

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 07/01/2025 03:21 AM

Council File No: 24-1225

Comments for Public Posting: I'm urging you to adopt Option 2 to protect housing providers to help protect naturally occurring affordable housing. Performing normal repairs, maintenance, and typical upgrades during a tenancy, such as installation of appliances, carpeting, plumbing fixtures, fumigation, etc., can be completed without major disruption to the habitability of the rental unit, in a short timeframe with the tenant in place and does not require the tenant to vacate their rental unit. According to state law the definition of Substantial Remodel is that the tenant is unable to remain in place during the repairs ONLY due to health and safety and that such repairs are only for major system repairs or hazardous materials abatement. This is dangerous for the occupants of the units and normal occurrences that need to be carried out in a safe manner for everyone. These draconian proposals is exactly what needs to be stopped to allow the natural cycle of operations a rental unit in the city to keep the housing units safe for the renters and habitable as well!

Communication from Public

Name: Michael

Date Submitted: 07/01/2025 07:08 AM

Council File No: 24-1225

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, As a housing provider in Los Angeles, I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed changes under Council File Number 24-1225, specifically the recommendation to eliminate substantial remodels as a valid no-fault reason for rental unit removal on properties not subject to existing rent stabilization laws. If adopted, this policy would make it nearly impossible for responsible property owners to maintain their homes without incurring excessive and unsustainable costs. Critical repairs, such as major plumbing, electrical overhauls, structural reinforcements, or hazardous material abatement, often cannot be completed with tenants in place due to safety and habitability concerns. Under the proposed rules, owners would be forced to either: Pay tenant relocation costs for temporary accommodations elsewhere during repairs, or Permanently buy out tenants at a cost the tenant deems acceptable. Combined with the fact that no rental income can be collected during these periods, these requirements would create a crushing financial burden, especially for small, mom-and-pop housing providers. Many of us own aging properties nearing or beyond 50 years old, and responsible stewardship of these homes requires substantial reinvestment. Notably, the Los Angeles Housing Department's data shows no evidence of widespread abuse. In over two years, only 77 properties with 99 units applied for substantial remodels—hardly a “wave” of bad actors. I urge the Council to adopt Option 2, which would still prevent abuse but allow small housing providers the flexibility needed to conduct essential work that maintains our housing stock's long-term health, safety, and affordability. Let's not discourage the very reinvestment that keeps naturally occurring affordable housing viable in Los Angeles.