

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 6:38 AM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Pasadena Rent Control and RSD

From: Ann-Marie
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 6:37:52 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Pasadena Rent Control and RSD

You don't often get email from

[Ann-Marie](#). [Learn why this is important](#)

[⚠ CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Please reconsider the rent stabilization department. This RSD being in place in our fair city is no way to run a city well and certainly no way to work with your community leaders who are providing housing.

We need housing providers of all sorts in the City of Pasadena in order to provide a vibrant tapestry of options for people so that they may live here, work here, raise their families here and most of all live in good rental housing. With the restrictions that are being placed upon housing providers, there are fewer rental housing options and fewer rental housing providers with strong local ties willing to provide this business service of providing rental housing units.

Amongst the many problems that this rent control board has created are the following:

- Growing Inability to maintain properties due to rent control restrictions.
- Financial Strain: Impact of the \$238-per-unit fee and constant increases in costs (utilities, appliances, maintenance, insurance) that cannot be recovered
- Administrative Burden: Hours spent on registering properties, navigating 50+ new resolutions, and costs for legal counsel.
- Leadership: Issues with incorrect information, hostility from Rent Board members and privacy concerns regarding sensitive tenant data

- **Housing provider's Future:** some are being forced to sell or considering a property tax reduction due to lost value.

Please stand up with the rental housing providers and give us a stronger voice so that we may continue to provide this very important resource in the City Of Pasadena. This rent control board is doing everything it can to work against housing providers.

Thank you for your attention to this very serious matter and thank you for considering drastic changes so that housing providers have an ally with the city council.

Ann-Marie Villicana
Engel & Völkers Real Estate Advisor
DRE 00974188
Broker-Associate, Attorney
Master of Real Estate Development

From: cityclerk
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 8:02 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Public Comment Regarding Rent Stabilization Impacts on Property Owners

From: Ted Dupas
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 7:54:48 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Rent Stabilization Impacts on Property Owners

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[⚠ CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

To the Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,

I respectfully submit this letter to share concerns regarding the practical and financial impacts of Pasadena's Rent Stabilization Ordinance on rental property owners.

Since its implementation, rent stabilization has introduced multiple new costs and obligations that have significantly affected the financial viability of operating rental housing. These include annual registration fees, mandated rent rollbacks applied after leases were already in place, and rising operating expenses across all categories. Together, these measures have materially reduced rental income and created ongoing financial strain.

In addition, property owners are now required to provide refrigerators and other appliances, creating an unfunded mandate. The costs associated with purchasing, installing, maintaining, and replacing these appliances represent a substantial additional expense that cannot be recovered under current rent limitations.

Rent stabilization has also not accounted for recent disruptions in the property insurance market. Many landlords have had their insurance policies canceled and were forced to obtain coverage through the state insurance program at significantly higher premiums—often double previous costs. This sharp increase has further compounded the financial pressure on property owners.

Unlike most other businesses, rental property owners are not able to adjust pricing to reflect increased costs. Expenses continue to rise, while rental income is capped and, in some cases, reduced. This imbalance places long-term stress on the rental housing system.

Beyond financial impacts, rent stabilization has increased administrative and compliance demands, requiring substantial additional time from property owners to ensure adherence to complex and evolving regulations.

Over time, these cumulative pressures reduce property values, discourage reinvestment, and risk unintended consequences such as deferred maintenance and reduced housing quality. A sustainable rental housing market requires policies that fairly balance the needs of tenants with the realities faced by property owners.

I respectfully urge the City Council to review the ongoing impacts of rent stabilization and consider adjustments that promote fairness, sustainability, and long-term housing stability for both tenants and owners.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Ted Dupas

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 8:59 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Agenda Item #10

From: Brian Smith
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 8:59:06 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Agenda Item #10

rn why this is important

[⚠ CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

RE: Impact the Pasadena Stabilization (RSD) has had on me.

Lets compare the "success" of Rent Control Districts and non Rent Control Districts that have been in operation for decades. "I," (the small independent landlord) is your model for affordable housing. Today, in this rental market I have \$500.00 and \$600.00 monthly rentals. Included in these rents are utilities and furnishings. I have tenants residing in my rentals for 10, 15, and 25 years. I am NOT a dichotomy. There are hundreds of landlords operating their rentals just like me. The squeaky wheel gets the oil. I would listen to the attendees at board meetings. Being generous I would estimate a maximum to 50 testimonials were offered by residents having difficulty with their rent price points. Being excessively generous, lets say 500 testimonials were given which we all know that not being the case. However, realize who was not in attendance. The hundreds of landlords and thousands and thousands of successful satisfied tenants who were content with their rentals, who were at home reading a book, watching TV, or snuggled in their warm beds. Landlords were railroaded. We did not organize because we did not realize the consequences the formation of the Stabilization Dept. would have on us. WHERE IS YOUR MODLE ? New York, San Francisco, Santa Monica? All these rent controlled districts have the highest rents anywhere! That's the historic outcome of Rent Control and those are the facts.

