



Real Estate Bulletin

Official Publication of the California Division of Real Estate

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor

August 1965

MILTON G. GORDON, Commissioner

LEGISLATION

1965 Session Passes Numerous Real Estate Bills

The 1965 Legislature enacted and Governor Edmund G. Brown signed an unusual number of bills making significant changes in laws relating to real estate licensing and the subdividing process. "Considered along with the legislative accomplishments in this area in 1963, it can be truly said that remarkable progress has been made toward achievement of a professional orientation for the real estate industry—progress I am told is unmatched in any comparable period in the 45-year history of the license law," Commissioner Milton G. Gordon stated after reviewing the final record of 1965 legislation.

Of the bills passed, one of considerable moment to all real estate licensees will abolish the business opportunity license after January 1, 1966. Real estate licensees will be relieved of the necessity of having two separate licenses to handle business opportunity transactions after that date. The same bill provides that persons collecting advance fees are required to deposit them in banks or other recognized depositories.

- A bill (AB 764) doing away with the concept of one-year original licenses will become effective January 2, 1966. *It is discussed in some detail elsewhere in this issue.*

Clarification of Audit Authority

Legislation effective September 17 gives the Real Estate Commissioner specific authority to examine and inspect records after prior notice of intention to do so. Upon sufficient cause appearing, an audit may proceed without further notice.

- Also effective September 17 will be a law prohibiting blind advertising. It requires that licensees, when acting as agents, designate their license status in their advertising. A corporation using its corporate license name or a

(Continued, Col. 1, Page 723)

ALL LICENSES TO GO ON FOUR-YEAR BASIS

Provisions for issuance of the original one-year license will be eliminated by changes in the license law effective January 2, 1966. And the same bill (AB 764) will remove the present limitation on the number of license reexaminations which may be taken.

Applicants for salesman license who qualify by examination will be eligible for a four-year license upon payment of the \$40 fee. Examination fees for real estate salesman license remain as they are—\$10. The broker four-year license fee will go to \$65 after January 1, 1966.

Anyone presently holding a second successive original salesman license will not be directly affected by the change in law—to remain in business the examination for four-year license will have to be taken, whether before or after January 1, 1966.

- The term of any original broker or salesman license in effect on January 2, 1966, will continue until the expiration date shown on the license.

- When a first original salesman license is due to expire in January 1966, application for the four-year salesman license examination will be accepted in November 1965; if it expires in February 1966, application can be made in December 1965, al-

LICENSE STATUS INFORMATION

To provide better service and more accurate information on inquiries about individual license status, a special desk has been set up in the DRE headquarters office in Sacramento to handle these questions. The cumbersome and often outdated duplicate license files in the district offices have been eliminated.

This is how the new system works: Suppose you want to know if John Doe is an active real estate broker licensee, how long he has been licensed, and his business address. You may telephone, write or visit the nearest district office outlining the information wanted. Within two working days, after receipt of your request, you will receive the up-to-the-minute answers directly from Sacramento.

If you need the information more urgently, you may call Sacramento directly at 445-5741, Area Code 916, and the answers will be given immediately.

lowing time to schedule one examination before expiration of such licenses.

- Note to those who hold first original licenses expiring during the remainder of 1965: If you want a second successive original license, apply at least two weeks before your license expires. Should your application and fee reach the Division of Real Estate on or after January 2, 1966, the second license cannot be issued.

- Applications received too late to permit issuance of an original one-year license prior to January 2, 1966, will be processed under the provisions of the changed law.

REAL ESTATE BULLETIN

Official Publication of the
California Division of Real Estate

August 1965

Published Bimonthly in Sacramento by the

DIVISION OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor

MILTON G. GORDON
Real Estate Commissioner

JOHN E. HEMPEL
Chief Assistant Commissioner

STATE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION

EDWARD BEVILACQUA JOHN H. TOLAN, JR.
Pleasanton Richmond
DAVID MILLER ROGER J. ROELLE
Beverly Hills West Covina
RALPH H. MILLER JOSEPH H. CARTER
Upland Eureka

