

Communication from Public

Name: Deborah Lutz

Date Submitted: 01/27/2024 04:22 PM

Council File No: 23-1134

Comments for Public Posting: City Council, Reducing the max rent increase below 3% is unreasonable. The cost to operate property (many are old) increases every year. In recent years Property Insurance has increased significantly especially with many carriers leaving the state. I've had my "non-renewed" due to dropping polices and having replace that insurance has doubled the cost from \$3,000/year to \$8,000 a year for only 7 units. At another property the new carrier required that I replace main circuit breakers (\$35,000), complete my earthquake retrofit (\$150,000)and other items. Utility and trash rates have increased and the administrative costs to operate properties has increased. There is often the discussion of tenants that are "rent burdened". The truth of the matter is that life in California is expensive. Many property owners are "financially burdened" as well. Property owners do not have control of the economy, cost of education, gas, clothing, food, vehicle registration.... It is unreasonable to ask private property owners to absorb the responsibility "house" people and a cost below that of what it costs to provide that housing. City, State and Federal government (by ways of our taxes) can provide direct assistance to those that are rent burdened. I have not hear of any subsidies for property owners for earthquake retrofit, insurance or utility costs. Anything less than 3% is NOT financially feasible. You are jeopardizing the stability of the housing providers that are housing your "vulnerable " population. Reducing the 3% increase is immoral .