

PUBLIC COMMENT

10/16/2023 21	Dennis Szczesniak	Written (see below)	Just Cause Non-Renewal Ordinance	
10/17/2023 4:3	Latasha Pittman	Written (see below)	Just Cause Non-Ren	Landlords provide housing and we should be able to exercise our right to the non renewal of a lease. Business owners have the right to not renew a contract at its expiration date with proper notice and the same option should be given to landlords. A Landlord is making a financial decision and should not be required to disclose the reasons why. Lastly, with the rising costs landlords are currently facing paying relocation fees for tenants is costly and unfair.
10/17/2023 10	Jane Garvey	Written (see below)	Just Cause Non-Ren	Just Cause will reward bad tenants while making it impossible for housing providers to justify continued investment in Evanston. Housing providers need to be free to make decisions about their property. Requirements to continue to provide housing past the end of a contractual period change the dynamics and economics of the relationship. The result - housing providers will need to be compensated for the extra risk and cost they will incur to pay resident's relocation costs. The two options I see are: raise the rents to offset the cost, or quit providing rental housing. Housing providers that have residents causing problems will no longer be able to wait until the end of the lease rather than filing an eviction to mitigate the problem. The result, more evictions.
10/17/2023 13	Michael Glasser	Written (see below)	Just Cause Non Ren	Many tenants who engage in inappropriate behavior need an incentive to clean up their act. Sometimes their behavior falls short of a provable lease violation - but their presence in the building diminishes the quality of the building. The list of bothersome behavior can be endless - frequent fighting between roommates; allowing visiting pets; playing loud music, or refusing to take reasonable steps (like adding rugs; moving a speaker) that may improve sound issues. Some tenants are packrats; others, overflow their bathtubs; some slam laundry room doors or jam the machines; some are just plain mean to their neighbors --- and I have realized that in 30 years of operating apartment building, the threat of non-renewal is often all it takes to bring the otherwise disrespectful or unruly tenants in line. Give them the permanent "right" to a renewal, and they have no incentive to clean up their act. These violations would be challenging to bring to eviction court (though we may now need to if this ordinance passes), as other tenants may need to show up in court to testify. The threat of non renewal is a sacred right that housing providers need to have in order to operate a good building. Take that right away from us, and we will all simply need to be far more selective when choosing to whom we should rent. Presently, we may take chances on a young unmarried couple who have never rented before - now we may not take a chance on them.
10/17/2023 15	Lisa Pildes	Written (see below)	Revised RLTO	Will be delivered in person at the mtg
10/17/2023 15	Richard White	Written (see below)		My name is Richard White. I am a licensed Illinois real estate broker and a small landlord/affordable housing provider. I partially own and self manage a small rental portfolio of medium and low income neighborhoods in Illinois. Every year it is becoming more and more difficult for small housing providers like myself to navigate the ever growing government regulations and requirements while continuing to operate and manage properties and tenants effectively. The proposed ordinance will be yet another burden and encroachment on the property rights of small landlords, many of whom are still recovering from economic vacancies due to covid. Not all landlords are millionaires. Many, like myself, make a small income or in some cases, a loss for each property. Many landlords are middle and working class people who may have a disproportionate amount of their savings invested in one or two properties. Small housing providers like this cannot afford to go through a lengthy eviction process in order to simply turn over a unit so they may adjust to market conditions. I ask that you please reconsider this ordinance.

10/17/2023	1 Syed Rahman	Just Cause Non Renewal	Opposed	I oppose the Just Cause Non Renewal . It infringes my right to do business and is unconstitutional and unlawful. I will sell my properties and get of this business. It eliminates the distinction between good and bad tenants. We homeowners decide who should be our customer / tenant . It is our investment and just like any other business person / entity we manage it to the best of our abilities , capacity , personal considerations (health / age / senior citizen / income to have food on our table). At the end of the Term of the lease the contract legally ends. It is unfair to enforce any continuity to it by any party . If the Federal / State is so concerned about the tenant they should provide them the facility on their terms rather enforcing unilateral restrictions on homeowners in favor of the tenants.
10/17/2023	1 Tracy Scanlon	Just Cause	Opposed	It will mean that bad tenants can't be removed easily. I won't be able to protect my tenants. I also will not be able to take a risk on somebody who might be a good tenant, because I won't be able to get rid of them without spending tens of thousands of dollars to evict them.
10/17/2023	1 Dave Madoch	Just Cause	Opposed	This will hurt renters the most.
10/17/2023	1 Vicki May	Just Cause Ordinance	Opposed	This terrible idea rewards bad tenants and punishes good tenants
10/17/2023	1 Victoria, Mayweather Flats	Just Cause Ordinance	Opposed	This ordinance is bad for good tenants, leaving them stuck living next door to bad tenants who will gain a right to stay in a place where they are making life miserable for their neighbors. This will make it impossible for housing providers to provide a safe and well-cared-for living space for those who deserve it.
10/17/2023	1 Victoria, Mayweather Flats	Just Cause Ordinance	Opposed	Just Cause ordinances make it impossible for good housing providers to do their job providing safe housing for tenants. If Just Cause comes to any neighborhood where I provide housing, I will be forced to sell my buildings. My job will become impossible to do.