PRINCIPAL OFFICE

111 Capitol Mall, Sacramento 95814
J. P. MAHONEY, Chief Legal Officer
GERALD E. HARRINGTON, Assistant Commissioner,
Regulatory Operations
HAROLD H. WELLS, Assistant Commissioner,
Licensing and Services
WALTER I. MILLER, Assistant Commissioner,
Education and Publications
PAUL R. POPE, Chief Deputy, Examinations
WALTER L. ALLEN, Senior Deputy, Editor

**NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
REGULATORY AREA**

GAYLORD K. NYE, Assistant Commissioner, Rm.
2033, 350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102

District Offices

San Francisco, Rm. 2033, 350 McAllister St.,
94102
Raymond M. Dabler, Chief Deputy
Sacramento, 111 Capitol Mall 95814
Thomas J. Nolan, Chief Deputy
Fresno, Rm. 3084, 2550 Mariposa St. 93721
Richard H. McAdoo, Supervising Deputy
Oakland, Rm. 6040, 1111 Jackson St. 94607
Marvin H. Wiegman, Supervising Deputy
Bakersfield (part time), 345 Chester Ave.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
REGULATORY AREA**

HENRY H. BLOCK, Assistant Commissioner
State Office Bldg., Rm. 8003, 107 S. Broad-
way, Los Angeles 90012

District Offices

Los Angeles (Main Office, Southern Area)
State Office Bldg., Rm. 8003, 107 S. Broad-
way 90012
JOHN LAZAR, Chief Deputy
San Diego, State Office Bldg., Rm. 5022, 1350
Front St. 92101
RICHARD B. NICHOLLS, Supervising Deputy
San Bernardino (part time), 175 West 5th St.

**DESIST AND REFRAIN ORDERS
Issued for the Period Between May 15
and June 30, 1965**

Number of orders	Violations
	IN STATE
5	Sale of real property securities without permit . . . and/or failure to comply with all applicable statutes and regulations.
6	Failure to provide for subdivision public report, promised recreation facilities, proper permit or otherwise meet requirements of subdivision law.
	OUT OF STATE
7	Failure to comply with California subdivision requirements.

Disciplinary Action—April—May 1965

NOTE: A list of actions is not published in this Bulletin until the 30-day period allowed for court appeal has expired; or, if an appeal is taken, until a final determination of the court action. Names of persons to whom licenses are denied upon application are not published.

