

Communication from Public

Name: Miki Jackson

Date Submitted: 11/12/2020 11:30 AM

Council File No: 18-1246

Comments for Public Posting: Miki Jackson for AHF/ Housing is a Human Right. Please vote no on item 9. This will hurt unionized hotel workers and it takes more housing off the market. If an owner can make as much or more money renting by the night why should they rent it permanently. They may think that once they have a permanent tenant it will be more difficult to sell it.

Communication from Public

Name: Tim Sundeen

Date Submitted: 11/12/2020 04:15 PM

Council File No: 18-1246

Comments for Public Posting: My wife and I are homeowners and landlords and we whole-heartedly support the Home Sharing Ordinance and oppose the Vacation Rental Ordinance. As you know we are in the middle of an economic crisis and a pandemic. People are ill or in danger of imminent eviction, living in extremely overcrowded conditions that are currently unsafe, or working themselves to the bone while putting themselves in danger for the public good. We need to focus on solving their problems, not creating special legislation to benefit affluent property owners. Not only does the Vacation Rental Ordinance fail to support the vulnerable, it creates a loophole in the current Home Sharing Ordinance that would allow unscrupulous landlords to bypass the current regulations. We are already hearing anecdotally that the HMO is putting units back on the market and the ordinance has not even been fully implemented yet. We should not undermine the ordinance before it has even started to benefit the city. Frequently in hearings on this topic multiple hosts will call in to say they “need” to be able to rent out on a short term basis; this is not true. These people aren’t needy – they would LIKE to be able to rent on short term markets because it is easier and more lucrative and will let them invest in property and live where they like. But it comes at a cost for the rest of the City, however much they do not want to hear that. It is disturbing that so many people who own properties worth hundreds of thousands and probably millions of dollars are willing to “cry poor” in efforts to have special legislation passed to benefit themselves. On a personal note, my wife and I own a second home which I rent to tenants. Yes, being a landlord is not always easy, and yes my wife would have liked to have my elderly in-laws be able to live there some of the time and rent it out the rest, but as people who will reap the economic benefits of owning the property we both know we have an obligation to the city to use that house in a responsible way

Communication from Public

Name: Anne Johnson

Date Submitted: 11/10/2020 08:28 AM

Council File No: 18-1246

Comments for Public Posting: Hello: I can't believe, during the most challenging times this city has seen in over 100 years, we are once again discussing the possibility of removing sustainable housing from the continually shrinking supply of single family dwellings. What really is going on? What "master" is the city council serving. You are all civil servants, yet if you collectively approve this short sighted and greedy motion, you will certainly not be serving the best interest for Angelenos. Only special interests groups who financially benefit from the short term rental business thinks this motion is a good idea. This motion serves as a tool of financial greed for those who are wealthy enough to own more than one single family dwelling. How many hard working class Angelenos do you know who owns a "vacation" home? Please place the needs of working class Angelenos and the overall health and well being of this city in first position by voting "NO" on this motion. Thank you, Anne Johnson

Communication from Public

Name: David Ewing

Date Submitted: 11/10/2020 05:01 PM

Council File No: 18-1246

Comments for Public Posting: Dear PLUM Committee Members, Please take a moment to think how it will look if you pass this ordinance under current circumstances, with a Federal judge occupying City Hall to chastise you and your colleagues for failing to minimally fulfill the City's basic obligation to provide shelter for the nearly thirty thousand unhoused people living unsheltered on our streets. This ordinance is an obvious loophole poked in the Home Sharing Ordinance for only the very wealthy. If you take this step, it will instantly become emblematic of the City's housing failures and its predilection for giving special treatment to those who need it least. In other words, close on the heels of other scandals involving special arrangements for moneyed interests, you will be branded with hypocrisy and obtuseness. Los Angeles has a highly aroused population of housing activists, and our housing failures are under close media and court scrutiny. Is this ordinance really something you feel comfortable putting your names on right now, before the Home Sharing Ordinance is even being seriously enforced? Step away from the edge. David Ewing Venice

Communication from Public

Name: Ann Kocarek

Date Submitted: 11/11/2020 08:03 PM

Council File No: 18-1246

Comments for Public Posting: I'm pleading with you to shoot down this new ordinance. We're in a covid and homelessness crisis and we're coming up with new ways to make houses un-occupiable to LA residents? The City should not be considering a vacation rental policy in the middle of a housing crisis. The City has not been able to create housing fast enough. If there are units sitting empty in the City of Los Angeles, they should be used for housing, no exceptions. Please vote NO on this ordinance.