

# TRANSIENT RENTALS IN SRO-TYPE BUILDINGS

## Summary

The purpose of this study is to determine the proportion of rent hotel owners derive from “transient” tenants. In this paper we compare data derived from Department of Finance I&E statements with DHCR rent rolls. For buildings which are registered with DHCR, it appears that hotel owners derive a considerable proportion of their revenue (40% or more) from transient rentals. Registered rooming houses and SROs, on the other hand, seem to have little or no transient income.

[Editor's Note: One of the major issues the Rent Guidelines Board has debated over the past several years is "transient income" in hotels. Tenant advocacy groups have argued that owners benefit greatly by short term rentals not subject to stabilization regulations. Hence, no rent increases for stabilized tenants are necessary. Owner groups contend that such a policy merely punishes the "good" owners who rent to long-term stabilized tenants (i.e. not to transients). This study contains the only concrete evidence presented to the Board regarding the extent of transient rentals.]

## Background

Last year's research consisted of two hotel studies. In the first of these, the so-called “Registration Study,” staff attempted to estimate the number of SRO-type buildings which should have registered with DHCR from 1984 to 1989,

and the percentage of buildings and units which actually did register. Using very conservative assumptions, it was estimated that almost half of all buildings and 40% of all units were not registered even once during the period. Based on this analysis we concluded that

“The data ... raises some troubling questions about the implementation of rent regulation in the hotel sector. Given the low rate of registration and the possibility that many owners may derive a small percentage of revenue from permanent tenants one might argue that the impact of the regulatory system on this vital housing resource is rapidly diminishing.”<sup>1</sup>

The second hotel study analyzed income and expenses in hotel buildings using the Finance Department's Local Law 63 filings. Although this study did allow us to compute averages for O&M expense, income, and the O&M to income ratio, it proved to be impossible to estimate how much income landlords derived from “transient” (i.e. non-stabilized) tenants.

In April the RGB gained access to DHCR's “on-line” rent registration records, thereby making it possible to compare the total amount of income reported by landlords to the Department of Finance with the aggregate amount of rent registered with DHCR. The difference between these two figures can be considered a rough estimate of income derived from non-registered units, some of which may be rented on a “transient” basis.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Rent Stabilized Housing in New York City: A Summary of Rent Guidelines Board Research*, 1991, p.74.

<sup>2</sup> “Rental income” reported to the Department of Finance includes rent from all “apartment units” (SRO-type or regular) as well as rent from commercial units (e.g. stores, parking). It is a measure of rent collected rather than rent charged. Registered DHCR rents, on the other hand, are rents charged and account for vacancy losses (in our study) but they do not account for collection losses. If commercial rent constitutes 10% of total income (as in the apartment I&E study) and collection losses average 10%, these factors would more or less cancel out, making the two sources of data roughly comparable.

The income and expense study included data from 178 buildings, including 66 hotels, 67 SROs, and 45 Rooming Houses. After a comprehensive search of the DHCR registration records, we found that only 107 of these buildings registered between 1988 and 1991.<sup>3</sup> In short, 40% of the buildings were unregistered compared to 47% in the previously mentioned registration study. Registration rates ranged from 67% of SROs, to 58% of rooming houses, and 55% of hotels.

Addresses for the 107 registered buildings were transmitted to the Finance Department. Finance staff then “matched” these buildings with last year’s computer file to produce income and expense data for the registered buildings. RGB staff undertook the task of manually entering the DHCR data (comprising 107 rent rolls and about 7700 units) into spreadsheets and deriving estimates of rent.

<sup>3</sup> Last year’s I&E study was largely comprised of income and expense filings for calendar 1989. The most directly comparable DHCR rent information is from April 1989.

## Findings

The table below shows the characteristics of the buildings in our study. In order to allow direct comparisons between the amount of rent reported to DHCR and the amount of income reported to the Department of Finance, buildings with commercial units have been eliminated. This allows us to compare income reported to Finance (nearly all of which presumably comes from residential unit rents) with rents registered with DHCR.

Although all of these owners registered their buildings with DHCR, the percentage of units which were registered varies considerably.<sup>4</sup> In the rooming house and SRO sectors it appears that 95% and 88% of the units (respectively) were registered.<sup>5</sup> In the hotel sector, on the other hand only 57% of units were registered.

The table also indicates the percentage of registered units which are labelled “stabilized” in the DHCR files. Between 87% and 91% of all the units are registered as “stabilized” units. The other two categories are “exempt” (indicating that the unit is either temporarily or permanently exempt from rent stabilization) and “vacant.” Very few units are registered “exempt.” The vast majority of

### Buildings Registered with DHCR Which Also Filed I&E Forms

	<u>% Units Registered</u>	<u>% Registered Units registered “Stabilized”</u>	<u>% Income from Registered units*</u>
Rooming Houses .....	95%	87%	112%
SROs .....	88%	91%	104%
Hotels.....	57%	88%	60%

\* Defined as registered rent divided by rents reported to the Department of Finance.  
Source: NYS Division of Housing and Community Renewal, NYC Department of Finance.

<sup>4</sup> This percentage is the sum of all units registered with DHCR (whether “stabilized,” “exempt” or “vacant”) divided by the number of units reported on the Finance Department income and expense form. It should be kept in mind that ALL of these figures were reported by owners to the respective government departments.

<sup>5</sup> Some of the units are certainly owner-occupied and not required to register. As a result, the percentage of units which should have been registered and were actually registered is slightly higher than indicated by the table.

the registered units not registered as “stabilized” are in the “vacant” category. Vacant units account for about 10% of all registered units.

The fact that few units are registered as exempt does NOT mean that transient occupancy is a rare phenomenon. As we noted previously, 40% of the buildings in the I&E sample did not register at all and a large percentage of hotel units are unregistered. Some portion of these may be rented on a transient basis. In addition, according to testimony heard by the board this year some landlords also rent out units registered as “stabilized” on a transient basis.

The last column of the table is the amount of registered rent divided by the amount of income reported to the Department of Finance.<sup>6</sup> In the rooming house sector this figure is 112% - in other words, DHCR rents actually exceed income reported to Finance. Part of the difference between the DHCR and Finance figures is due to collection losses. If collection losses of 10% are included, the figure would approximate 100%. It is conceivable that some of the rent paid by tenants to small landlords is in cash and that not all is reported. Note from the table that the characteristics of SROs are similar to rooming houses.

Hotels derive approximately 60% of their income from registered units.<sup>7</sup> Since we have excluded buildings with commercial units from our sample, the remaining 40% of the income must be derived from the unregistered units (43% of all hotel units), some portion of which may be rented on a transient basis. **It seems clear that hotels have a very different income structure from rooming houses and SROs. The figures**

**cited here suggest that transient income is probably an important factor in the hotel industry.** Rooming houses, on the other hand, may derive little if any income from transient tenants. SROs are between the two extremes but appear to be more akin to rooming houses than hotels.

One final aspect of these figures is worth noting. The average monthly rent for non-registered hotel units is \$351, or less than the average for registered stabilized units (\$455). Since one might expect unregistered units to rent for more than the registered units, the only plausible explanation is that a large number of units are unoccupied - either through deliberate warehousing or because of inability to rent them to transients. ○

<sup>6</sup> DHCR rents are annualized to arrive at a figure comparable to the Department of Finance figures. Included in the DHCR figure are all unit rents classified as “stabilized” or “exempt” but NOT those classified as “vacant.” By excluding the vacant units we assume that this “snapshot” of the vacancy rate would hold true for the entire year.

<sup>7</sup> The figure may be somewhat less since collection losses are not considered.