

1 Timothy J. Tatro, Cal. State Bar No. 175633
Peter A. Zamoyski, Cal. State Bar No. 185579
2 TATRO & ZAMOYSKI, LLP
12264 El Camino Real, Suite 400
3 San Diego, CA 92130-3063
TEL: (858) 244-5032
4 FAX: (858) 847-0032

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
DE ANZA COVE HOMEOWNERS
6 ASSOCIATION, INC.

7
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

10 DE ANZA COVE HOMEOWNERS
ASSOCIATION, INC., a California non-profit
11 corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CITY OF SAN DIEGO, a California
municipality; and
15 DOES 1-100, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

17 AND RELATED CROSS ACTION
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. GIC 821191

**PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION**

DATE: January 7, 2005
TIME: 11:00 a.m.
DEPT: 66
I/C JUDGE: Honorable Charles Hayes

Complaint Filed: Nov. 17, 2003
Trial Date: June 10, 2005

Table of Contents

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Cover

Table of Contents i-iii

Table of Authorities iv

Introduction..... 1

Issue 3

Overview..... 3

Statement of Facts..... 4

1. The birth of a new community..... 4

 A. The City nurtures the growth of De Anza Cove by authorizing permanent construction ... 4

 B. In the 1960’s, the City re-zones De Anza Cove to parkland—thereby ensuring closure of the mobilehome park 5

 C. The City requires its lessee to propose a redevelopment plan that would change the use of the land from a mobilehome park to a “higher and better use” 5

2. The early 1980’s and the Kapiloff Bill era. 5

 A. Assemblyman Kapiloff and Councilman Gotch knew what was going on at De Anza Cove..... 5

 B. In 1981, the City decides to press on with its plans to redevelop De Anza Cove..... 6

 C. The Legislature moves into action to protect the residents..... 7

 D. ...while the City wants to build another hotel. 8

 E. The City knew that the Kapiloff Bill could become law *only* if it approved the Bill. 8

 F. The City considered what it would owe in relocation benefits—and considered *not* approving the Kapiloff Bill..... 9

 G. Hearing the City’s grumblings, the Legislature sends its own message..... 9

 H. The City calculates the millions it will reap by passing the Kapiloff Bill..... 9

 I. And the City weighs the consequences of losing its land use authority—and millions upon millions of dollars—if it decides not to ratify the Kapiloff Bill 10

 J. The City makes another planning decision and takes action—the City ratifies the Kapiloff Bill..... 10

 K. The Kapiloff Bill’s language is unequivocal. 11

 L. The State never exempted the City from the MRL or other State statutes..... 11

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS –cont’d

M. ...And the City knew that the Kapiloff Bill had no effect on other State laws.....12

N. The City sends Notices to the homeowners—but adds language found nowhere in the Kapiloff Bill.13

3. The post-Kapiloff era and the homeowner’s dilemma.13

 A. Homeowners foot the bill for the City’s negotiated rent hikes.13

 B. DHRG tells the City: if the hotel plan isn’t approved, the City could be stuck with preparing a tenant impact report and paying relocation costs under the MRL.13

 C. Residents sign long-term rental agreements with DHRG and face more problems.....14

 D. The City makes affordable housing a priority and, by local ordinance, demands that San Diego’s mobilehome park owners provide relocation assistance.15

 E. ...but the City checks to see how much it will need to pay to the De Anza Cove residents under its ordinance.15

 F. ...and then the City acts to exempt itself from its own ordinance.....15

 G. The City considers several plans for a mammoth hotel resort.....16

 H. The City contractually agrees not to recognize the resident’s claims.....16

 I. The City agrees to negotiate exclusively with DHRG—shutting out the homeowners.17

 J. With only a month left, the City tries to bulldoze the Park’s homeowners with its take-it-or-leave-it “transition plan.”18

 K. Despite reaping the financial benefits from De Anza Cove, the City procrastinates, and then, abandons the statutory obligations it owes to the residents.18

Standard Governing Summary Adjudication.....19

Argument20

 1. The Mobilehome Residency Law applies to the De Anza Cove mobilehome park and to the City of San Diego.....20

 A. Legislative history and intent.....20

 i. The State Legislature passes sweeping reforms to protect mobilehome owners throughout the State from the financial hardships they suffer when a park closes.....20

 ii. The new law specifically targets San Diego21

///

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS –cont’d

2 iii. The Legislature closes a loophole by clarifying that the reporting
3 requirements are mandatory, regardless of whether the park is closing or the
 use is changing.22

4 iv. The Legislature acts again to ensure that cities—like San Diego—cannot
5 maneuver out of the MRL’s reach22

6 v. Determined to protect all mobilehome residents, the Legislature underscores
7 the City’s duty to the residents.....22

8 vi. The City—appreciating the risk of incurring liability for closing De Anza
9 Cove—contemplates seeking an exemption to the MRL from the Legislature.....23

10 B. Whatever the reason for closure, cities must—and do—follow the MRL.23

11 C. The only case interpreting Gov’t Code section 65863.7—*Keh v. Walters*—confirms
12 that the City’s closure of the mobilehome park—for *any* reason—triggers the MRL’s
13 reporting requirements.25

14 D. The MRL’s protections cannot be waived by contract.26

15 2. The City of San Diego is “closing” or “changing the use” of the De Anza Cove
16 mobilehome park.27

17 A. The City—and nobody else—is closing the mobilehome park.27

18 B. Regardless of the reason, the City is “closing” the Park or, at a minimum, is
19 “changing its use” from a mobilehome park to something else.....28

20 C. The closure of De Anza Cove results from the City’s own actions and planning
21 decisions.....28

22 3. The City cannot terminate—or refuse to renew—the tenancies because there is
23 no lawful reason for termination stated in the Notices.30

24 4. The City’s transition plan—delivered as an ultimatum—provides residents no realistic
25 means of relocation.32

26 Standing33

27 Conclusion34

28

1 **Table of Authorities**

2
3
4 **CASES:**

5 *City Area Property Owners Assn. v. M. Penn Phillips Co.* (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d35
6 *Daar v. Yellow Cab Company* (1967) 67 Cal.2d35
7 *Hernandez v. City of Pomona* (1996) 49 Cal.App.4th20
8 *Keh v. Walters* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th2, 26, 29, 31, 32
9 *Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th20
10 *Loving & Evans v. Blick* (1949) 33 Cal.2d27
11 *Payne v. National Collection Systems, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th35
12 *Raymond v. Paradise Unified School Dist.* (1963) 218 Cal.App.2d.....20
13 *Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1973) 34 Cal.App.3d.....35
14 *Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California* (1976) 17 Cal.3d.....20
15 *Tenants Ass'n. of Park Santa Anita v. Southers* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d35

16
17
18 **STATUTES:**

19 Assembly Bill 447, § 1, § 3(d), § 411, 13
20 Civ. Code § 7981, 15, 21, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
21 Civ. Code, § 437c(f).....20
22 Gov't Code § 65863.71, 14, 22, 23, 24, 29, 31
23 S.D. Muni. Code § 101.1002(A)(9)15
24 S.D. Muni. Code § 143.061016, 18
25 S.D. Muni. Code § 143.0615.....16, 18
26
27
28

