

de la Guerra, Sheila Public Comment - Group 2

From: Phillip Tabyanan <PTabyanan@plusmanagement.net>
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 6:35 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fw: Regarding Agenda Letter For Meeting 6.27.23 - Mandatory Offer of Residential Lease -



Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

If possible, can you add this to agendac public comment.

Apologies for late distribution.

Phillip Tabyanan
GENERAL MANAGER
DRE LICENSE NO. 02019635
Plus Property Management
CELL: 805-574-9740

Central California | WWW.PLUSMANAGEMENT.NET
Santa Maria | Arroyo Grande | Lompoc | Los Alamos
Santa Ynez | Five Cities | Guadalupe | Nipomo | Santa Barbara

From: Phillip Tabyanan
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 12:18 PM
To: steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>; Bob.Nelson@countyofsb.org <Bob.Nelson@countyofsb.org>
Cc: ezapeda@countyofsb.org <ezapeda@countyofsb.org>; ycuevas@countyofsb.org <ycuevas@countyofsb.org>; Lawnae Hunter <lhunter@plusmanagement.net>
Subject: Regarding Agenda Letter For Meeting 6.27.23 - Mandatory Offer of Residential Lease -

Good Afternoon Mr. Lavagnino and Mr. Nelson,

My name is Phillip Tabyanan and I am the General Manager of PLUS Property Management.

In regards to the Agenda Letter For Meeting 6.27.23, Titled "*Mandatory Offer of Residential Lease*," and Addendum Item added to the Departmental Agenda, Item No. "23-00654".

I respectfully request for a continuance of this item so that the community (including tenants and landlords) can understand the lasting impacts, both direct and indirect.

Thank you and have a good day.



Phillip Tabyanan

GENERAL MANAGER

DRE LICENSE NO. 02019635

1430 MISSION DRIVE, SOLVANG, CA 93463

CELL: 805-574-9740

Central California | WWW.PLUSMANAGEMENT.NET

Santa Maria | Arroyo Grande | Lompoc | Los Alamos

Santa Ynez | Five Cities | Guadalupe | Nipomo | Santa Barbara

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: lannyebenstein@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 7:12 AM
To: Supervisor Das Williams; Laura Capps; Hartmann, Joan; Bob Nelson; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Miyasato, Mona
Subject: Proposed Chapter 44 Amendments at Your Meeting Today

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I regret I haven't had the opportunity to critique and review the proposed chapter 44 amendments on your agenda today in detail but wanted to send you thoughts before your meeting today.

In reading the proposed amendments, I am reminded of the saying, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions." I have no doubt that the intentions behind the proposed ordinance are great but am less certain of what the outcomes of the ordinance would be.

What is being proposed is essentially the single most significant group of changes in renter-landlord law in Santa Barbara county history ever (I don't think that's an overstatement). One would accordingly expect the proposed ordinance would be accompanied by in-depth analysis and arguments for and against, presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the proposed changes, and how the proposals are working elsewhere (to the extent they have been implemented elsewhere). However, at least as far as I saw, there really is very little of this sort of substantive discussion.

Rather, the ordinance seems to be an example of "conventional thinking"--of course it's the case the proposed ordinance will benefit renters in Santa Barbara county--we all know this to be true, there's no real reason to discuss or evaluate it.

However, I teach my students the most important questions in government are the factual ones, not questions of values. Anyone who has been involved in government for any length of time knows that unanticipated consequences often short-circuit intentions, and I see lots of unanticipated consequences in the proposed ordinance.

To cut to the chase: The proposal to include single-family residences with more than two rentals under the ordinance's provisions would remove hundreds of housing units from low-income people in Santa Barbara county--more housing units would be lost than the recent housing issue in Isla Vista that precipitated the ordinance. That is, even though the landlords there were simply greedy rental property owners and members of the Board of Supervisors are public-spirited individuals, you would do more harm to low-income renters through inclusion of single-family residences with more than two renters in the ordinance than the greedy landlords did in Isla Vista. That would not be the intent of your action, but it would be the result of your action. Rental property owners in single-family residences simply would not rent to more than two renters anymore. I would guess the ordinance would remove something on the order of 500 or more rentals in Santa Barbara county, primarily for

low-income renters, from the market in the next two years if it passed, just on this aspect of the proposed amendments.

Similarly, the proposal to have a two-year right of first refusal on rentals would, particularly in single-family residences, have many unanticipated consequences. It, too, would remove hundreds of, if not more, rental units from the county housing market in coming years, both in terms of removal of existing rentals (primarily for low income people) that would no longer be rented and new rentals that would not be built or repurposed.

To address only one other issue here, the proposal that essentially all rentals would have to be year leases would remove many hundreds, and in time thousands, of rentals from the market.

Although your intentions would be otherwise, **the proposed ordinance would be the most significant local legislation to increase housing gentrification in Santa Barbara county that would ever be passed.** If the Board of Supervisors passes the proposed ordinance, thousands of housing units, primarily for low-income individuals, would no longer be rented, would not become rented, or would not be built.

Housing issues are really difficult, and they require lots of thought and discussion. The problem in California is that, much too often, important decisions are made in a vacuum with inadequate discussion and consideration. If you want to do something about Santa Barbara county's housing circumstances, much can be done easily and at little cost, but the proposed ordinance is not the way forward. It would be another example of a well-intentioned proposal that had the completely opposite effects of what were intended and that made housing issues worse, not better.

I would especially like to thank Supervisor Williams for sending out a newsletter that highlighted the proposed housing ordinance, which has prompted this letter. These are very important issues that require much attention, participation, and discussion. I hope the Board of Supervisors will devise a more thorough process of consideration of these issues than approval for first reading today and final approval of the proposed ordinance in two weeks. Housing issues are far too important for the current intended process.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and service.

Sincerely,
Lanny
Lanny Ebenstein, Ph.D., President
California Center for Public Policy
P.O. Box 3480
Santa Barbara, CA 93130
Ph. (805) 682-9815

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Matthew Mucha <matthewmuch4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 1:13 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Laura Capps; Nelson, Bob; sbcob;
sbtenantsunion@gmail.com; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: I support renoviction protections for renters

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, my name is Matthew and as a resident of Santa Barbara County I think it vital that more protections be put in place for renters. Renoviction is a serious problem and to address this issue I feel that there needs to be more done. First, there needs to be a reasonable cap on how much rent can increase after a unit is renovated. This is vital as many tenants that wish to remain in the same communities are unable to do so due to being priced out. This is gentrification. Secondly, there should be more protections for renters throughout the long and complicated process of renoviction. I think the ideas that the SBTU puts forth are excellent and are a great way to help members of the community thrive.