Licenses Revoked During April—May 1965

Name	Address	Effective date	Violation
Zagorin, William Edward Real Estate Broker	4144 Harter Ave., Culver City	4/ 4/65	Secs. 10145; 10176 (a), (c), (i); 10177 (d), (f), (g); 10305; Secs. 2830, 2832, 2971 and 2972 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Garcia, Phillip, Jr. Real Estate Salesman (Granted right to restricted license on conditions)	3254 24th St., San Francisco	4/ 6/65	Sec. 10177 (a), (b) and (f)
Adams, Ralph Clay Real Estate Salesman	4445 W. 154, Lawndale	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b)
Ames, Donald Franklin Real Estate Broker	230 W. Warner St., Santa Ana	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Anderson, Mabel Irene Real Estate Salesman (Granted right to restricted license on conditions)	1281 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Braun, Alejandro Ernesto Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license)	40 Main St., Los Altos	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Combs, Gregory Fox Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license on conditions. Respondent shall abstain from acting as real estate broker for 30 days from and after effective date of decision)	564 Castro St., San Francisco dba The Fleur De Lys Real Estate Co.	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Davies, William Elton Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license on terms and conditions)	6101 Foothill Blvd., Oakland	4/ 7/65	Secs. 10145; 10176 (c), (g); 10177 (d), (f) and Sec. 2832 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Farrell, Forrest George Real Estate Salesman	368 Grenola St., Pacific Palisades	4/ 7/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Regalado, Julian Restricted Real Estate Broker	730 S. Simmons, Los Angeles	4/ 7/65	Secs. 10176 (a), (c), (i); 10177 (d), (f), (g), (h) and Sec. 2731 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Sykes, Robert Lowell Real Estate Salesman	3440 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles	4/ 7/65	Secs. 10176 (a), (i) and 10177 (j)
Ramsgate, Chase Real Estate Salesman (Granted right to restricted license on conditions)	2323 Nichols Canyon Rd., Los Angeles	4/ 8/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Rentz, Clavette Mae Real Estate Salesman	735 Buckeyewood Ave., Orange	4/13/65	Sec. 10177 (b), (f) and (g)
Sherwood, Clifton John Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license after 30 days on conditions)	853 Seventeen Mile Dr., Pacific Grove	4/13/65	Secs. 10176 (a), (b), (i) and 10177 (f)
Great American Realty Corp. Real Estate Corporation (Granted right to restricted license after 30 days on conditions)	1631 S. La Cienega Blvd., Los Angeles	4/14/65	Secs. 10137, 10177 (d) and (f)
Lonski, Leo Floyd President, Willow Bay Mortgage & Investment Corp. dba Leo Lonski Co. Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license on conditions. Respondent shall abstain from acting as RE Officer for 30 days from and after effective date of decision)	200 3rd St., Los Altos	4/20/65	Secs. 10085; 10137; 10138; 10176 (e), (j); 10177 (d), (f), (g), (i); 10305; Secs. 2832 and 2971 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Board, Clay William Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted real estate broker license without prejudice to reinstate RE Sales)	215 Frederick St., San Francisco	4/21/65	Sec. 10177 (a) and (f)
Andrews, William James Real Estate Salesman	1106 E. 68th St., Inglewood	4/22/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Fredricks, James E. Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted real estate salesman license on conditions. Granted right to restricted real estate broker license after 2 years from effective date of Order on conditions)	420 Market St., San Francisco	4/28/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Blasdel, Joe Richard Real Estate Salesman	3791 Corona Ave., Norco	4/29/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Hollyhead, George Henry Real Estate Salesman	1394 Dakin Ave., Simi	5/ 5/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Lott, Travis Truman Real Estate Broker	2635 S. Western Ave., Los Angeles	5/ 5/65	Secs. 10145; 10176 (c), (j); 10177 (d), (f), (g); Secs. 2830, 2831 and 2832 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Waxman, Sol Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted license on conditions)	1550 34th Ave., San Francisco	5/ 5/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Reeves, Robert Briggs Real Estate Salesman	3750 Arboveda Rd., Los Angeles	5/11/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Menzie, Crystal Clarida Real Estate Broker	300 N. Wilshire, Anaheim	5/19/65	Secs. 10176 (i) and 10177 (f)
Dixon, Ruby Lee Secretary of Associated Property Owners Realty Service	1109 E. Vernon Ave., Los Angeles	5/25/65	Sec. 10177 (d) and (k)
Everett, Fred Real Estate Salesman (Granted right to restricted license 30 days from effective date of decision, on conditions)	7807 S. Western Ave., Los Angeles	5/25/65	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Gomez, Eugene Joseph Real Estate Broker Business Opportunity Broker	1255 Post St., San Francisco dba Gero's	5/25/65	Secs. 10145; 10177 (d), (f), (j); 10301 (e), (i); 10302 (d), (e) and (f)
Newman, Robert Barry President of Associated Property Owners Realty Service	1109 E. Vernon Ave., Los Angeles	5/25/65	Sec. 10177 (d) and (k)
Traylor, Arillia Mae Real Estate Broker (Granted right to restricted licenses on terms and conditions)	5800 Grove St., Oakland dba Traylor's Investment Agency dba Melrose Realty	5/25/65	Secs. 10145; 10176 (e), (g) and 10177 (f)