				<p>From: Andrew Holmes, Founder of ChicagoREIA.org 520 E. 22nd St., Lombard, IL 60148</p> <p>I am Andrew Holmes, the founder of ChicagoREIA.org which is the Largest Real Estate Investors Association in the Chicagoland Area, and a subgroup of National RE Invest which is the Largest Real Estate Investors Association in the United States. Our mission is to provide education, networking, and business to business opportunities for entrepreneurs in the real estate investing community.</p> <p>A majority of our membership consists of those from minority communities, the recent immigrant community and first-time investors. Our group consists of many small real estate investors, often called “mom and pop” landlords, who often invest their life savings and perform much of the upkeep and maintenance on their own. A number of our investors have invested in the Evanston community.</p> <p>Some of the proposed changes to the landlord-tenant ordinance, particularly the “Just Cause” proposal if passed, will have a chilling effect on the small landlord as well as the tenants, and will negatively affect the overall Evanston community.</p> <p>One of the stated reasons for “Just Cause” is to reduce evictions. In Cook County, the eviction process is very expensive, laborious, and often takes many months up to more than a year. As one who is very familiar with the small landlord, I can attest that small landlords, or any landlord for that matter, would frivolously file evictions.</p> <p>Based on my long history of involvement in real estate in all areas of Chicagoland, I believe that enactment of “Just Cause” will result in Evanston rental properties being less attractive to small investors, and devalue those properties on the market resulting in lowers sales prices. Evanston is a beautiful, diverse community and many small investors would like to invest there and share in that community, and I suggest enacting regulations which would encourage and not discourage such.</p> <p>Since “Just Cause” will make it more difficult for the small landlord to survive in Evanston, it is likely the hedge funds and other institutional investors will move in and make offers to the small landlords for their properties...that’s the pattern when it becomes more financially difficult for small landlords. Small landlords tend to have smaller, older properties, and charge much less rent than new developments as can be seen when comparing the rents in Evanston. In my experience, the small landlords also attempt to mediate disagreements or problems, and want to keep the tenants for a longer period of times, as turnover often results in a loss of rent due to having to clean, paint, and search for a new tenant. This expense is a difficult burden for a small landlord.</p> <p>There are many more reasons to oppose “Just Cause”, but I will end here with a request that you consider the many alternative, less invasive ways to ensure affordable housing which other communities use successfully. This approach will avoid rents increasing; the decrease in prices of small, rental properties; an increase in institutional landlords; and Evanston from becoming one of the least investable communities for the small landlord in the Midwest.</p>
10/17/2023	1 Andrew Holmes, ChicagoREIA.org	Just Cause enactment	Opposed	
10/17/2023	1 Nathan	Just housing	Opposed	This ordinance will hurt the renters in the long run. It will increase housing costs and result in additional affordability issues.
10/17/2023	1 Tom Nelson	Just Cause	Opposed	This does absolutely nothing be reward bad tenants and punish good ones. Another reason I am so hesitant to continue investing in Illinois real estate is because of ordinances like this.
10/17/2023	1 Colin Olsen	Just Cause	Opposed	Stop virtue signaling. Fix the foot cause of issues.
10/17/2023	1 Inder	Just Cause	Opposed	If this ordinance passes, I will no longer consider investing in Evanston, and will urge other investors to steer clear of Evanston as well. An ordinance which rewards bad tenants and harms good ones is bad for renters, home owners, and investors, and will harm the city of Evanston. I am strongly opposed to this proposed ordinance and urge you to reject it.
10/17/2023	1 Brad Taylor	Just Cause	Opposed	Majority of mom pop landlords have one or two houses for their retirement. We need laws to protect hard working, tax paying citizens. It will be the right cause to protect the property rights and ownership rights and not tenants who do not pay or cause other issues.
10/17/2023	1 Kelsey maren	Just Cause	Opposed	An ordinance like this rewards bad tenants and punishes good tenants and good landlords by keeping quality housing from being occupied by people who need those homes. Why reward bad tenants with incentives like this that ultimately hurts good housing for all?
10/17/2023	1 Kelsey maren	Just Cause	Opposed	Wont be able to pay the bills if Just Cause is in place

