

Submitter: Craig Dean

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development

Measure: SB611

I purchased a duplex a few years ago in Creswell. It was built in the 50's and had a lot of deferred maintenance and just overall was not a great place to live for a renter. I have put well over \$40 thousand dollars into that residence making it place that my renters are proud to live in and call a home. More repairs will need to be done in the future and unfortunatley the costs of those repairs increase as inflation increases. I keep my rents competitive to what the market is and by evaluating what my costs are. My rents are not the highest, or the lowest, but are set at a price where I can cover that costs of the residence and make a small profit (yes, a profit because my time is valuable too). I truly enjoy giving people a nice place to live and was considering buying more property in the area to fulfill that need. However, if SB 611 passes or similar bills, that probably will not be the case. First, by instituting the new cap and making the owner / operator of a property use the lower of the CPI + or 8%, the State is basically saying, "Ok, we know that your costs are increasing across the board but we don't care, you can just absorb those costs". Well, many of us small mom and pop owners can not. Although I do support many charities, my real estate business is not a charity and it is not the State's place to make me run it as such. Second, if I have supplied a clean, safe, good home for a renter and we have both met our contractual obligations, how does it make sense for me to have to pay them three months rent if I "NEED" to sell "MY" residence or move into it. If rent control works, then in theory any place that they moved into would be on par with the cost of the place they just moved out of, so there is no monetary loss to the renter, except moving expenses which might total a months rent. The State can't have it both ways, it is just wrong and unfair to owners. That would be the same as the State forcing renters to pay three months rent to the owner / landlord to cover the owner's turnover costs if the tenant suddenly got the opportunity to buy a house. It is my belief that if the State continues down this path of strict rent control and unbalanced tenant / landlord rights, well intentioned landlords that improve their propreties and quality of life of their tenants will be forced out. Not because they want to, but because they can not afford to run a business that way. What you will end up with is landlords that squeeze every penny out of the properties and do no repairs or upgrades except what they are abseloutly required to. The State will end up with a lower class of housing for renters, and less happier tenants. I am not petitioning for no renter protections, only for fair laws and practices that take all parties into account AND support a healthy system. Thank you for your time.