

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sharon Kemmer  
**Date Submitted:** 08/08/2024 11:42 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0268-S18

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is very difficult to protect both parties in the service industry which is rental housing. As a landlord, I try to keep a personable but businesslike relationship with my tenants. A couple of them are unreasonable and unhinged at times, but I try to remain objective and helpful, while strictly adhering to the rules and laws which govern the housing industry. Because it is still very difficult, expensive, and time consuming to evict a tenant for cause, which it should not be, it is important to not pass regulations which encourage really bad behavior on the part of a tenant. You might consider making it easier to evict a tenant for cause while also protecting tenants from harassment. Landlords need protection from harassment too. I have a tenant who refuses to move his furniture 1 meter away from a wall heater but keeps insisting that I connect his wall heater ... I am legally required to provide heating but I am also required to make the building fire safe -- I offer to make a floor plan for his furniture, I offer an electric heater until he could arrange his apartment's furnishings a safe distance from the wall heater .... I include this example as symbolic of the kind of problems a landlord has to solve with even handedness and consideration. I know that tenants need protections and I generally support all protections you propose. I just think that it is difficult to legislate fair relationships between landlord and tenant in the absence of some realistic protections for the landlord. For example, this same tenant put an entire pot full of spaghetti down the drain in his kitchen sink, thereby threatening the safety (flooding) of the apartments adjacent to him....and he demanded that I pay the plumbing bill, that he feels he should not have to pay it, even though his lease agreement clearly states what can not go into a drain and who would pay for at-fault plumbing problems. I solved it by doing a second increase to his rent to cover the plumbing bill, as I had not increased his rent to the maximum allowed under CA rent control, and I am able to increase rents twice in a 12 month period as long as the increases do not exceed the 5% + CLI allowable. In deference to his age and limited employability, I had kept his rent increase to a minimum. I increased it to the allowable maximum to cover the expenses incurred in unclogging the drain. I realize that I could have added the \$270 bill to his rent or could have given him a payment plan but his adamant refusal to pay the plumbing bill

made me feel that it would be less confrontational to just raise is rent the extra \$50 as a built-in payment plan. It would probably cost me \$5000 to evict the man, even though there is ample cause well beyond what I have mentioned here. My point is we landlords are not protected by the current eviction situation and just piling more restrictions on us in order to protect tenants does nothing to fairly regulate the industry.