10/17/2023	1 Sam Sigmon		Opposed	
10/17/2023	1 Baris Yuksel	Just Cause	Opposed	I oppose because Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out. I would sell my buildings if Just Cause passes
10/17/2023	1 Bev Paul			
10/17/2023	1 Patrick	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out
10/17/2023	1 Mark Obszanski	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards tenants who abuse the system while forcing out good tenants who do not want to live with neighbors who abuse the system. Furthermore, it will disincentivize good landlords from investing in the area. It will attract slumlords who barely maintain the property. It is a two-way street between landlords and tenants. Tenants are leasing the space to live there for a designated amount of time, not indefinitely. Asking someone to move out after the lease ends is beyond fair, no matter the reason. There is no guarantee to renew.
10/17/2023	1 Michael Fox	Just Cause Housing	Opposed	This ordinance will only reward bad tenants and drive good ones out.
10/17/2023	1 Bradley Austin	Opposed to Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause unfairly benefits problem tenants, while pushing responsible residents out. Just Cause will make it near impossible for me to provide safe, healthy, and affordable housing to responsible residents.
				<p>October 17, 2023</p> <p>City of Evanston Housing & Community Development Committee 2100 Ridge Avenue Evanston, Illinois 60201</p> <p>Housing & Community Development Committee Members:</p> <p>On behalf of the Chicagoland Apartment Association (CAA), I am writing to urge you to reject any amendment to the Evanston Residential Landlord and Tenant Ordinance that would enact a Just Cause Eviction policy. CAA represents the owners and managers of over 275,000 residential rental apartments in 1800 apartment communities throughout the Chicagoland region, including over 2500 units in the City of Evanston.</p> <p>Despite proponents' assertions that just cause eviction measures benefit residents, we believe, and experience has demonstrated, the opposite to be true. Just cause eviction restrictions hurt residents by limiting property owners' ability to respond to resident concerns and remove disruptive and threatening residents. Such policies harm rental communities and disincentivize investment in rental housing.</p> <p>Just cause policies destabilize apartment communities by preventing owner-operators from effectively managing their properties. For example, just cause policies essentially eliminate a property owner or operator's right to serve a nonrenewal notice on a resident at the end of a lease term, granting residents an indefinite lease. Meeting the legal standard required to prove a resident is disruptive requires detailed record keeping on the part of the owner and corroborating testimony of affected residents against neighbors. This can be difficult to obtain as residents may fear retaliation from the individuals in question. The unfortunate outcome is that good residents move out.</p> <p>Apartment owners and operators are in the business of providing quality housing to members of the community. They value long-term residents who remain in their home year after year and avoid filing evictions whenever possible due to the expensive process of managing resident turnover and other associated costs. Ironically, just cause eviction policies can result in increased eviction filings as owners no longer have the option of non-renewal and feel compelled to use the legal process to end a lease term.</p> <p>CAA opposes the adoption of just cause eviction policies because such requirements adversely shift the balance in the landlord and tenant relationship to the detriment of residents and the community. We urge you to reject just cause policies and embrace measures that will attract, and not discourage, more investment in rental apartments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Michael J. Mini Executive Vice President</p>
10/17/2023	1 Michael Mini	RLTO Amendment Just C	Opposed	
10/17/2023	1 Harry Walsh		Opposed	Landlords won't be able to run their businesses. Investors won't invest in Evanston multi family properties. I'm starting to hear some investments companies will no longer invest in multi family housing in Illinois. This is not good. Particularly for communities with an abundance of multi family apartment buildings like Evanston.

10/17/2023	1 Denise Sacks	Just Cause	Opposed	Non-renewal of a tenant lease leads to additional expense for the housing provider and is not done unless there are compelling reasons because of that expense. Non-renewal often means a month or more without rent, the cost of finding new tenants, and often repair or refurbishment expenses. No ordinance is needed to discourage non-renewal, and such a law is likely to scare off investment in Evanston's multi-unit buildings.
10/17/2023	1 Margaret Wright	Just Cause	Opposed	
10/17/2023	1 Karen Baldwin	Just Cause	Opposed	As a realtor, if a bad tenant (not following rules, dangerous, irritating to other neighboring rentals) is allowed to stay, with no form of removal at some point, then it directly penalizes other tenants and makes it hard to rent other units. This ordinance sets forth a right for any tenant to stay in a rental unit forever unless they are found in violation of the lease and evicted by a court. So good tenants must live next door to bad tenants and the landlord has no avenues to remove them, especially with the disfunction of the Cook County eviction court system right now (about 8 months for the simplest eviction to be ordered). There is really no way for a landlord to get rid of a dangerous or non-paying tenant. If this passes in Evanston, it will soon pass elsewhere and my landlord clients are nervous.
10/17/2023	1 Luke Williams	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out and Just Cause will make it impossible for me to run my small rental property business. I would have to sell my buildings if Just Cause passes.
10/17/2023	1 Adam Vaughan	Just Cause	Concerned	I am confused about the one time right to pay and stay section 5-3-6-1-A. Paragraph a says that if a person pays within 14 days after a possession order is given, the order is dismissed. paragraph i says that if a person pays before the possession order is given, they have a one-time right to pay and stay. Is this a one time right, or can a person repeatedly pay after a judgement is made (as in paragraph a.)? If the latter, then what would stop a person from only ever paying rent once an eviction order has been given, with the landlord having to pay the attorneys fees every time?
10/17/2023	1 Daniel Nash	Proposed Just Cause Evic	Opposed	Dear Members of the Housing & Community Development Committee. The legislation that you propose will have dire consequences to the residential housing rental market. If it takes effect, it will be close to impossible to remove a bad tenant from a building - other than for non-payment of rent purposes. In essence, this law gives a bad tenant carte blanche to ignore lease clauses and the standing building rules and regulations with impunity. Just exactly who is supposed to be enforcing any rules here ... the Housing Provider, or the tenant? One single bad tenant alone can compel my good tenants to move. This not only turns out a bad operating environment for the building, but consequently to the neighborhood. This simply makes it impossible towards feasibly running my business! Why would you reward such bad behavior? If such a law would be put into effect, I would be hard pressed to sell my building. Please do not place my neighborhood into a downward spiral. It's hard enough to be able to pay all of the taxes, and ever-rising expenses, and then to suffer the consequences of several bad tenants. Please Do Not Pass the Just Cause Eviction bill! Sincerely yours, Daniel Nash
10/17/2023	1 Justin	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out; this adds unnecessary complexity to running our business and we will avoid purchasing any buildings in areas that adopt this
10/17/2023	1 Matt putnick		Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out
10/17/2023	1 TJ	Just Cause	Opposed	I would sell my buildings if Just Cause passes