Licenses Suspended During April-May 1965

Name	Address	Effective date and term	Violation
Lindstrom, Hartwell Erling Real Estate Broker	2636 Ocean Ave., San Francisco	4/ 1/65 60 days	Secs. 10176 (b), (i) and 10177 (f)
Dow, Benjamin James Real Estate Broker	455 Alta Loma Lane, Santa Cruz	4/ 7/65 to and including 9/16/67	Secs. 10160; 10162; 10164; 10177 (d), (f) and Sec. 2771 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Holcsek, Frank Alois Real Estate Salesman	800 N. Ave. 50, Los Angeles	4/ 7/65 60 days	Sec. 10177 (b) and (f)
Tewes, Glenn Alvin Member of Tewes Realty Co.	4210 Eagle Rock Blvd., Los Angeles	4/ 8/65 90 days	Secs. 10176 (a), (d), (i); 10177 (f) and (j)
Tewes, Ruth Evelyn Member of Tewes Realty Co.	4210 Eagle Rock Blvd., Los Angeles	4/ 8/65 90 days	Secs. 10176 (a), (d), (i); 10177 (f) and (j)
Hosky, Richard Vice President, Great American Realty Corp.	1631 S. La Cienega Blvd., Los Angeles	4/14/65 30 days	Secs. 10137, 10177 (d) and (f)
dba Globe Properties Real Estate Broker (Stayed for one year on conditions)	6349 Coldwater Canyon, North Hollywood		
Becker, William Charles dba Allied Realty Real Estate Broker (Stayed for one year on conditions)	19 W. 41st Ave., San Mateo	4/30/65 90 days	Sec. 10177 (a) and (f)
Holub, Alfred Peter Real Estate Salesman	3441 Baster Ave., Napa	5/ 1/65 15 days	Secs. 10159.5; 10177 (c), (d); Secs. 2731 and 2732 of R.E. Comm. Reg.
Lemke, Gaylord Carson Real Estate Broker Member of L & M Sales Co.	2383 Pruneridge Ave., Santa Clara	5/ 4/65 5 days	Secs. 10151, 10177 (a), (d), (f) and (j)
Castaneda, Carlos Enrique Real Estate Broker President of Karlo Realty Co., Inc.	4017 24th St., San Francisco	5/ 6/65 20 days	Sec. 10177 (g)
Goff, Thomas Eugene Restricted Real Estate Salesman	1188 Diamond St., San Francisco 1999 Junipero Serra Blvd., Daly City	5/11/65 (Indefinitely)	Sec. 10177 (k)
Larson, Oscar Emanuel Real Estate Salesman (Execution of 165 days of suspension stayed for 3 years on conditions)	696 El Camino, North Sacramento	5/11/65 180 days	Secs. 10142; 10176 (a), (b), (i); 10177 (d), (f) and (j)

NEW SACRAMENTO ADDRESS FOR DIVISION OF REAL ESTATE

As announced in the June edition of the *Bulletin*, the DRE has moved to 111 Capitol Mall. The building lies at the intersection of the Capitol Mall and The Embarcadero (formerly Front Street) near the Tower Bridge.

EMPLOYING BROKERS CAN EASE TRANSFER PROBLEM

Brokers are in a position to curtail a practice which causes considerable confusion and costly crisscross correspondence. The practice is simply this: requesting transfer of a salesman license before it has been issued. At first glance this may seem improbable, but literally hundreds of such requests for transfer have to be rejected and returned together with instructions for proper procedure.

How does this happen? Here is the story: Thousands of potential real estate salesmen enroll with license examination preparation schools run or controlled by licensed real estate brokers who, as part of their service, sign the student's license application as the sponsoring or employing broker. In many cases, the student and the sponsor seem to have no intention of maintaining a continuing broker-salesman relationship.

Thus, receiving notice that he was successful in the examination, the applicant, without waiting for the actual issuance of his license, seeks out an employing broker and submits a license transfer form for him to sign. This transfer application, together with the transfer fee, is then directed to the Division of Real Estate, which has to return it with instructions that, since the license has not yet been issued, an original application for license, properly signed by the new broker, is in order.

an examination can take as many reexaminations as he chooses. The present law limits the license candidate to one reexamination.

Get the Facts Straight On License Law Change

Considerable misinformation is apparently being circulated as to the effects of AB 764, a bill which does away with the concept of the original one-year license. Some licensees—and perhaps other persons not licensed—seem to have the false impression that the whole real estate licensing situation is going to change drastically on January 2, 1966, the effective date of the new legislation.

To forestall a flood of premature and ill-considered license applications which will undoubtedly come if the rumors are not quashed, "let's look at the record". The qualification standards for real estate broker license, including examination, will remain exactly the same after the law is changed. The only difference: The successful applicant will be immediately eligible for the four-year broker license rather than a one-year license.

