

Communication from Public

Name: peeved small landlord

Date Submitted: 09/27/2022 10:10 AM

Council File No: 20-0291

Comments for Public Posting: I am not sure what is the City Council's big problem with doing what is right and ending this illegal Moratorium. Instead the narrative has shifted to how do we put in more tenant protections?? Perhaps it's the inconvenience with the upcoming elections or perhaps it is rather the incompetence as after 32 months (and counting) there is still no plan to phase-out this illegal Moratorium. Firstly, the City has an 'independent' agency, LAHD, tasked with studying and coming up with recommendations to phase out this Illegal Moratorium (8/25) which they too have admitted they did not contemplate the original Ordinance fully and correctly. It took 19 dragging days before it was even heard by the Housing Committee. During the 9/15 Housing Committee, the audacity of Councilwoman Nithya Raman was insulting to Angelenos that were force to open their own homes for public use. After all that work done by LAHD, Raman is essentially saying she does not trust LAHD, perhaps it is inconvenient to her, and wants to discount and further drag out and institute unjustifiable extensions and MORE tenant protections? Raman is pushing to omit LAHD's institution of penalty under perjury in her view to, 'be consistent with County.' If Councilman Raman truly believed in being aligned with County, why she is asking to extend the Illegal Moratorium until February 28, 2023 with even more tenant-protections when County is declaring this over Dec 31 2022 with no further tenant protections! What a joke this is. You are insulting Angelenos with this coddling. The abuse against small mom+pop landlords needs to stop. These policies will do NOTHING for affordable housing which has been the battle-cry of the City Council. The City Council is showing a lack of leadership. Other municipalities like Pasadena, Beverly Hills or San Diego have fully entrusted their own Housing Departments and adopted their reports immediately without any politics unlike in LA City. Shame on you City Council for playing with the livelihoods of hard-working, honest, tax-paying Angelenos. The only thing I will agree with in the Housing Committee is Councilman Harris-Dawson's plea that there needs to be distinction between the small mom+pop landlord and the corporate landlord when developing these 'fair and equitable' policies. Let's face it this has NOT been fair at all. I do not think many would argue against having more tenant

protections in the corporate own units. But haven't the small mom+pop landlords suffered enough with these heavy-handed policies?? How do you expect small mom+pop landlords to pay those ridiculous LARSO Relocation Fees which unscrupulous tenants have targeted. The only thing I will agree with Councilman Raman is small mom+pop landlords should not but subject to the LARSO Relocation Fee pay schedule. Instead please consider her proposal, in cases where a Relocation Fee is required, instead small mom+pop landlords pay the State defined amount in AB1482. The City Council needs to understand small mom+pop landlords provides much of the Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) in LA City and to do that they need to have the wiggle room to operate their units without more regulation. These policies will only erode that housing stock and bring in more corporate landlords to the market. Additionally with all the time that was stolen by this draconian policy as the City held our properties hostage , 32 months and counting, the City should consider subtracting that time period when calculating the Relocation Fee amount. It is an unfair burden to give tenants 32 extra months in their tenancy where a small mom+pop landlord will have to pay the larger Relocation Fee amount as the 3-year threshold was not discussed in the LAHD report. Please consider all the wrong you did to small mom+pop landlords and make this right. Lead, if possible, us out of this mess YOU created.