			<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Just Cause measure.</p> <p>I care about this because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - I care about Evanston; 2 - I care about soundly written policy that promotes economically vibrant and socially equitable communities; and 3 - as a small, ethical apartment building owner, I care about my ability to run my business successfully — and fairly. <p>I now live in Forest Park, I attended Kellogg from 2016-2018 and loved my time on Elmwood Ave. While politics shouldn't matter, you can guess mine based on the fact that I've spent thousands of hours of my life knocking doors for my brother Sean Casten, who currently represents IL-06. (**The views expressed here are entirely my own, though he loves a good wonky policy debate).</p> <p>As the owner of several small multifamily apartment buildings in the Chicago area, my husband and I take immense pride in ethically revitalizing and managing our buildings. Our niche is to buy terribly run buildings that have fallen into disrepair, transforming them into well-maintained, professionally run properties. We care very deeply for our tenants' well-being and take pride in our fairness as landlords. I understand and empathize with the intent behind this legislation – to create safe and stable living environments for all. However, the Just Cause measure, if enacted, will not achieve this but severely handicap Evanston's ability to attract small, ethical building owners. I believe it will have the exact opposite effect to the one intended.</p> <p>One example to consider: In the past few years, my husband and I have acquired two severely dilapidated 6-flat buildings, both plagued by appalling living conditions and previously owned by what can only be described as two owners who define the term "slumlord". Neither building could have been properly and fully brought up to an acceptable standard without a full gut rehab, a process that requires the buildings to be vacant (it's impossible to replace plumbing and HVAC economically and access the "guts" of the building if you have tenants occupying units). We asked existing tenants to vacate, providing 60 to 90 days' notice and offering references for timely rent payments. We wrote them pro-rated checks if they were able to move out before the end of the month. We apologized on behalf of the prior owners — the exact kinds of bad apples that (understandably) spur lawmakers into looking for solutions to protect tenants. But keep in mind that many of the changes we needed to make were not required by village rules or violations — they were systems upgrades to ensure that tenants would have more than a trickle for their shower, or to be able to control the heat so top floor tenants don't have their windows wide open in the winter. They were doing things like adding vents to the roof and improving the venting throughout to prevent future instances of black mold.</p> <p>If the Just Cause measure had been in effect in the areas where these buildings were located, we would never have purchased them, perpetuating the cycle of neglect by unscrupulous landlords or enabling the perpetuation of squalid living conditions. A purchaser would have had to have one of the following plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Plan to get the tenants out using illegal or unethical measures; 2 - Plan to leave the building in its poor condition and not provide a healthy or safe place to live; 3 - Instead of being able to have an honest conversation with tenants and make a tenable plan for them to move out, plan to raise rents to a point that is essentially the same as asking for a tenant to move out (achieving the same end, but sours the relationship between tenant and landlord) or 4 - Budget or negotiate an amount of cash to get the tenants out by offering "cash for keys" — a crazy phenomenon where tenants can essentially name their price to vacate their unit. <p>In sum, the Just Cause measure, while well-intentioned, will discourage honest and ethical landlords from investing in Evanston. Instead, it will incentivize existing landlords to sell their properties or to manage at a much lower level. Please do not overlook the unintended consequences of this legislation.</p> <p>Please reconsider the implications of the Just Cause measure and explore alternative solutions that do not punish and deter responsible property owners. Encouraging ethical landlords to invest in updating buildings to meet healthy, safe standards is crucial for any vibrant community, and this objective cannot coexist with the proposed legislation.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Gillian Casten</p>
10/17/2023	1 Gillian Casten	Just Cause	Opposed

