

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 12:42 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Government makes the landlord out to be the bad guy. Actually, it is government that is the enemy of the renter. Every election they have bogus propositions on the ballot to raise property taxes which are totally outrageous. That is ok to pass on to the public but landlords cannot cover their expenses for maintenance, repairs, insurance increases, etc. Do as we say, not as we do, is their motto. Free enterprise is being taken away. When one builds or remodels the permits are outlandish. Those costs have to be passed on to the tenants or buyer of property. What you see happening in China and Iran will happen here. The people will have had enough. What a shame. You can only squeeze so much out of a turnip.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 05:29 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose imposing higher relocation fees for those owners with newer buildings and single-family homes. This tenant protection is already covered by AB 1482. Do you remember why there was a carve-out for newer buildings and single family homes? It was because you knew that this would discourage even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more housing? Relocation fees to the tune of "three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Tenants already have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners that are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rate in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if what is proposed passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. This recommendation kills organic affordable housing. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at:
<https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,
Your Name

Communication from Public

Name: Lisa Malone
Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 05:45 AM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3
Comments for Public Posting: As a sr. retiree, who worked 37 years to invest in real estate in the free world I am amazed at the number of elected officials who are easily swayed by tenants pleas that housing is a right and that property owners MUST support them. Now, its to the point that many tenants either DON'T want to work in a job that monetarily supports them, make bad choices in chosen jobs that are unrealistic (show biz, musicians) and hard to get or, have chosen to just NOT work and game the system. For over 2 years, owners rights have been taken away and have had to subsidize tenants, many of whom are gaming the system and not paying rent. It is UNFAIR for owners to continue to have to pay all business expenses related to property rental ownerships and not not be able to count on in coming rents. Even the IRS defines a business as an entity that makes a profit, while a hobby does not. I invested in property to aid me in my senior years and/or to assist my grandkids in their endeavors. I like restaurants, hotels/motels, department stores, utility companies. Etc provide a service/product in EXCHANGE for MONEY. I am NOT a CHARITY or Government entity set up to dole out FREE services. Many tenants whose rents have been frozen are subletting rooms in in their rental property in order to receive higher rents than what they pay their landlords and are making thousands of dollars. Therefore, they are running a business at the expense of their landlords who then must pay for additional maintenance cost dues to increased wear and tear, and related business costs. HOW IS THAT LEGAL OR FAIR? By NO means is it right to take away the rights of property owners. It is NOT DONE with other businesses. Property owners pay property taxes that fund many services that are for ALL, yet non-property owners pay zero. Where is the equity. Please end the covid related moratoriums.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 08:11 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE end the rent freeze immediately, not in 2024, but IMMEDIATELY! I am a small landlord who is suffering financially because of this moratorium. My building, which is my sole source of income, is located in a rent control area, so the rents were already below market rate before this moratorium. Now, I haven't been able to raise rents since 2019, THREE years ago, and with the current plan, if you vote on it, I won't be able to raise rents until 2024. This is FIVE years without a rent increase, yet as you know, we are in a season of unprecedented inflation levels. The cost of maintaining the building has skyrocketed - this includes utility bills, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates (another unfair situation), and the cost of hiring workers/contractors, who have raised their fees exponentially due to the cost of gas and the need for them to cope with inflation. In addition, the moratorium has allowed tenants to move in unlimited people and pets with no consequence - so in addition to having to deal with all of the other rising costs, I now have to pay water bills and endure additional wear and tear on my units for unauthorized occupants and pets. The impact of this rent freeze and eviction moratorium on me is as follows: 1. I no longer have the financial ability to maintain the building, even though tenants and local ordinance expect me to. 2. I can no longer earn a living - as this is my sole source of income. Why are you picking on small landlords, who deserve to earn a living like everyone else? 3. The value of my building will be affected. If I want to sell it in the future, it will be at a lower price because the rents are low. There is no way that I can catch up after 5 years of no rent increases. It will also affect my ability to obtain a loan on the building if I wanted to do so in order to make capital improvements that I can no longer afford because of this freeze. 4. I am now subsidizing the lifestyles of all of my tenants. Why? I'm not related to these people. Why do I have to financially subsidize them at the expense of being able to support myself? 5. These moratoriums and freezes have created an unprecedented sense of entitlement among my tenants who have now become belligerent. After a season of not having to pay rent, and not honor other terms of the rental agreement (like moving in unauthorized people and pets), it has become very difficult to command any sort of respect as the owner of the building. This moratorium has created a culture of tenant belligerence - they do

anything that they want to do because they know that there will be no consequence. If this situation ever ends, it will be difficult to undo that cultural shift. Bottom line, this whole situation has undermined my right as an individual to own and manage property THAT I PAY FOR, and to earn an honest living which I deserve. PLEASE stop this unnecessary discrimination against small landlords. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Fredi Castaneda
Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 08:31 AM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3
Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members: How long will you keep this unbearable burden on me as a small-business landlord? Today it has been 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! You have no idea how I have struggled with the enormous hikes in repair hikes during this inflation. All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose imposing higher relocation fees for those owners with newer buildings and single-family homes. This tenant protection is already covered by AB 1482. Do you remember why there was a carve-out for newer buildings and single family homes? It was because you knew that this would discourage even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more housing? Relocation fees to the tune of "three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Tenants already have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners that are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rate in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if what is proposed passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. This recommendation kills organic affordable housing. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample

revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at:
<https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.
Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly
repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL
EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial
eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is
best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,
Fredi Castaneda