-FAQs.pdf>
 11. <https://research.upjohn.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1272&context=reports>
 12. <https://plaintiffmagazine.com/recent-issues/item/experts-in-habitability-cases>
 13. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8045672/>
 14. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829224000108>

15. <https://www.elevateblackhealth.com/seneca-village-displacement-and-health-impact/>
16. <https://www.preventioninstitute.org/sites/default/files/publications/Healthy Development without Displacement - realizing the vision of healthy communities for all.pdf>
17. <https://acphd-web-media.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/media/programs-services/social-health-equity/docs/development-without-displacement.pdf>
18. <https://www.prb.org/articles/more-than-shelter-how-housing-affordability-is-linked-to-older-americans-health/>
19. <https://sksconstruction.com/what-is-california-senate-bill-8-and-how-does-it-impact-housing-development/>
20. <https://www.saje.net/sb-8/>
21. https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/2c923930-d78d-460d-9f95-ce65cdc144cd/Fact_Sheet_Resident_Protection_Ordinance_FD.pdf
22. <https://www.yimbylaw.org/unit-replacement>
23. <https://housing.lacity.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/SB-8-RUD-Info-Sheet.pdf>
24. <https://caanet.org/91263.kbdl>
25. <https://oag.ca.gov/tenants>
26. <https://housing.lacity.gov/rental-property-owners/rent-control-property-overview>
27. <https://housing.lacity.gov/residents/tenant-anti-harassment>
28. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2802386>
29. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-housing/forced-evictions>
30. https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/faculty_articles/253/
31. <https://aclucalaction.org/bill/aca-10/>
32. <https://www.unitedstateszipcodes.org/90027/>
33. <https://www.kqed.org/news/11953216/lack-of-affordable-housing-is-driving-older-californians-into-homelessness>

34. https://ccoa.ca.gov/docs/HomePage/Solving_the_economic_security_gap_for_californias_older_adults.pdf
35. <https://www.ppic.org/publication/policy-brief-californias-aging-population/>
36. <https://www.jurispro.com/category/community-mental-health-s-668>
37. <https://www.seakexperts.com/specialties/public-health-expert-witness>
38. <https://calbudgetcenter.org/resources/the-rise-of-homelessness-among-californias-older-adults/>
39. <https://planning.lacity.gov/resources/demographics>
40. <http://censusreporter.org/profiles/79500US0603732-los-angeles-county-central-la-city-east-central-hollywood-puma-ca/>
41. <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/west-hollywood-he-0421.pdf?1620755968>
42. <http://censusreporter.org/profiles/79500US0603721-los-angeles-county-north-la-city-northeastnorth-hollywood-valley-village-puma-ca/>
43. <https://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/our-work/elder-index>
44. https://data.census.gov/profile/Los_Angeles_County,_California?g=050XX00US06037
45. <https://data.census.gov>
46. <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ohae/docs/cchp/pdf/2018/WestHollywood.pdf>
47. https://data.census.gov/profile/Los_Angeles_city,_California?g=160XX00US0644000
48. <https://martinezlawcenter.com/navigating-californias-new-rent-control-laws/>
49. <https://martinezlawcenter.com/attorney-for-wrongful-eviction-lawsuit/>
50. <https://caanet.org/u-s-supreme-court-declines-to-hear-appeals-on-rent-eviction-controls/>
51. <https://martinezlawcenter.com/how-often-do-tenants-win-eviction-cases/>
52. <https://bornstein.law/monumental-cases-that-impacted-california-landlord-tenant-law/>
53. <https://www.change.org/p/save-5416-5430-carlton-way-stop-evictions-of-vulnerable-tenants/u/33838861>
54. <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/F2/406/1259/259425/>