10/17/2023	1 Brian			<p>I have owned a two flat in Evanston for more that 40 years. For many of those years I lived in one unit, and for some I rented out both. I have kept my rents at very reasonable, often well below market, rates. Over the years, the average length of my tenants' stay has been five to seven years.</p> <p>Evanston has a number of small landlords who have worked very hard to purchase their places and often do the maintenance and management themselve. Small landlord/ tenant rentals are based on relationships and the the rents tend to be lower than those of larger landlords. Unfortunately, the number of small landlords in Evanston is declining due to the increasing taxes, regulations, and inflation.</p> <p>I am not sure why the concept of Just Cause is being seen as a way to increase affordable housing or lowering the number of evictions. I believe it will have a negligible effect on those goals. The ordinance will make the sale price of rental buildings, particularly small buildings, as prospective purchasers will be hesitant with Just Cause and other restrictive regulations. It is already quite difficult to be a small real estate investor in Evanston, as many see Evanston as " un-investable" for the small investor. This is truly a shame as the result is making it almost impossible for lower and middle income people to find reasonable rentals and the small number that are available are owned by the decreasing number of small landlords. As that happens, new developments will fill the void. Those developments offer rents at almost twice that of the small landlords. Thus more units are available for those who are of means, at the loss of more reasonable rentals. And Just Cause will contribute to the decrease in the affordability of rentals in Evanston.</p> <p>The spurious assumption that there are many frivolous or retaliatory evictions currently being brought by small landlords is ridiculous. Evictions are very expensive due to attorney fees, repair and decorating the unit, and the nearly year-long eviction process...all items that small landlords cannot afford. So, Just Cause will not reduce the number of frivolous or retaliatory evictions as it relates to small landlords.</p> <p>I am very disappointed that Evanston is choosing to use the Just Cause ordinance, which is a very intrusive and oppressive action by government towards landlords, when so many other non-aggressive and more effective methods are available. There is no reason to believe that the Just Cause ordinance will have any meaningful effects on dealing with the problem of affordable housing, in fact the opposite is likely.</p> <p>Having lived in Evanston and owned rental property for more that 40 years, I am very saddened to see that these extreme actions and regulations are being taken, rather than implementing more prudent and careful measures.</p>
10/17/2023	1 Mary DeSloover	Just Cause ordinance	Opposed	
10/17/2023	1 Margaret Payne	Just Cause	Opposed	<p>I am a small time landlord (6 units) and I self manage. I do my best to place tenants carefully because I can't afford to make a mistake and I have not yet had to non-renew anyone thankfully. Having the option however to non-renew a disruptive tenant helps me ensure a good living environment for all of my tenants. This ordinance creates an undue burden that prevents me from doing right by my good tenants in favor of difficult ones. It would make me reconsider investing in Evanston in the future even though this is a community we have considered in the past.</p>
10/17/2023	1 Praim Dillon	Just Cause	Opposed	<p>Just Cause will make Evanston a worse place to live, not better. Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out! Please do not approve this measure.</p>
10/17/2023	1 Lindsey	Just cause	Opposed	<p>Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing good tenants out</p>
10/17/2023	1 Landon	Just cause	Opposed	<p>Just Cause rewards bad tenants while forcing good tenants, such as myself out</p>
10/17/2023	1 Mary Rosinski			
10/17/2023	1 Helen Cho			
10/17/2023	1 Elizabeth Cavanaugh	Just Cause	Opposed	<p>"Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out."</p>
10/17/2023	1 Chris	Just Cause	Opposed	<p>Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out</p>
10/17/2023	1 Rita Thomson	Just cause	Opposed	<p>This law would reward irresponsible tenants and make good tenants endure the noise and disorder they cause</p>

10/17/2023	1 Richard Nitzsche	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause represents still more government intrusion into landlord-tenant relationship and to the ability of responsible owners to maintain their properties to the welfare of all their tenants. It will be particularly burdensome on small family operators who work hard for a living to provide peaceful and decent housing to tenants.
10/17/2023	1 Siraj Ahmed	Just cause	Opposed	We would consider selling our buildings
10/17/2023	1 Gediminas Pranskevicius	Just Cause	Opposed	
10/17/2023	2 Hector Estrada		Opposed	
10/17/2023	2 Austin Estrada	Just Cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out.
10/17/2023	2 Fran Sweeney	Just Cause Housing	Ordinance ne	I've listened two about 2 hours of the meeting this evening. It shouldn't be this hard. Check with ordinances in Wilmette: there is a warning system: 3 written violations and it's very possible that court action is initiated. It doesn't matter if they pet the cat for 9 days and stop on the 10th. The offense occurred on day 1 and the tenant either ceases the action or receives a second and then a third warning. If it's a law then from my understanding an officer of the court must follow the law when deciding. And, yes, the tenant pays the court costs if the tenant is found to be the offender. Add a clause that a pay check can be garnished and put it as a condition of the lease. I agree that the small landlord has unique rights that must also be protected. Many of the other just cause provisions are valid -- just at least give buildings with 10 or less units some leeway.
10/18/2023	9 Dewayne teid	Just cause	Opposed	Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out. Just Cause will make it impossible for me to run my business. I would sell my buildings if Just Cause passes.
10/20/2023	1 Vincent Mazzaferro	Just Cause	Opposed	Why are you trying to hurt housing providers? These are people who pay the most, invest the most in the community, and have the most at stake to lose. I don't understand why you are trying to hurt the backbone of society and take away their rights... I am strongly opposed to taking away housing provider rights in a place where housing providers have almost no rights left. What a short sighted, terrible idea....

HCDC October Public Comments

10/17/23 – Andrew Levin – Just Cause

Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out

10/17/23 – Matthew Fritzshall – Just Cause

Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out

10/17/23 – Julie – Just Cause

Just Cause rewards the bad tenants while forcing my good tenants out. Just Cause will make it impossible for me to run my business

10/17/23 – Frank Martinez – Just Cause

I am opposed to Just Cause

10/17/23 – Lauren Guzik – Just Cause

Just Cause promotes irresponsible tenancy and crowds out responsible tenants. These laws are forcing investors to look elsewhere and causing existing investors to sell when possible. These laws lead to higher costs or lower maintenance standards. This is not positive.

10/17/23 – ASDF – Just Cause

I would sell my buildings if Just Cause passes

10/17/23 – Jane Garvey –Just Cause Non-Renewal

Just Cause will reward bad tenants while making it impossible for housing providers to justify continued investment in Evanston. Housing providers need to be free to make decisions about their property. Requirements to continue to provide housing past the end of a contractual period change the dynamics and economics of the relationship. The result - housing providers will need to be compensated for the extra risk and cost they will incur to pay resident's relocation costs. The two options I see are: raise the rents to offset the cost, or quit providing rental housing. Housing providers that have

residents causing problems will no longer be able to wait until the end of the lease rather than filing an eviction to mitigate the problem. The result, more evictions.

