

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ching Chan  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 02:41 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16  
**Comments for Public Posting:** this would be disastrous for housing providers and disincentivize new residential development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lula Valissarakos

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 02:30 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Why do the landlords need to solve the city's Homeless issue? We are a mom and pop Owner that has struggled to be good landlords for 26 years in Los Angeles, pay Our taxes, mortgage & insurance which Has gone up steadily not to mention repairs and renovations. We were hit with COVID 3 years longer than any other city. Why are we being punished for being law abiding Business owners with integrity and goodwill? Please reconsider your actions to be equitable to EVERYONE.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dore Brand

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 02:38 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am totally against freezing rents and evictions. When is government going to realize that it is quickly becoming impossible to be in the property management business and make even a small profit. Let's make a deal: we won't raise rents if you make sure that our property tax and insurance rates don't go up either. How are you going to look out for us? These freezes you are attempting to put in place have little to do with those displaced from the fires. Thank you, Dore Brand

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 01:50 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is another example of the city making it clear they do not care about property owners. Los Angeles already has one of the strictest rent control systems in the country, and this is another overreach in this area. It's a system that stresses tenant rights over those who actually provide housing as a service. This is why property owners are warehousing units instead of renting them. It's a liability to rent them because of city and county policies. The city is asking property owners to act as interest-free lenders to non-paying tenants. It's worse than that because tenants who don't pay rent, don't take care of the property they live in. The damage caused by the non-paying tenants is also expected to be covered by the property owners. At this point, one can hardly be called a property owner in the city and county of Los Angeles as they are at the whims of self-ingratiating politicians using any catastrophe as an opportunity to make themselves look benevolent, or entitled tenants thinking that they have some right to a property that is purchased, maintained and owned by another. No other industry or product is treated this way in the civilized world. It leads to criminality and will ultimately lead to a reduction in housing providers. This is where huge corporate landlords move in, because the city has made it overwhelmingly inhospitable for mom and pop landlords to be involved in the housing market.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** harold brown

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 02:06 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Why is this city Anti Small Landlords. The Politian's present and past are responsible for the housing problems in Los Angeles. You all governed over this. Stop punishing the Landlords for your mistakes.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonathan Swire

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 01:12 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** How many times do we need to negatively impact Landlords? Why are we the ones to bear the brunt of all the issues? How does it make sense that a tenant can claim they were affected by the fires, not have to pay rent, and not have to provide any proof? can I go into Ralph's and take my groceries for free by saying I was impacted by the Fires? How does this make sense? This is like COVID all over again, where I had over \$600K in lost rent that was never repaid to me. How is that fair? If a tenant can't afford rent, he/she should move into a unit they can afford. Why is it my responsibility to make sure they have a place to live for free?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Yawar Charlie

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 01:13 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Public Comment – Oppose Council File 25-0006-S16 I strongly oppose the proposed city-wide eviction moratorium. My family has personally experienced the devastating impact of housing policies that favor non-paying tenants at the expense of responsible landlords. We lost our rental property because a tenant refused to pay for months, and protections for landlords were nonexistent. This measure disproportionately harms small housing providers, forcing many to sell and reducing the already-limited rental housing stock in Los Angeles. Implementing yet another layer of restrictions, on top of the recently passed County moratorium, creates unnecessary confusion and financial hardship. If the goal is to help those in need, direct rental assistance and grant programs for small landlords are far more effective solutions. Please reject this moratorium and consider fairer alternatives that support both renters and housing providers.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** carol shogren

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 01:16 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Just cause evictions are difficult enough, almost impossible already. So, legally how are property owners supposed to be compensated for non payment of rent for 6 months? All hardships should not fall on the shoulders of property owners. An example of this is non payment of rent and illegal activities, how is this fair to the other tenants who are playing by the rules?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joshua Morrow

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 01:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** We absolutely cannot afford to carry housing for 24 months for anyone who is not paying, or anytime for that matter. The city has already passed very strict guidelines to rent which are already too strict on the homeowner. Please VOTE NO against this eviction moratorium. This is outrageous and absurd. I speak on behalf of myself and my clients could lose their homes. Insurance is taking care of most of the fire victims. I know because I work in the field of real estate. If anyone is to vote YES we will definitely have NO CHOICE but to start petitions of impeachment against that counsel member. Thank you! Joshua Morrow and Fernando Mazoco da Silveira 5715 ALLOTT AVE, VALLEY GLEN, CA 91401

