

Wed, April 18th 2018 OPEN HOUSE

Comments and Responses

1. For house inspections, the city of Aurora should give at least one time free for re-inspection instead of charging more than \$100 for re-inspection. It is unfair for landlord. That is the purpose of house inspection to allow the landlord to correct the finding without charging extra fees.
 - a. The rental program needs to transition even more toward covering its costs so that the average taxpayer is not affected.
 - b. We are working on efficiency and effectiveness improvements to the program and additionally have been granted new software from Mayor Irvin's administration and City Council to aide us in this effort. The planned software launch is 01 January 2020. Along with this software, we plan to implement a **Performance Based Inspection Program** so that we focus more of our manpower on properties and landlords/agents who fail to pass their inspections as well as their peers and properties for which we have recorded Type 01 crimes.
2. The house rental regulations in the city of Aurora are the toughest among the adjacent cities. This will affect the rental house investment and the economy of Aurora.
 - a. We will continue to strive to improve our program and communication with landlords/agents and even tenants to improve efficiency for all. Part of these communications will focus on expectations and feedback through customer surveys.
3. During the house inspection some of the inspectors abused their power.
 - a. This should never occur in our program. If you feel we have fallen short of excellent service please let us know. We will be implementing a customer service survey system with links to our forthcoming electronic communication efforts. It is our hope that this additional layer of anonymity will increase the amount of feedback you feel comfortable providing so that we can tailor our service and training to best meet your needs.
4. If the tenants have been living in the house for many years, city of Aurora should not inspect the house yearly. It should only do the inspection the one time tenants move in.
 - a. Again see Item 1. B above regarding Performance Based Inspection Program. This would be the means of obtaining inspection byes in future licensing years.
5. Water bills extremely expensive.
 - a. This is unrelated to the Rental Licensing program and not part of our departmental responsibilities.
6. Lots of garbage on streets and alleys.
 - a. We are proposing a minimum size and perhaps number of garbage receptacles in rental properties based upon the occupant load to help alleviate this.
7. So many pets without registration.
 - a. This is unrelated to the Rental Licensing program, it is through a challenge AC&C is working on.
8. Neighbor walking their dogs and never pick up after them.
 - a. This is unrelated to the Rental Licensing program.

9. Landlord should be given more miles. Should be minimum 60 miles, Aurora has policy for 30 miles.
 - a. We actually have heard this comment both ways closer and farther. It is our belief that the research that went into the 30 miles as a typical threshold is still appropriate. We will though be looking to add agent registration and qualifications to aide landlords in their choice and to help tenants and neighbors resolve quality of life issues more quickly and perhaps even prevent them from occurring in the first place.
10. City of Aurora should not charge the fee every year. Rental license fee going up too much.
 - a. The rental licensing program should not be a burden to the general taxpayer. This means that both landlords and the City will be challenged to maintain as efficient a program as possible. When implementing the Performance Based Inspection Program we may attempt to shift more of the burden of costs to landlords/agents whom are using more of our services. It though is not anticipated that the annual licensing fee will be entirely removed at this time.
11. The inspections do not need every year.
 - a. Again see Item 1. B above regarding Performance Based Inspection Program. This would be the means of obtaining inspection byes in future licensing years.
12. Good condition house wastes landlord, tenants and city tax money and time. It is not a good investment.
 - a. Again see Item 1. B above regarding Performance Based Inspection Program. This would be the means of obtaining inspection byes in future licensing years.
13. Some of the Inspectors abuse the power.
 - a. Again see Item 3.
14. Same tenant doesn't need re-inspection every year.
 - a. Again see Item 1. B above regarding Performance Based Inspection Program. This would be the means of obtaining inspection byes in future licensing years.
15. New tenant move in, inspect once.
 - a. Again see Item 1. B above regarding Performance Based Inspection Program. This would be the means of obtaining inspection byes in future licensing years.
16. Adding sprinkler system would be excessive cost.
 - a. Yes sprinkler system retrofit for Lodging Houses (4 or more Unrelated occupants) would be a large expense. We have had more concern about this item than the other proposed provisions for Lodging House changes and may consider a modification to the proposal.
 - b. If not modified when adopted this and the other requirements could be avoided by limiting the number of unrelated occupants to 3 or fewer in the unit.
17. I see more rules (more ways) to fine landlords. Can you make any progress with helping landlords deal with problem tenants with the extra money you will collect from us?
 - a. Becoming a landlord comes with many responsibilities and risks but it is a choice. Other taxpayers whom have not made that choice, should not be burdened by the challenges you find in state statues for which the City of Aurora has no control. We will however commit to continually improving our program to minimize as much as possible the burden on the better landlords and properties.

18. The proposal for parking is unreasonable in our circumstance. Single family home rented to 4 university students, 2 car garage with 2 lane driveway fits another 4 cars. Room in front curb for 4 cars. New definition only recognizes 2 spaces. What would be now illegal is something that has worked well for many years. There are some areas, especially in areas of Chicago where this makes sense. In this instance, it makes no sense. If this is not changed, our options will be to reduce the number of tenants and operate at a loss, or to sell as a single family unit which would probably be another loss.
 - a. You are correct that your option is to reduce the number of unrelated to 3 or fewer. Despite your contention that it has worked well the University Neighborhood is telling us that it has not or at least for enough of the Lodging houses it has not.
19. It is not city's job to enforce county home owner property tax exemption rules. Please remove the proposal rule about home owner property tax exemption status.
 - a. The city is choosing to verify homeowner tax exemption status on properties for which we are issuing licenses. If a rental property and not owner occupied this false status with the county assessor again burdens other taxpayers while you falsely claim an inappropriate status to the county. This practice will continue as it is fair for the taxpayers of Aurora and yourself.
20. Can I use the neighbor's portion of a shared driveway be used to calculate my ability to provide individually accessible parking spaces?
 - a. No, we will be evaluating the access based upon the delineated lot. Even with permissions the property could change hands and the access could be eliminated without your control.
21. I have a lease with 4 or more unrelated individuals currently. Will I be "grandfathered"?
 - a. We are contemplating a grandfathering period with an expiration date. Current discussions have been for a 3-5 year period. At the end of the grandfathering period, either the improvements would be expected OR the Lodging House use would need to cease.
22. I have a Victorian single family home with multiple units how will the unrelated occupant test be applied? Will it include all units simultaneously?
 - a. We are proposing that the unrelated occupant evaluation will be performed individually on a legal unit by legal unit basis. If one of your legal units has 4 or more unrelated individuals we will analyze parking and attribute required parking for each of the non-lodging home units plus the Lodging Home unit to determine the total parking required on site.
23. I have a common corridor Apartment building. Does this apply to my rentals?
 - a. No, this only applies to structures governed by the one and two family home code; Single family detached, Townhomes, Rowhomes, Duplexes and Quads.