10/17/23– Latasha Pittman – Just Cause Non-Renewal

Landlords provide housing and we should be able to exercise our right to the non renewal of a lease. Business owners have the right to not renew a contract at its expiration date with proper notice and the same option should be given to landlords. A Landlord is making a financial decision and should not be required to disclose the reasons why. Lastly, with the rising costs landlords are currently facing paying relocation fees for tenants is costly and unfair.

10/16/23 – Linda L. Ehlers –Just Cause Non-Renewal

I live in, and own, a small apartment building. Leasing is by its nature a temporary arrangement; ownership is not. We owners have full responsibility for everything from maintenance to taxes. We are subject to penalties for any error, mistake or oversight that accompanies those responsibilities. We must therefore have full control over that property. This proposed Ordinance takes away another level of control from the owners. Forcing apartment building owners to play another game of “Captain May I” with governmental bureaucrats is unacceptable, a blatant invasion of our rights to own and keep property, and an infringement on our basic American liberty.

10/16/23 – Maria Aiello – Just Cause Non-Renewal

As a homeowner, who has a significant monetary investment in my property and the community, my absolute right to choose whether or not to rent my property should not imposed nor infringed on in any way. It is in no way an individual homeowner’s responsibility to incur the tenant’s moving expenses. The responsibility of providing housing should not be placed on individual homeowners.

10/16/2023 – Mary Edelstein – Amended Residential Landlord Tenant Ordinance

There are many reasons to not renew a lease (financial, selling the property, renovating the property, providing housing for a family member, etc). This change in ordinance will discourage landlords from providing housing in Evanston and exasperate the need for affordable housing.

10/12/23 - Michelle Hays - Just Cause Ordinance

I am a "small landlord." I own a single unit in Evanston which I rent out at cost because there was no other way to house my closest friend. I support significantly more regulation of landlords, as I see tenants being abused far and wide across Evanston and have yet to see a landlord seeking support at any of the charities where I volunteer. I am angered that individuals who clearly don't have the interests of either tenants or small landlords are commenting that ordinances supporting basic human decency will "hurt" small landlords and tenants. We have a problem in Evanston with real estate speculators positioning themselves as "landlords."

As a municipality, we are under ZERO obligation to support individuals who gamble with people's lives in order to get rich. The people who are hurting tenants are these speculators those who seek to protect them by preventing reasonable legislation like the Just Cause ordinance. Landlords *should* be required by law to provide stable housing. As an advocate and volunteer, I cannot tell you how many times I have had to support a family through homelessness and unstable housing situations simply because their former landlord refused to renew a lease for no cause of theirs.

As a landlord, I know that my landlord insurance will protect me financially if my tenant is for some reason unable to pay rent, but tenants have no such protection. As a landlord, I know that insurance will protect me if my property is somehow rendered unusable, but in order to access that same protection as a tenant, tenants have to reach out to organizations outside the City to invoke the law that is supposed to protect them.

Stop listening to people who clearly have their own interests at heart and the time and inclination to lobby. Listen to those who advocate for the people who don't have a voice instead. Open Communities and other organizations like them should be the voices you hear the loudest. As for the straw man argument about potential illegal tenant behavior, please remember that the Just Cause ordinance is exactly that: if there is a *legitimate* reason a tenant's housing needs to be terminated, the ordinance supports ending a lease.

However, please remember that your job on this committee is to oversee housing for ALL Evanston residents, including those who have complex needs. We should have a system of supportive housing referrals for individuals or families who for whatever reason find maintaining rental housing difficult: they still need shelter.

9/19/23 – Dominic Voz, Open Communities – Just Cause for Eviction

I would like to take my time today to simply express gratitude.... to committee members, tenant advocates, city staff, and the community as a whole for taking on the not-so-easy task of improving our landlord tenant law. While this meeting will largely focus on other

matters, we remind the committee and the public that just cause for eviction and non-renewal is a policy recommended by the federal government, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, Mayor Brandon Johnson's administration, the American Bar Association, and countless other groups.

Nonetheless, we want to ensure thoughtful consideration in anticipating unintended consequences and burdens to small landlords... We express our gratitude to folks like Adam and Stephanie Vaughn and Richard Koenig, who, while not in agreement with us on all the policy recommendations, have met with Open Communities in good faith to share meaningful feedback on how the law could be improved from current iterations.

We also want to thank the folks on the just cause task force who are doing the hard work of policy analysis, reaching for compromise where it can be found while maintaining needed rights for tenants. What we are doing here matters, especially for those who are at the margins in our city. Thank you.

9/19/23 – David Zoltan, Chicago Housing Justice League – Just Cause for Eviction

As a disability and housing justice activist, I am glad to see that my neighbors to the north are looking to enact Just Cause for Eviction in Evanston. With over 10 million households across the United States having Just Cause for Eviction in place in some form and Chicago about to join those ranks as well, Evanston would be putting best practices in place to prevent the worst aspects of the private market from adversely affecting tenants moving forward, including racism, ableism, other forms of discrimination, gentrification of communities, and retaliation by landlords when renters look to uphold their rights. We have found that in Chicago, nearly one in four evictions result from these and related issues and are covered up by so-called "no-fault" evictions, destroying communities at their roots, especially those in Black communities, and I am certain that the same is true for Evanston.