## Communication from Public

**Name:** jimmy martinez  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 08:55 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16  
**Comments for Public Posting:** NO eviction moratorium. This hurts Mom and Pop property owners.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rochelle R. Pegg  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 06:58 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THAT VOTING IN A ONE YEAR EVICTION MORATORIUM IS THE CORRECT AND ONLY WAY TO ADDRESS THIS PROBLEM?? THIS IS AN UNFAIR BURDEN ON LANDLORDS, ESPECIALLY THE MOM AND POP OWNERS. YES, SOME TENANTS AND WILDFIRE PEOPLE ARE VICTIMS. OTHERS WAIT ON AN OPPORTUNITY LIKE THIS (AGAIN LIKE THE COVID MORATORIUM) AND JUST SIT ON THE LANDLORDS WHEN THEY COULD HAVE PAID THEIR RENT. INSTEAD, SOME BRAG ABOUT "GETTING OVER" AND KEEPING THEIR MONEY TO PILE UP UNTIL THEY'RE PUT OUT. YOU CANNOT SOLVE ALL OF THE UNHOUSED PROBLEMS AND THROW IT ONTO THE LANDLORDS WHILE NO OTHER GROUPS OR ENTITIES IN LA ARE IMPACTED. NOT FAIR OR EQITABLE.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lisa Potier

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2025 08:16 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** An eviction moratorium is not the answer and creates chaos. The last eviction moratorium allowed tenants to lie, stall, manipulate and take advantage of a program meant for a very small number of people being hurt by their landlords. Create a program that will address the few that are abusing the system rather than create an over reaching program that adds so much means for abuse that everyday folks trying to make a living are the ones hurt. I have story after story of tenants making money on the last moratorium, and abusing the intent of the program. One example is a new family - husband and pregnant wife who bought their first home with tenants on board. The tenants were scheduled to leave so the new owners could move in. The tenants refused to leave for nearly three years causing the new owners to pay both their existing rent and the new mortgage. The tenants made \$200,000 annually, were paying 50% of market rate because the previous owner did not raise the rent and were not financially affected by Covid shutdowns in any way. The tenants were my clients. It was horrible to watch my clients, while staying within the law, so horribly take advantage of a family, causing them the loss of their hard earned wealth. I have more stories like this, all in the business do. This is a regional issue. Deal with it in another way!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Semel

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2025 08:55 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Over the past two months, Los Angeles City, County and State elected officials have proposed and imposed tenant protections under the premise of helping those financially impacted by the fires in the Palisades, Hughes, and Eaton communities. Last week, LA County Board of Supervisors voted for a six-month eviction moratorium allowing those who are impacted to self-certify hardship. This comes after LA City being subject to the longest tenant protections in the country in the form of moratoriums (three years) and rent freezes ( four years) despite the cost of insurance, utilities, services, have all risen exponentially. Tomorrow, Los Angeles City Council votes on its eviction moratorium again, after the original version was voted down on February 14th. As a result , regulations imposed on Los Angeles landlords since the onset of COVID has largely disincentivized investment in housing in Los Angeles; while most people tend to agree the city needs more housing, how and who builds that housing is up for debate; that factored with rising construction costs, softening rents (market and Section 8), and increased transfer taxes has disincentivized developers from building housing in Los Angeles. As of January, 338 residential units (single family, apartments and 2-4 units) were permitted last month; to meet the state housing goal the city is supposed to permit 7,000 residential units monthly. The loss of investment in the city of Los Angeles due to regulation does not only hurt “greedy” landlords and developers; it also hurts ancillary industries that rely on the business that the construction and sale of apartment buildings and homes generate. -Construction, Lending, Design, Lending, Property Management, Leasing, Sales and Title and Escrow to name some. The loss of investment hurts the city, county, and state as well-in the way of lost income generated in the form of taxation: increased property taxes due to the sale of property, transfer taxes, permitting fees, etc. This comes at a time when the city of Los Angeles has a 222m million-dollar budget deficit, and the state is operating at a deficit of 2 billion dollars; neither numbers account for the billions of dollars in the residential and commercial property loss due to the Palisades, Eaton and Hughes fires. To spur the economic activity needed to increase revenue at the city, county, and state level, what is needed is less regulation of residential property owners,

