

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** Richard Hermon-Taylor <rhermon-taylor@smrtpts.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 02, 2017 4:50 PM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Subject:** HB 2004-A

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to urge you to vote against Oregon HB 2004-A. I am the owner of a single-family property in Yamhill which I have rented to the same tenants for nearly four years without any change in their rent. I feel I am responsible about pricing my rental to market value and that it would be improper to add any restrictions on pricing. Rent control has been shown in city after city to have long-term deleterious impacts on the maintenance of housing and the quality of the neighborhoods in which it has been imposed.

I have been very willing to allow my tenants to continue their leases after the initial fixed period on a month-to-month basis with adequate notice on both sides for termination of the rental, so it follows that I would not be opposed to a more formal required notice period, even as long as three months. However, to force landlords to pay for the relocation expenses of tenants seems to be an unwarranted extension of the protection of tenants' rights and certainly open to all kinds of abuse, such as tenants who know they need to relocate creating circumstances under which the landlord would terminate their rental so that they could receive payment for their relocation. Even if it could be argued that such protection is needed in a few unusual circumstances, there are simply too many scenarios with facts on both sides for it to be fair to both landlords and tenants to automatically adjudicate a move-out payment stipulation. I can see this as having a significant effect on the values of rental property, which may end up in the removal of many units from the rental market, an outcome that I am sure supporters of the proposed legislation would not wish to see.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Hermon-Taylor