Certainly, disabled neighbors that have escaped institutionalization and found their place in community as we were promised over 33 years ago by the Americans with Disabilities Act and affirmed by the Olmstead decision of the Supreme Court need the assurance that we will be able to stay in community without discrimination from landlords. In order for that to happen, we cannot have landlords abrogating our human right to housing for any reason, let alone no reason at all. Just Cause puts the onus in eviction court on the landlord to justify that an eviction is necessary and the only means of resolving an issue so that we can stay in our homes and communities without a proverbial Sword of Damocles over our heads.

I urge you to pass this ordinance with all due diligence, and to say to the people of Evanston that their human right to housing does, indeed, take ascendance over the property rights of landlords. Where those two right must be balanced, it is incumbent that when the tenant has done nothing wrong, that they are made whole through relocation assistance. Otherwise, every tenant is due a presumption of stable housing without interference, and every community is due a presumption that no landlord has the unchecked power to break it apart. Thank you and good luck in the days ahead.

David Zoltan
Legislative Coordinator
Chicago Housing Justice League

9/19/23 – Tina Rounds, Beds Plus – Just Cause

Housing and Community Development Committee Members,

My name is Tina Rounds, and I am the Chief Executive Officer of BEDS Plus, Inc., a leading Cook County homeless service agency. As the Housing and Community Development Committee considers updates to Evanston's Residential Landlord Tenant Ordinance (RLTO), I urge the committee to consider the opportunity we have to make a more just and equitable rental landscape in our city.

In Evanston, 43% of residents rent, and with rents up 17%, low- and moderate-income residents are facing high housing cost burdens and an ever-present risk of displacement. Tenants often think of this kind of instability in their housing as part and parcel of the rental landscape. Just Cause for Eviction will increase fairness and transparency in the landlord/tenant relationship and will offer dignity and resources to those displaced through no fault of their own.

We commend the work of the Just Cause Task Force to shape a proposal to bring back to this committee for swift passage. Displacement is often traumatic and can lead to health issues, housing instability, and even homelessness; families are uprooted from their neighborhoods, school systems, and burdened with unexpected financial strain. Without requiring "good" or "just" cause, housing providers are free to end the relationship when no violation has taken place, for arbitrary or even discriminatory reasons.

By requiring disclosure and limiting housing providers' ability to evict a tenant or non-renew a lease to a set of "good causes," our community will show that it values those who rent by conferring them greater opportunities to maintain what is an essential

human need. Relocation assistance requirements will begin to address the costs of sudden, no-fault displacement.

Evanston is a leader in the region, and in fact, across the country, because of its commitment to human rights and inclusion. I encourage this committee to continue us on that path.

Thank you for allowing the chance to comment.

Tina Rounds
Chief Executive Officer
BEDS Plus, Inc.

9/8/23 - Year Round Heat Minimum (via housing@cityofevanston.org)

Good day to all

Evanston should have a year-round heat minimum, not just September 15th to June 1st. Some days, it gets cold, June 1st to September 15th.

Also, this would attempt to solve the problem of some housing providers "forgetting"/refusing to turn the heat on. The same people rarely, if ever, "forget" to turn the heat off.

"Section 602 Heating Facilities

602.2 Residential Occupancies. Dwellings shall be provided with heating facilities capable of maintaining a room temperature of 68 degrees F. (20 degrees C) in all habitable rooms, bathrooms and toilet rooms based on the winter outdoor design temperature for the locality. Neither cooking appliances nor space heaters shall be used to provide space heating to meet the requirements of this section.

602.3 Heat Supply. Every owner and operator of any building who rents, leases, or lets one or more dwelling unit, lodging unit, rooming unit, dormitory or guest room on terms, either expressed or implied, to furnish heat to the occupants thereof shall supply heat during the period from September 15th to June 1st to maintain a temperature of not less than 68 degrees F (20 degrees C) in all habitable rooms, bathrooms and toilet rooms. Space heaters, whether portable or permanently installed, shall not be utilized as the primary source of heat for any such unit or room. Buildings or individual units shall employ central heating systems except where a designed system is approved by the building official.

602.4 Occupiable Work Spaces. Indoor occupiable work spaces shall be supplied with heat during the period from September 15th to June 1st to maintain a temperature of not less than 68 degrees F 20 degrees C) during the period the spaces are occupied.

Exceptions:

1.

Processing, storage and operation areas that require cooling or special temperature conditions.

2.

Areas in which persons are primarily engaged in vigorous physical activities.

602.5 Room Temperature Measurement. The required room temperatures shall be measured approximately 3 feet (914 mm) above the floor near the center of the room, approximately 3 feet (914 mm) above the floor near the center of interior walls of the room that are perpendicular to the exterior wall of the room. Temperatures may be measured utilizing thermometers that measure air temperature or thermometers that measure surface temperature."

October 17, 2023

Remarks to Evanston No-Fault Eviction Task Force:

William Bridges; 2109 Colfax St., Evanston, IL 60201

Honorable Task Force Members:

My remarks tonight are about an important, but limited, aspect of the proposed revisions. I am sure that you will hear from others about the pros and cons of whether any revisions to the current policy of lease renewals are needed. My concern has to do with the scope of the proposal and to suggest an important addition to the list of exclusions. The proposal should exempt owner-occupied properties with a small number of co-residential tenants.