not more. The knife of regulation cuts both ways, hurting both owners and renters. It is my hope that you understand the importance of balancing the priorities of tenants with those of property owners and builders who house Los Angeles renters, create new housing, and ultimately provide taxable revenue for the city at a time where it is the most needed.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 02:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not punish honest, law-abiding landlords who care about their tenants and neighbors for the despicable acts of a few bad players who have chosen this time to take advantage of the tragedy in our beloved city. We are in our late 70s. We have owned a beautiful, 100-year-old four-plex in the Beverly-Fairfax district since 1997. It requires constant maintenance and upgrades. Our insurer made our policy contingent on replacing the aging sidewalk. This is the City's responsibility, but there is no money in the budget for sidewalk repair, so we took it upon ourselves for the cost of \$12,000—about one month's gross rental income. We were counting on the upcoming 4% rent increase to help offset a small portion of this expense. It took 7 months of wrangling with several city departments to get the correct permits. Yesterday, the sidewalk was finally poured. And now this? Property at 507-509 1/2 N. Spaulding Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90036

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Keith Abouaf

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 03:21 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** The last eviction moratorium, during Covid, was abused by some of my residents. One of them stopped paying rent while subletting his unit so he could travel the world. He was collecting rent on a unit I paid for, in a building that I paid utilities and insurance for, and for which I was legally responsible. We already have greatly expanded eviction protections and support for renters over the past several years making this definitely appear to be an overreach. If the city is truly concerned about renters being evicted bc they cannot pay rent, then the city should just PAY THEIR RENT. This new moratorium is the city using force of law to borrow and/or steal from property owners to pay rent. Truly Venezuelan-Socialist-Disgusting!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James Maxwell

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 03:33 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Enough! Stop with the Eviction Moratoriums and the Rent Increase Moratoriums. This unfairly penalizes housing providers and causes them to withhold help they could otherwise provide. If one has an ADU on the property but is threatened with a two year eviction moratorium, they will not offer short term assistance if they need the ADU for family at other times of the year. There are as many situations as there are empty units. This type of short sighted moratorium is the same type of offensive slash and burn tactic as Elon Musk is taking to firing. There are real people who make real mortgage payments on these properties. STOP DEMONIZING HOUSING PROVIDERS.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Galina Chytyreva

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 03:41 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** My husband and I are small-time landlords in LA (two properties), both have loans on them. If our tenants decide not to pay and we don't have a way of renting the properties to someone else - we will not be able to sustain the rentals. We are already struggling to keep the rents down with skyrocketing maintenance fees and increasing tax and insurance costs. Please DO NOT PASS EVICTION MORATORIUM, this is going to make things worse in the long run.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 04:43 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed one-year eviction moratorium (Council File 25-0006-S16), which is under consideration at the City Council meeting on Tuesday, March 4th. While protecting vulnerable renters is a priority, this sweeping, extended eviction ban is an impractical and harmful policy that will create serious financial strain on small housing providers, increase confusion for tenants, and worsen the city's long-term housing crisis. The L.A. County Board of Supervisors has already enacted an eviction moratorium, covering all 88 incorporated cities, including Los Angeles. Adding another layer of city-specific restrictions will only lead to overlapping, conflicting policies that cause legal uncertainty for both renters and landlords. More importantly, this proposal extends the non-payment period to 24 months—six months longer than the county moratorium—putting an unreasonable financial burden on small landlords who rely on rental income to maintain their properties and cover mortgages, taxes, and utilities. Rather than pushing more housing providers to sell and further shrinking the rental market, I urge the Council to pursue alternative solutions that directly support struggling tenants without forcing small landlords to absorb the financial hit. Options include: A direct rental assistance program for tenants impacted by financial hardships, including wildfires and economic downturns. A grant program for small "mom-and-pop" housing providers (20 units or fewer) to help cover lost rental income and avoid displacement. This moratorium does not address the root issues of affordability and economic recovery—it only shifts the financial burden onto small property owners, many of whom are already struggling. If we truly want to protect renters, we must find sustainable solutions that support both tenants and landlords instead of implementing one-sided policies that risk further destabilizing the housing market. I strongly encourage the Council to reject this flawed proposal and focus on direct financial aid solutions that provide real relief without unintended consequences.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 04:54 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Los Angeles City Council will meet again tomorrow, Tuesday, March 4, to discuss implementing a citywide one-year eviction moratorium (Council File 25-0006-S16). The proposed moratorium could require housing providers to accommodate non-paying renters for up to 24 months—six months longer than the 18-month period already mandated by the County’s moratorium. This could force smaller housing providers to sell their properties, further deepening the city’s rental and housing crisis. The County should explore alternatives, such as direct rental assistance for renters affected by wildfires and a grant program for mom-and-pop housing providers with 20 or fewer units.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Frank Rayati

