

From: [REDACTED]
To: [-- City Council](#)
Subject: Residential Tenancy Ordinance
Date: Thursday, February 2, 2023 9:30:08 AM

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Dear Council Members,

I wrote to each of you individually on January 10, this year with my concerns about this ordinance and the ability of an individual owner of a single family residence to remove a tenant for the purposes of selling the property. We could also include condos and townhouses as each of these units could be individually owned, unlike individual units within an apartment building. Most of you responded to my concern, a few did not. I attended the Zoom meeting last night only to learn that there are even more restrictions than I had previously thought that impact me directly.

Here are my concerns and recommendations:

1. Single family homes should be eliminated from the ordinance unless you can show that tenants of these properties here in Petaluma have been substantially subjected to arbitrary, retaliatory or discriminatory evictions. The statistics to support including single family units must be by a nonpartisan entity. Alternatively, you might consider allowing a tenant's removal for the purposes of sale by increasing the usual 30-day notice to 60 or 90 and include a clause stipulating that if the property is not sold, the tenant has first right of refusal to resume tenancy. This should prevent a landlord from evicting a tenant on the grounds that they are removing the unit from the market only to raise the rent and put it back on the market. I take really good care of my rental. I want a tenant who will do the same. When I have one, I want them to stay.

2. I have a short story to tell you and I suspect from what I heard in last night's zoom, it's a common one. I purchased this modest, by Petaluma standards, property some 20 years ago. It was my residence until six years ago, when due to my safety and health reasons I moved to live with a friend. I then rented the house. Five years later, the tenant moved out of state. I had a lot of work done while vacant during this last summer intending to re-rent in October. Then I heard of this ordinance. I'm seriously reconsidering and removing another rental in Petaluma. At 75, I'm now retired. This house has been a significant part of my retirement income. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to manage this rental and I have concerns for my long-term care. If I cannot remove a tenant in order to market the house to the best possible buyer then this ordinance is damaging, stealing really, some of my hard-earned investment and my ability to care for myself. Like me, there are multiple senior landlords in Petaluma. There were some on zoom last night who have their rentals as a safety net also. Should I need to

move to assisted living, this ordinance would prevent me from having that choice. I do not have children and any family is out of state.

3. I heard at the zoom meeting last night that we can no longer have a prohibitive subletting clause in our leases. I have seen a lot of leases, both residential and commercial, and never one that didn't have this clause. The only reason I can think of to allow this is so a tenant can make money off my property, my investment. This is done without my consent causing further wear and tear or worse that I will have to pay to repair. How does an uncontrollable subletting effect the neighborhood? What about parking and noise? This is a poorly written and poorly researched ordinance.

Sincerely,

David Brunhofer