First, a word about my current status as a landlord. For the past thirty-nine years my wife and I have been the owners of a property that has two separate residential structures, a house at the front of the lot where we live, and a house at the back that has been continuously rented during that period. In current parlance the smaller rear house would be labeled an ADU. Our tenant requires access to our portion of the property to receive mail, packages, and other deliveries, and we require access to the rented portion of the property to take garbage and recycling to the alley and to carry out lawn care, snow removal, and other maintenance activities. Over approximately twenty or more tenancies in those 39 years, there have been only a small handful of, but important, instances in which we have had to opt for a non-renewal.

Any sensible municipal policy must recognize one important principle: Not all landlord-tenant relationships fit into a “one size fits all” box. Situations like ours require substantial degrees of co-operation, flexibility, and good will that are not present where an absentee landlord manages dozens or even scores of tenants.

For example, on a routine, if not daily basis, we function as unofficial custodians of packages that are not properly delivered to our tenants. We have also been asked to help tenants out with providing access to service people when the tenants are away. Under the best of circumstances, these favors are reciprocated. The need for relationships of this kind are not present in large scale rental situations.

When co-operative relationships fail, there are bad outcomes for landlords in our type of situation. As an example, we allow our tenants to have pets, but at the time of leasing have to accept their word about the character of these pets. We have rented to many tenants with dogs, mostly without incident. However, one recent tenant showed up with a 120 pound, mixed-breed dog that was totally untrained. Its idea of play was to grab hold of your forearm with its mouth and wrestle with you. My wife, is not afraid of dogs but as a petite human being who was outweighed by the dog, was extremely wary of taking out the garbage or recycling for 10 months. Another tenant violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the lease by conducting personal training sessions in the house—a practice which might have led to severe liability issues for us. Not every intolerable situation can be anticipated when a lease is written. For that reason, non-renewal, or the potential of non-renewal, becomes a critical resource in managing these more personal relationships between on-site landlords and their tenants.

We urge the committee to recommend an exemption for people in our situation. We believe that exemptions of this type are present in other municipalities with these type of ordinances.



Lindsey Wade <lwade@cityofevanston.org>

2nd request from Mr. Schermerhorn

Eleanor Revelle <erevelle@cityofevanston.org>

Mon, Oct 16, 2023 at 2:10 PM

To: Elizabeth Williams <ewilliams@cityofevanston.org>, Marion Johnson <marionjohnson@cityofevanston.org>, Lindsey Wade <lwade@cityofevanston.org>

Cc: Sarah Flax <sflax@cityofevanston.org>

What are your thoughts about this request?

Did any of the "tenants" organizations provide comments at the Just Cause task force meetings?

Eleanor

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dan Schermerhorn <dan@schmermerhorn-realestate.com>
Subject: RE: Housing & Community Development Committee
Date: October 16, 2023 at 12:55:35 PM CDT
To: "erevelle@cityofevanston.org" <erevelle@cityofevanston.org>

Good Afternoon:

I wanted to follow up on my e-mail of last Thursday (below) to see if the North Suburban Housing Providers would be allowed to present at the next meeting of the Housing & Community Development Committee. Our group would appreciate the opportunity to present our position to the Committee regarding the pending changes to the RLTO, including the Just Cause Non-Renewal provision.

Looking at the agenda and packet for tomorrow's meeting, it is not clear whether the topic will be on the agenda for a full discussion, since there is no draft of the changes to the RLTO included in the packet.

As Chair of this Committee, we understand you are the one to address our request to. If that is incorrect, please let us know. We are glad to present to the Committee at tomorrow's meeting if that is appropriate, or we can do so at the November meeting.

Thanks very much for your time.

Sincerely,
SCHERMERHORN & CO.
Daniel T. Schermerhorn, CPM
President - Managing Broker
847-869-4200
224-420-9546 (direct)
847-869-0140 (fax)
www.Schermerhorn-Realestate.com

From: Dan Schermerhorn

Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 5:09 PM

To: erevelle@cityofevanston.org

Subject: Housing & Community Development Committee

Dear Alder Revelle:

I am reaching out on behalf of the North Suburban Housing Providers, an organization of concerned property managers and property owners. We are reaching out to you as the Chair of the Housing & Community Development Committee, and we would like to request the opportunity to present to the Committee on the topic of the Just Cause Eviction proposal and the proposed changes to the City's Landlord Tenant Ordinance.

We attended the meeting on July 18, 2023, where members of the Law Center for Better Housing, Open Communities, and the Metropolitan Tenant's Organization were allowed time to present their opinions regarding the Just Cause Ordinance Proposal. We believe the point of view of housing providers should receive an equal opportunity to present information regarding the impact of the proposed ordinance. So far, we have been relegated to the Public Comment period and thereby given about 2 minutes to present our position. We would hope that the Committee would be interested in hearing from stakeholders providing housing in Evanston much as the tenant organizations that were allowed to present on July 18th.

We have not heard whether the Just Cause ordinance proposal will be on the agenda for the October 16th meeting or the November meeting, but we would like the opportunity to present our position at the next meeting where the topic is on the agenda.

Thank you for your consideration of our request. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,
SCHERMERHORN & CO.
Daniel T. Schermerhorn, CPM
President - Managing Broker
847-869-4200
224-420-9546 (direct)
847-869-0140 (fax)
www.Schermerhorn-Realestate.com