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 04:51 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Esteemed Council Members I urge you to vote NO on the above referred to item, eviction moratorium, before you tomorrow March 4th. If passed, it will be devastating for many of us small landlords. All of our expenses have risen double digits, particularly our building insurance and utilities. The City can help those affected much better than passing a law that effects the entire city. If COVID has been an indication many tenants WILL misuse your good intention. Thank you for your consideration

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rachelle Paniccia

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 04:26 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** AB246 would be detrimental to businesses who own properties. How dare the city tell the public we can not put raises on rent just because some buildings burned down. You should not be involved in private matters. Stop the big government over reach. Stop trying to tell people how to live. We the people should vote on something like this, not you elected officials. End this AB246 now.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Richard Greene

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 05:08 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** The eviction moratorium, item 13 on the agenda for the March 4, 2025 mneeting, should not be a blanket moratorium. Rather, if adopted, it should be limited to protecting those adversely impacted by the recent fire disasters. To just impose a city-wide moratorium on all evictions would permit wholesale permission for people who don't need such protection to take advantage and not pay rent. That could cause devastating harm to landlords, especially "mom and pop" owners of small multiple dwelling properties, by leaving them with no remedy should someone just choose to stop paying rent when able, while the property owner remains obligated to pay mortgage, taxes and all other expenses of the property.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 05:09 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Oppose Eviction Moratorium. I have tenants who owe me \$23,000 and 18,000 from your last eviction moratorium, each of which bought new cars. I am a small owner and cannot survive with non paying tenants and "self certification" is an invitation to fraud. This is LA, people cheat!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Semel

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2025 05:14 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the proposed one-year citywide eviction moratorium (Agenda Item 13). Extending such broad protections without targeted relief creates unintended consequences that harm small landlords, discourage property maintenance, and reduce available housing. A blanket moratorium is not a sustainable solution. Instead, the City should focus on direct assistance for tenants in need while ensuring landlords can maintain their properties and continue providing housing. Policies should promote fairness, not shift burdens entirely onto one group. Please vote against this measure. Sincerely,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Semel

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2025 08:54 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0006-S16

**Comments for Public Posting:** Over the past two months, Los Angeles City, County and State elected officials have proposed and imposed tenant protections under the premise of helping those financially impacted by the fires in the Palisades, Hughes, and Eaton communities. Last week, LA County Board of Supervisors voted for a six-month eviction moratorium allowing those who are impacted to self-certify hardship. This comes after LA City being subject to the longest tenant protections in the country in the form of moratoriums (three years) and rent freezes ( four years) despite the cost of insurance, utilities, services, have all risen exponentially. Tomorrow, Los Angeles City Council votes on its eviction moratorium again, after the original version was voted down on February 14th. As a result , regulations imposed on Los Angeles landlords since the onset of COVID has largely disincentivized investment in housing in Los Angeles; while most people tend to agree the city needs more housing, how and who builds that housing is up for debate; that factored with rising construction costs, softening rents (market and Section 8), and increased transfer taxes has disincentivized developers from building housing in Los Angeles. As of January, 338 residential units (single family, apartments and 2-4 units) were permitted last month; to meet the state housing goal the city is supposed to permit 7,000 residential units monthly. The loss of investment in the city of Los Angeles due to regulation does not only hurt “greedy” landlords and developers; it also hurts ancillary industries that rely on the business that the construction and sale of apartment buildings and homes generate. -Construction, Lending, Design, Lending, Property Management, Leasing, Sales and Title and Escrow to name some. The loss of investment hurts the city, county, and state as well-in the way of lost income generated in the form of taxation: increased property taxes due to the sale of property, transfer taxes, permitting fees, etc. This comes at a time when the city of Los Angeles has a 222m million-dollar budget deficit, and the state is operating at a deficit of 2 billion dollars; neither numbers account for the billions of dollars in the residential and commercial property loss due to the Palisades, Eaton and Hughes fires. To spur the economic activity needed to increase revenue at the city, county, and state level, what is needed is less regulation of residential property owners,

not more. The knife of regulation cuts both ways, hurting both owners and renters. It is my hope that you understand the importance of balancing the priorities of tenants with those of property owners and builders who house Los Angeles renters, create new housing, and ultimately provide taxable revenue for the city at a time where it is the most needed.