

Submitter: D Torres
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3054
Chair & Committee Members,

I oppose HB 3054.

I STRONGLY urge you to read testimonies like the owners of Rocky Pointe Marina and the reasons this bill should NOT proceed forward.

It is obvious by the testimonies presented like the one listed above that a rent cap could disincentivize property owners from maintaining or improving rental spaces as well as tearing down and rebuilding a modern home in areas of higher values.

A fixed cap on rent increases may sound like a good idea on the surface, but in practice, it could limit a landlord's ability to keep pace with rising costs of maintenance, repairs, and improvements. As inflation and operational costs rise, property owners need flexibility to ensure their properties remain viable and in good condition. Capping rent increases at six percent may prevent landlords from making necessary adjustments to cover these expenses, potentially leading to deferred maintenance or a reduction in the quality of housing available.

Additionally, the requirement for tenant approval of infrastructure upgrades introduces significant complexity and potential delays. While it is important to involve tenants in decisions that affect their living environment, requiring tenant votes for infrastructure upgrades could lead to lengthy delays in critical repairs or improvements, especially in larger facilities with many tenants. In some cases, delays in upgrading infrastructure may result in deteriorating conditions that could affect the health, safety, and well-being of tenants. This could disproportionately impact low-income tenants who might be the most vulnerable to living in substandard conditions.

The prohibition against landlords requiring aesthetic improvements or internal inspections as conditions of sale could unintentionally reduce housing options. Property sales are an essential part of the real estate market, and requiring certain conditions for sale can ensure that a dwelling is in good condition and up to code. By prohibiting landlords from requesting aesthetic improvements or internal inspections, the bill could unintentionally lower the quality of homes available for sale within rental facilities. Without these requirements, there may be less incentive for property owners to maintain or improve the properties they wish to sell, leading to lower standards and less desirable homes on the market.

Lastly, the bill could create a chilling effect on future investment in rental properties. By imposing these restrictions and creating uncertainty around rent increases, infrastructure investments, and conditions of sale, this bill may discourage future investment in rental housing. Investors and property owners may be hesitant to invest in or develop rental facilities if they perceive the regulatory environment to be overly restrictive or uncertain. This could exacerbate the housing shortage and reduce the number of rental properties available to tenants, particularly in high-demand areas.

In an era where business is suffering and lack of housing is a problem, we SHOULD NOT be attacking landlords and the housing options they provide. I understand possibly the thought process on this legislation, but it is not well thought out and does not take into consideration those landlords who have taken the time to write opposing testimony. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Committee to NOT pass this bill.