Stabilization has empowered tenants. New "informed" tenants attempt to create "uninhabitable residences" with exaggerated complaints of the conditions of my properties of which construction was so new it was still in warranty. The intention was to create scenarios un-reparable as to not have to pay rent. I have expended thousands of unnecessary dollars on attorneys fees and ridiculous third party clearances of habitability conditions. Another newer tenant of 13 months introduced bed bugs, cockroaches, and ants due to his poor living practices attempting to make it my fault. Thousands of dollars later these informed tenants and their problems are gone. I have sold two properties in fear of re-renting to empowered tenants. My rentals have become so unmanageable navigating 50+ new Stabilization resolutions that I have now had to employ a management company to help me with the ever changing issues with incorrect information and hostility from Rent Board members. Corporations have purchased my properties and I guarantee you the now multi-unit complex which was once my single family home, will not offer a price point anything near "affordable" compared to what I had to offer. Not to mention forever changing the character and landscape of a once single home community.

I need some convincing where my \$238-per-unit fee can beat my lifetime of investment of affordable, successful, happy tenants that can compare. Again, where is your model? My taxes, insurance, utilities, and maintenance costs have skyrocketed and Stabilization restricts me from practical rent adjustments!!! There is no business in the entire USA that was told to roll back their prices to 2023? Those few that squeaked that wheel are now going to dictate how the thousands of properties are going to be impacted for decades. Show me your model, I challenge you to match my affordable model. You can't. Even with an excess of a \$300 K annual salary that the head board member receives. Wow, maybe I'm in the wrong business!

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 5:31 AM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: January 26th, 2026 : Agenda Item #10 - Opposition to the Rent Stabilization Department (RSD) Annual Report

From: Victor Caballero
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 5:30:14 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: January 26th, 2026 : Agenda Item #10 - Opposition to the Rent Stabilization Department (RSD) Annual Report

You don't often get email from  [Learn why this is important](#)

 **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

RE: Opposition to the Rent Stabilization Department (RSD) Annual Report

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to you as a concerned property owner in Pasadena to provide a necessary counter-perspective to the Rent Stabilization Department's (RSD) Annual Report. While the department characterizes its recent operations as a "massive success," the reality for those of us providing housing in this city is one of unsustainable financial and administrative strain.

The narrative of success presented by the RSD overlooks the following critical issues:

1. Severe Financial Strain

The current regulatory environment has created a "perfect storm" for housing providers:

- **The \$238-Per-Unit Fee:** This significant fee, combined with the inability to recover rising costs for utilities, appliances, maintenance, and insurance, is making it impossible to maintain properties at the standard Pasadena residents deserve.
- **Stagnant Recovery:** With inflation affecting every aspect of property management, the current caps do not account for the actual cost of business, essentially forcing owners to subsidize the city's housing policy out of pocket.

2. Excessive Administrative Burden

The sheer complexity of the new system has turned property management into a full-time legal exercise:

1726/2026

- **Regulatory Overload:** Navigating over **50 new resolutions** in such a short timeframe is a monumental task.
- **Compliance Costs:** Many of us have been forced to hire legal counsel simply to ensure we are registering properties correctly, adding another layer of unrecoverable expense to our operations.

3. Leadership and Governance Concerns

The conduct of the Rent Board and the RSD has been disappointing and, at times, adversarial:

- **Hostility and Misinformation:** Rather than acting as a neutral administrative body, there has been a palpable sense of hostility toward owners, often accompanied by the dissemination of incorrect information.
- **Data Privacy:** There are serious concerns regarding the handling of sensitive tenant and owner data. A "successful" department should prioritize security and professionalism, yet many feel their privacy is at risk.

4. Impact on Pasadena's Housing Future

These policies are actively devaluing Pasadena's housing stock. I am now in a position where I must consider **selling my property** or seeking a **property tax reduction** due to the significant loss in asset value. When long-term, local providers are pushed out of the market, the entire community loses.

I urge the City Council to look past the self-congratulatory tone of the RSD's report and engage in a meaningful dialogue with the people who actually provide the housing in this city. We need a balanced approach that ensures the viability of rental housing, not just the growth of a new city department.

Sincerely,

Victor Caballero