

Wojaczynski, Brittany

From: Nathaniel Greensides <mynci90@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 1:39 PM
To: eComment
Cc: Hernandez, Johnathan; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Agenda Item 29 - Dec 20, 2022 City Council Meeting

Nathaniel Greensides
Ward 5 resident
Comment about Agenda Item 29

Dear City Council,

I live across the street from three of the properties in question. I know that two of those properties have tenants. I know too that the mom-and-pop landlord of these properties had major medical expenses which may be the cause for the deferred maintenance. I know that this mom-and-pop landlord also owns a fourth property listed in the agenda item, but I do not know too much about this property.

I worry about two entities for the properties on North Flower Street – the landlord, and the tenants. The landlord's surviving spouse has had trouble with keeping up maintenance on the property after the husband died of ongoing medical expenses prior to his death. I do agree that the receivership process should be utilized when and where necessary, yet I worry about what will occur to the tenants once the code violations have been remediated. If the landlord has thus far been unable to arrange finances in a way that provides for ongoing and expected maintenance of the properties, then I doubt that the landlord will be able to make payments on any liens or debts incurred as a part of the receivership process.

Some of the code violations listed in the agenda item establishing the bases for the City to step in and remediate the properties are a bit egregious – the old exterior paint of the three properties on North Flower Street isn't a real issue that should serve as a reason to pursue a receivership nor should the cars being parked in front on the dirt – while other listed issues such as the decrepit roofs, I agree should be remediated immediately.

The City may also serve long term residents better in seeking manners of providing easier down payment assistance qualifications to tenants where a landlord seeks to sell a property. Closer collaboration with the Housing Division throughout the receivership process in the city might be a good avenue for such. One barrier currently to qualifying for down payment assistance is that property owners sell at market rates, yet tenants' incomes are nowhere close to being able to purchase a property for sale at or above market rates. Because property owners asking prices are not in line with most renters in our City and because the housing supply remains stifled in our city and region by those who currently stand to profit off the limited supply in perpetuity, I don't foresee myself, or any other Santanerx ever being able to purchase a home of my own even with down payment assistance programs.

I well understand that selling the properties may be required to avoid default, and even in the case of default, my worry remains: community destabilization. Should these three properties be sold (and I'd argue that these three properties deserve historic protections given their age and location), current tenants should be offered the right of first refusal dependent upon the landlord finding a willing and able buyer to purchase any of the properties.

Ultimately, the rationale that properties should be maintained in the interest of the general public's health and safety as well as for any tenants who rent housing in our City remains. I urge, however, that further consideration of the long-term desired outcomes be considered because if the issues are remediated, and then successively the properties sold to a new owner who then razes the housing units, the efforts will have been for naught.

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Greensides