

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Anonymous

**Date Submitted:** 06/30/2025 01:29 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1225

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm a longtime Angeleno, a renter, and a small housing provider. I'm urging you to reject Option 1 of the LAHD report. Eliminating Substantial Remodels as a no-fault cause for renter removal is not just misguided — it's dangerous. It directly targets mom-and-pop landlords like me who are already struggling to maintain safe and affordable housing in Los Angeles. The Just Cause Ordinance has only been in effect for two years, yet it has already ballooned into a sweeping web of restrictions. Option 1 takes it even further, effectively removing our ability to do critical repairs unless we can afford to pay renters to leave — or pay to house them elsewhere. That is not realistic for small owners. Right now, I have a tenant who has caused serious water and fire damage. I'm expected to repair it — while leaving that tenant in place. That tenant even brags about getting an “annual, landlord-funded beachfront vacation.” It's outrageous. The City's own data shows there have been fewer than 100 substantial remodel applications in nearly three years. That's 0.000067% of renters — hardly a crisis. This policy won't protect tenants. It will force small owners to sell to developers, leading to more luxury housing and less naturally affordable stock. We need safe housing. We need balanced policy. Please: Reject Option 1. Adopt Option 2. Do not criminalize property maintenance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/30/2025 05:51 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1225

**Comments for Public Posting:** We want a vote NO on Council File Number 24-1225. As an owner and industry professional I see major renovations necessary during the life of a property. It would make no sense not to have the ability to fund renovations going forward. If the government wants to build more affordable housing they should assist in city wide affordability not have small owners have to pay. Thank you, Jacqueline

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andrea

**Date Submitted:** 06/30/2025 05:52 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1225

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposal is devastating for mom-and-pop housing providers—many of whom are seniors relying on rental income to make ends meet. Penalizing landlords who need to make essential repairs by forcing them to pay tenants to relocate—\*and\* cover alternate housing costs—is unreasonable and unsustainable. Most of these properties are decades old and require substantial upgrades that simply cannot be done with tenants in place. The LA Housing Department’s own report shows there’s \*no\* widespread abuse of the substantial remodel provision—only 77 properties over 2.5 years. The City continues to take an openly hostile stance toward tax-paying housing providers. These one-sided policies punish responsible small landlords and make it harder to preserve safe, affordable housing across LA. Prove that the City is serious about keeping naturally occurring affordable housing, and adopt \*\*Option 2\*\*, not Option 1. Start supporting the people who actually provide the housing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/30/2025 06:09 PM

**Council File No:** 24-1225

**Comments for Public Posting:** 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. Thus, LAHD's report does NOT support Option 1 and it should be eliminated as an option. Many multifamily properties are nearly 50 years old and the single-family properties may be even older, these properties must have major repairs conducted. Small owners with 20 or fewer units must be allowed to continue to use Substantial Remodels in order to preserve their properties as naturally occurring affordable housing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kelly Aluise  
**Date Submitted:** 06/30/2025 06:18 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-1225  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Thank you for educating me on this!