55. <https://www.jlegal.org/blog/understanding-ellis-act-eviction-east-hollywood-a-tenants-guide-2025/>
56. <https://lafla.org/stories-events/dredf-and-lafla-sue-22-housing-providers-for-source-of-income-discrimination-in-los-angeles/>
57. <https://law.justia.com/cases/florida/supreme-court/2000/sc95799.html>
58. https://housing.lacity.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/rm_-_corrected_settlement_agreement_and_release_of_claims_0.pdf
59. https://www.georgeabrahamsfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/2023_8-07_CBSC-First-Amended-Petition-FILED.pdf
60. <https://dcba.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Relocation-Assistance-FAQ.pdf>
61. <https://trellis.law/doc/201788978/complaint-filed-by-238-serrano-properties-llc-plaintiff-414-palm-drive-llc-plaintiff-616-sweetzer-villas-llc-plaintiff-et-al-as-to-state-california-a-governmental-entity-defendant-county-los-angeles-a-governmental-entity-defendant-city>
62. <https://trellis.law/case/bs168306/george-abrahams-vs-board-building-safety-commissioners>
63. <https://housing.lacity.gov/rental-property-owners/relocation-assistance-information>
64. <https://www.change.org/p/save-5416-5430-carlton-way-stop-evictions-of-vulnerable-tenants>
65. https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2016/16-0478-S1_pc_8-9-16.pdf
66. <https://caltenantlaw.com/la-rent-information/>
67. <https://notices.dailyjournal.com/LegalNotices/DJCLegalNotices/LDJ-2025-08-15.pdf>
68. <https://trellis.law/case/21stpb02378/abrahams-george-p-decedent>
69. <https://housing.lacity.gov/rental-property-owners/landlord-occupancy-owners>
70. https://www.instagram.com/p/C-tXnc2yQI_/?hl=en
71. <https://www.georgeabrahamsfoundation.org>
72. <https://martinezlawcenter.com/california-tenant-protection-act-2025/>
73. [https://alcl.assembly.ca.gov/sites/alcl.assembly.ca.gov/files/SB_8_Skinner\).pdf](https://alcl.assembly.ca.gov/sites/alcl.assembly.ca.gov/files/SB_8_Skinner).pdf)

74. <https://justiceinaging.org/defending-californias-facility-residents-from-evictions-protections-for-people-living-in-residential-care-facilities-for-the-elderly-adult-residential-facilities-and-similar-licensed-facilities/>
75. <https://nlihc.org/resource/several-new-tenant-protections-went-effect-renters-california-month>
76. <https://canhr.org/eviction-protections-for-rcfe-residents/>
77. [https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2021/21-1230-s8_misc_4_10-16-24_\(1\).pdf](https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2021/21-1230-s8_misc_4_10-16-24_(1).pdf)
78. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e6YZ6UGXnK8>
79. <https://planning.lacity.gov/project-review/housing-crisis-act>
80. <https://bestcoaststatelaw.com/can-my-landlord-evict-my-elderly-parent-after-i-die/>
81. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/senate_bill_330_and_senate_bill_8_-_summary_of_housing_crisis_act_of_2019.pdf
82. <https://housing.ca.gov/resources/rights.pdf>
83. <https://justiceinaging.org/california-older-renters-unaffordability-homelessness/>
84. <https://legiscan.com/CA/text/SB8/id/2433369>
85. <https://caanet.org/caa-updates-compliance-papers-following-changes-to-concords-rent-control-law/>
86. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7345658/>
87. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8096710/>
88. <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hpb20210315.747908/>
89. <https://journalistsresource.org/home/tree-health-equity/>
90. <https://cnr.ncsu.edu/news/2022/04/parks-green-spaces-improve-health/>
91. <https://purl.stanford.edu/vw826zm7724>
92. <https://www.clf.org/blog/urban-trees-benefit-our-climate-and-health/>
93. <https://hsph.harvard.edu/research/environmental-health-niehs/community-resources/annotated-literature-review-health-benefits-of-urban-greenspace/>
94. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10728029/>

95. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2542519625001123>
96. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/10793739241277600>
97. <https://justicedirect.com/post/sue-landlord-california-small-claims>
98. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/07/15/us-supreme-court-decision-undermines-right-housing>
99. <https://calcivilrights.ca.gov/housing/>
100. https://wclp.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Housing_as_a_Human_Right_in_California_-_Final_mission.pdf
101. <https://scholarship.law.uc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1094&context=ihrlr>
102. <https://noplacelikehome.ucsc.edu/history-of-the-rent-control-debate-in-california/>
103. <https://www.justice.gov/crt/fair-housing-act-1>
104. <https://housingmatters.urban.org/articles/naming-housing-human-right-first-step-solving-housing-crisis>
105. <https://www.doorloop.com/laws/california-rent-control-laws>
106. <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Healdsburg/html/Healdsburg09/Healdsburg0944.html>
107. <https://calmatters.org/housing/2023/06/right-to-housing-california-constitution/>
108. <https://caltenantlaw.com/rent-control/>
109. <https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/TBOR-Final.pdf>
110. <https://www.mapofzipcodes.com/zip/90027>
111. <https://www.infoplease.com/us/census/california/west-hollywood>
112. <https://www.zip-codes.com/zip-code/90027/zip-code-90027.asp>
113. <https://evecap.com/neighborhoods/hollywood>
114. <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/west-hollywood-ca>