

From: glen woodmansee
To: [SHS Exhibits](#)
Subject: Rent Control - Good intentions but bad side effects
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 9:18:39 PM

Rent Control - Good Intentions but Bad Side Effects.

Some people have a bad experience with a landlord, or with a tenant, and then decide that all landlords or all tenants should be controlled. Actually, many people begin as tenants, then do some sacrificing and saving, and later in life are able to rent to others to supplement their incomes.

That was my experience. When I look for a tenant, I seek someone who is a good match for the property and will enjoy it and take care of it. I don't want to force them to stay if they suddenly need to move or don't like the area after trying it. There will be someone else who likes it. Likewise, if the tenant become a nuisance to neighbors or is hard on the property, I find that knowing that I can make them move has a very beneficial effect on their behavior.

Between two reasonable people, there should be a reasonable business relationship that is based on a continuing benefit for both of them. That's why I usually let my tenants move any time they give a reasonable notice, and my tenants give me a similar right - I can ask them to find another place if it is not working out. (The mere fact that I can do so almost always keeps the relationship a healthy one).

In Santa Monica, California, landlords for some decades were not allowed to raise rents when a unit became vacant. The controlled properties were notorious for housing extremely wealthy tenants, who were often more wealthy than the landlords. When a place became vacant, there was such a premium on the below-market price that lots of applicants competed for it, so the landlords naturally chose those with the best applications. This defeated the original idealistic goal of helping the poorer tenants.

When people focus on the tenant who does not like rising prices, they forget that a free market allows a free opportunity for everyone to live in that neighborhood. Young professionals looking for a place to rent should be given as much of an opportunity to live in Santa Monica, say, as a wealthy tenant who has been renting a unit for a long time at an under-market rate. Why should anyone have a right to prevent others from moving in to a luxury beach community like that, by controlling under-market units, when others want to rent them at a fair market price? When politicians interfere with free enterprise, undesirable side effects result.

Rent control, besides its inherent unfairness to the prospective tenants who are willing and able to rent that unit but are blocked from doing so, also has a dampening effect on construction of rental units. If the legislature becomes an enemy of free enterprise, it should be aware that it can't force people to build. Building happens automatically because of free enterprise, and supply will be reduced if free enterprise is curtailed by politicians.

Sincerely,

Glen Woodmansee
Owner of a single rental house in Eugene