The serious candidate for real estate salesman license who intends to make a career in real estate will have to pass virtually the same type of examination he presently faces to stay in real estate beyond a two-year period. Brokers have complained that some

... May Forfeit Rights

A surprising number of persons have passed the original salesman license examination, but have not applied for their licenses. With the upcoming change in the law, if these people do not apply before January 2, 1966, they will automatically forfeit their right to make application for an original one-year salesman license (fee \$10).

If you know of any person in this situation, the commissioner will appreciate your forewarning them, so that they will not unknowingly lose this privilege.

successful salesmen have not been able to devote time for serious study in preparation for the present examination for the four-year renewal license, and find themselves abruptly out of business for a year. Or, worrying about the test, their production falls off. The principal reason for proposing the new legislation providing for one type of examination at entrance level for real estate salesman license was and is protection of the public by doing away with what has been in effect a "temporary" one-year license.

And, after January 1, 1966, the candidate for either real estate broker or salesman license who fails

ANNUAL REPORT

Summarizes Research Underway and Completed Projects

An analysis of reasons behind the current home building slump and a discussion of why the long-range housing picture is bright for California feature the *Annual Report*, available free from the University of California's real estate research centers at Berkeley and Los Angeles.

The report also summarizes research now underway at the centers as well as projects completed during the academic year, 1964-1965.

Decline Studied

Professor James Gillies of the Real Estate Research Program, Los Angeles, reports the current decline in housing stems from general overbuilding.

"Analysis of vacancy rates, foreclosures, and demand for mortgage credit indicates that the supply of new additions, plus the existing stock, has been greater than demand," he writes.

"This is an unique situation in the post-World War II residential housing market," he continues, "and it is unlikely that construction will once again move upward until this excess supply is absorbed by the market place."

Gillies' analysis places the current situation in an encouraging perspective. "Overbuilding," he reassures, "is a function of mistaken market analysis, not a symptom of major underlying problems.

"The downswing in residential building is more an indicator of the need for better planning and research on the part of lenders and builders than it is of any fundamental weakness in the basic economic structure of the state."

Demand Picture Bright

"In fact," Gillies states, "population growth, higher incomes, and credit availability point toward increased levels of activity in California real estate markets."

Equally optimistic are expectations based on income statistics. Gillies points out, "housing need is translated into demand only when people have enough money to purchase space. In this respect, California residents are extremely fortunate, for their average family income is well above that for the nation as a whole."

At the same time, "sharp increases

(Continued, Col. 1, Page 724)

Stockton Reaps Benefits From Urban Renewal Action

According to a study just published by the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics at Berkeley, the City of Stockton has reaped impressive benefits from urban renewal action in its blight-ridden, 189-acre eastern addition.

Not only has renewal resulted in such tangible benefits as lower costs for municipal services and better quality housing for hundreds of families, it also has fostered related intangible benefits which should contribute much to Stockton's future well-being.

This view of one city's renewal efforts is based on *Efficiency in Public Urban Renewal Expenditures Through Capital Budgeting*, a study financed by Real Estate Education Research and Recovery Fund through the Berkeley Center and written by Professor James C. T. Mao.

Tangible Effects

One of the most immediate results of renewal action was a sizeable saving in the costs of fire, police, and health protection. Mao estimates this at no less than \$137,500 annually.

He notes, however, that because Stockton is a growing city with growing expenses, "it is unlikely that renewal will bring about an actual reduction in the city's total expenditures for municipal services.

"More likely," he predicts, "the saving will take the form of a slower rate of increase than what would have prevailed had there been no renewal."

Before renewal, 75 percent of all dwelling units in the project area were substandard. Mao's findings indicate that relocation represented a giant step toward eliminating such inferior housing conditions.

"Among renters, 60 percent of all families and 40 percent of all single

EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER

University of California - State

FREE REPRINTS

New reprints available free from Berkeley and Los Angeles: Berkeley—*Price Movements of Building Sites in the United States* (Reprint No. 37) by Sherman J. Maisel. Los Angeles—*A Programming Model for Urban Development* (Reprint No. 36) by Leland S. Burns. *Prediction of the Incidence of Urban Blight* (Reprint No. 37) by Fred E. Case.

persons moved into standard housing after relocation," Mao reports. "Among owners, the corresponding percentages were 86 and 61, respectively. Clearly, the former residents of East Stockton have experienced an improvement in the quality of their housing."

