

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 09:29 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmember Rita Kubela Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long-run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. 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”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on by exceeding occupancy limits

should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Mahendra Desai