

Rosenberg Corey

From: Marlina Eckel <meckel@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 9:38 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: Opposition to HB 2004-A

Hello,

I would like to officially state my objection to House Bill 2004 as drafted.

The specific reasons that I have issue with this bill is that it removes personal control of the owner's property. I find that unacceptable.

I find it egregious that the state would draft measures that jeopardize a house owner's rights to their property, with steep monetary penalty. Ultimately, this legislation is detrimental to both landlord and tenant. Specifically, this bill discourages flexible arrangements between landlord and tenants (in the form of mutually agreed upon month-to-month residency) by requiring a landlord to pay moving costs if they choose to end such agreement. This is ridiculous! It will discourage such agreements and result in term leases for tenants who want to be flexible. If a tenant moves before their lease is up, they will be subject to a buy-out clause. I can't imagine that a landlord would ever extend flexible month-to-month arrangements with their tenants if this ruling were to be enacted. Why would we be liable for relocation costs? These are costs which should be incurred by a tenant...not the owner of a property where they have had the privilege to live. In addition, relocation costs and damages would be difficult to assess and are subject to arbitrary ruling.

In addition, requiring further fixed term tenancy agreements to be equal to or greater than the existing lease term is wrong. We recently had a tenant who had completed a few years of one-year term leases who then arranged a 6 month agreement to accommodate moving into their new house. That would be illegal in the proposed law. The tenant and landlord should be able to agree upon fixed term length regardless of what their prior rental agreements have been.

I find it wrong that owners would not have the option to end tenancy except for the few drafted exemptions. This is our property!

The law as written stifles both the tenant and the landlord, but most importantly the landlord, who invests a great deal of money in a real estate object. Not all people can own real estate and it is important to remember and respect the important role a landlord plays in housing people. We don't have government supplied housing like they do in Europe. Someone has to own the property that provides housing for those who cannot afford it. We must be protected so we can retain control of our real estate investment. We are not bad people, and in our case, not particularly wealthy. This law targets in a bad way people that provide valuable service to their community.

I appreciate your reading and consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Marlina Eckel