Intangible Benefits

The report lists seven intangible benefits flowing from East Stockton Urban Renewal Project:

- The aesthetic value of having a residential slum replaced by an appealing neighborhood.
- The savings in lives resulting from reduced fire hazards.
- A more healthy population resulting from reduced incidence of certain communicable diseases.
- A more orderly society resulting from lower rates of crime and juvenile delinquency.
- Cultural benefits of another park and school built in the renewal area.
- Stimulus to racial integration through citywide dispersion of relocatees from the project.
- Improvement in the housing welfare of former residents of East Stockton.

The Mao study may be obtained by writing the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics, 340 Stephens Memorial Hall, University of California, Berkeley 94720. Price is \$2.50 plus 1 percent sales tax if ordered in California.

MAP PROGRAM

Colleges — Junior Colleges

New Town Builders Veer From Traditional Methods

New town builders and their massive projects are establishing trends which differ markedly from traditional methods of home building.

Michael D. Soper, former graduate researcher at the Berkeley Center, recently studied 15 bay area and Sacramento new towns and talked to many of the managers active in their development.

New Versus Old-line Firms

His findings, reported in the June issue of *California Builder* magazine, reveal sharp contrasts between today's new town developers and the builder-subdivider firms which have dominated the California scene since the early 1950's.

"Where the old-line firms are usually well grounded in the construction business," Soper finds, "this is becoming less and less the case with new town developers.

"In an increasing number of instances, the newer projects are backed by giant business firms representing such diverse areas of the economy as metals, petroleum, finance, and transportation."

Possessing little prior real estate experience, "many have had to build their staffs from scratch by absorbing already successful development firms into their operations."

Today's newer firms and the traditional "big builder" also differ in their profit expectations in the market. Says Soper, "the big builder is essentially a speculator concerned primarily with quick turnover and the resultant developer's profit.

"In contrast, new town builders are adopting a long-range attitude emphasizing equity buildup, tax shelter, and investment appreciation. They concentrate far less on actual construction than on comprehensive management of the entire project.

(Continued, Col. 1, Page 724)

Renters Disclose Likes and Dislikes in Recent Apartment Survey in San Diego

Size, location, and cleanliness, in that order, are what renters look for most when they go apartment hunting in metropolitan San Diego.

Secondary—but still important—considerations include storage space, on-site laundry facilities, and the condition of furnishings in furnished apartments.

Far down the list, at least for the bulk of renters, come such items as swimming pools, air conditioning, or steam rooms.

Source for these findings on tenant preferences in apartments is a new study completed with assistance from the Real Estate Education, Research and Recovery Fund by Associate Professor William H. Hippaka of the San Diego State College Bureau of Business and Economic Research. The findings should be applicable to tenants in most other metropolitan centers.

Entitled *Factors Contributing to Successful Investment Experience in Multiple-unit Housing*, the report is based on 298 field interviews with renters, managers, and owners of San Diego apartment buildings.

On the whole, tenants reported a high degree of satisfaction with their accommodations. Nearly nine out of 10 answered "yes" when asked, "Are you satisfied with your apartment?"

As to their reasons for preferring their apartment to a house, most answered that an apartment required less effort to maintain. "This definitely indicates," Hippaka observes, "that people living in apartments expect someone else (managers, owners) to do most of the work connected with maintaining and operating the property."

Location Preference

Respondents furnished a variety of answers when asked what they liked most about the *location* of their apartment. Almost one-third (there were 141 women in the sample) were pleased that the apartment was "close to shopping." Another one-fourth cited "closeness to work," and still another one-fourth listed "quiet neighborhood."

Hippaka considers tenant preferences on the question of location to be crucial to efficient property management. "No property manager can be

successful in the maximum sense of the word," writes the San Diego researcher, "without knowing what tenants consider to be the basis of apartment location desirability."

