

The good cause eviction proposal goes too far:

1. It undermines the property rights of individuals. (Which are outlined in the NY state constitution, and which council members took an oath to protect) Current zoning laws and building safety laws are more than sufficient.
  - a. Prevents people from doing what they want, or need to with their property. Including having family members move in who might be sick, or elderly.
2. It prevents people's right to contract (tortious interference), and for consenting adults to be able to come to an agreement without the intrusion of the government.
  - a. It presupposes that because someone is poorer, or because of their race or background that they are somehow incapable of, or lack the agency to enter into an agreement without the extra protection of this law, which is false, and racist at its core.
3. The rent cap discourages capital improvements and unnecessarily burdens the property owner to seek approval for such improvements from tenants, or the courts. It will also create a less desirable place to live.
4. It compels the property owner to be stuck with a tenant for perpetuity, and is one-sided, the tenant can still exercise their right to not renew the lease. This is grossly unjust, and biased.
5. The law as proposed will clog up the courts, needlessly involve a judicial process, and encourage people not to pay their rent with the result of the landlord losing necessary income to remain solvent.
6. The proposed law will exacerbate the housing problem by disincentivizing people from wanting to provide housing. The housing stock will decline rapidly if this passes. Many property owners have already decided to turn their multiple-family properties into single families and just use the extra space themselves, rather than be burdened with the restrictions of this law.
7. The proposal makes many false assumptions about people's intent, motivations, and is divorced from the reality of the business cycle, and free, and open economy. It also paints business owners in a very negative light and suggests that their choices and decisions are somehow arbitrary, and made for cruel and random reasons which are naturally coupled with greed.
8. The conversations around this proposal have been infused with such entitlement, envy, disdain, and a complete lack of respect to the generous, and entrepreneurial individuals who provide housing for so many of our neighbors. They should be thanked and supported instead of being unjustly vilified. Property owners provide a very necessary economic engine for our local economy and will be greatly hurt by this misguided attempt at regulating a problem that has been made worse every time the local government has intervened in these matters. The

city government has done more to accelerate the gentrification they claim to care about than anyone with their flawed attempts at fixing the very problem they created.

9. Evictions are bad for tenants, they follow them around on their record for many years making it harder for them to get new credit or become homeowners in the future. This law could create more evictions than anticipated as it will effectively become the only mechanism to remove someone from the property. Historically, at the end of the term of a lease, both parties have the right to end the tenancy(sunset provision), for any reason, maybe the owner wants to move in a family member, maybe they just don't get along and the owner doesn't want them to live in their house anymore. This law affects owner-occupied houses as well, we aren't just talking about large apartment complexes here.

10. The proposed law is based on the Albany law which is already being challenged in the courts. When legislators ignore the advice of counsel and knowingly create laws that undermine even the most basic property rights they act in bad faith. When the intention is to have it decided in a court, which is a waste of taxpayers' time, and money, and knowingly undermining property rights all while hoping that an activist judge might agree with their ridiculous assertions is in fact not legislating in good faith, but instead trying to rule by judicial fiat.

11. "Timing" the timing of this law comes on the heels of an eviction moratorium. There are several landlords who have received no rent throughout the last 18 months. They have still been required to provide their property for free, pay for utilities, and of course their TAXES. This is a very poor or conceived time to do this to people. Unless the intent is to force people to lose their properties and the local government seize them for back taxes.

"For what property have I in that which another may by right take, when he pleases to himself?" -John Locke

The right of property," Arthur Lee of Virginia wrote in *An Appeal to the Justice and Interests of the People of Great Britain* (1775), "is the guardian of every other right, and to deprive a people of this, is in fact to deprive them of their liberty."

Vice President John Adams in an essay, *Discourses on Davila* (1791), summed up the view of a new American creed: "Property must be secured or liberty cannot exist."

Property rights are well established with laws that predate the Constitution and well established with natural rights(Natural law) and vested law.

President John Adams in an essay, Discourses on Davila (1791), summed up the view of a new American creed: “Property must be secured or liberty cannot exist.”