Not all, however, was perfect where location was concerned. About one out of every eight tenants in the survey disliked something about the area where his building was situated. Of all the complaints voiced, the most common was "noisy." Next came "amount of traffic," an objection which might have some relation to the noise factor.

Noise problems, it should be pointed out, were fairly common even among

Real Estate Bookshelf Sold Out

The 1964 edition of the *California Real Estate Bookshelf* has been sold out. At present, the Berkeley Center has no plans to reissue the publication.

those who reported general satisfaction with their own individual apartment units. Most often, the disturbances came from outside the building, but in about one-third of the cases, it originated in adjacent apartments. Owners should take steps to eliminate such problems, Hippaka counsels, for "the noise factor is a substantial contributor to vacancies in apartment properties."

Tenant Mobility

Overall, a large percentage of those contacted were committed to apartment living in general, and to their current apartments in particular. About half said they had no plans to move "in the next 12 months," while another 6 percent were "undecided." Of those who did expect to move, more than one-third indicated their

(Continued, Col. 3, Page 724)

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 157
SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Annual Report

(Continued from Col. 1, Page 720)

in property values have greatly enhanced the equity positions of many home owners. They now have an equity situation which they can, if they wish, convert into new debt for the acquisition of additional property," Gillies declares.

"And since long-term mortgage rates have not risen, mortgage money in mid-1965 is available at more attractive terms than at any time during the decade of the 1960's."

Gillies summarizes, "When all factors are considered, it is clear that the outlook for residential building, and real estate activity in general, is bright. In fact, there is not a single negative demand force currently operating in the California housing market."

The *Annual Report* is free from either the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics, University of California, Berkeley, or the Real Estate Research Program, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles.

New Town Builders

(Continued from Col. 1, Page 721)

"Different specialists are hired at each stage of development. Landscapers and engineers ready the sites; builders are then called in to build the homes; finally, the management itself will usually market its own dwellings."

Observes Soper, "this trend is creating a new kind of home builder, one

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SETS PROGRAM

Again this fall, University Extension, University of California, will offer a wide variety of real estate courses.

Classes will be given in: Berkeley, Buena Park, Burbank, Burlingame, Campbell, Chico, Davis, Downey, Fremont, Fresno, Glendale, Inglewood, Irvine, Lompoc, Los Angeles, Marysville, Monterey, Oxnard, Palo Alto, Pasadena, Redding, Redwood City, Riverside, Rosemead, Sacramento, Salinas, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Leandro, San Rafael, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Santa Maria, Santa Rosa, Stockton, Torrance, Van Nuys, Ventura and Walnut Creek.

For further information concerning courses get in touch with:

Northern California

University of California
University Extension
2223 Fulton Street
Berkeley 94704
Phone: 845-6000

Southern California *

University of California
University Extension
1100 So. Grand Ave., Room 315
Los Angeles 90015
Phone: 747-4321, Ex. 33

* Applications for the present basic Real Estate Certificate must be on file by October 1, 1965. All course work must be completed by September 1, 1966.

who doesn't become involved at all with site preparation."

To obtain a free reprint of the Soper article write the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics, 340 Stephens Memorial Hall, University of California, Berkeley 94720.

Apartment Survey

(Continued from Col. 3, Page 721)

next address would be another apartment.

A large number of the "movers," however, expressed intentions to acquire a house as their next residence. Many among this group were either young couples with growing families or single persons with imminent marriage plans.

Backgrounds of Respondents

About two-thirds of all tenants interviewed were married. Although there was a large sprinkling of persons 56 years old or older, the most numerous age group was the 16- to 36-year-old category. Female respondents outnumbered males about 7 to 3. In terms of income, most families earned between \$4,000 and \$7,500 annually.

In all, some 167 individual rental properties were represented in the study. Not surprisingly, in view of San Diego's recent apartment boom, about 58 percent of the buildings were only 10 years old or less. One out of four fell in the 10- to 25-year-old category, while approximately 12 percent were built 25 to 35 years ago. Five percent were "over 35."

Copies of the Hippaka study may be obtained from:

*The Division of Real Estate
Education and Publications Section
111 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814*

Cost of the publication is \$1, plus 4 percent state sales tax if ordered in California.