

<https://medium.com/@sbuss/software-was-eating-the-world-now-landlords-are-eating-everything-e21ba6802f54>

In a fundraising effort that made the [frontpage of Hacker News this week](#), Steven Buss attempts to highlight a serious issue:

Landlords are taking \$1 of every \$8 in venture capital investments.

As proof, he cites the increase in median rent (\$1,050), compared to the increase in seed round size (\$1.6MM) between 2011 and 2018, a statistic which bizarrely runs contrary to his political claims.

In 2011, median rent was \$2,600 and median seed round was \$500k, meaning that a round of funding bought you about 192 months of housing.

In comparison, by EOY 2018, rent had increased to \$3,650, but the median seed round shot up much much more to \$2.1MM, enough for 575 months of housing.

In other words, even though the cost of housing has risen, **seed rounds pay for almost 3 times as much housing as they used to.**

Still, \$1 out of \$8 sounds pretty bad, but it's based entirely on Buss's assumption that a seed round "should last four years", a notion not at all grounded in reality.

It's admittedly difficult to tell exactly what the correct assumption here would be. [Crunchbase](#) writes that "the time between each round can vary between six months to one year", and [Forbes](#) estimates that the "runway between rounds can be as short as 12 months but some entrepreneurs push it to 6 months."

Anecdotally, a16z's last 3 investments spent around 11 months between rounds.

[FlyHomes](#): Seed October 2017, Series A May 2018 (9 months)

[Singularity 6](#): Seed September 2018, Series A August 2019 (11 months)

[Hipcamp](#): Seed December 2016, Series A November 2017 (11 months)

Using these new numbers, we get:

Increase in median rent paid for by seed round: \$50k (4 people * 12 months * \$1,050 increase)

Increase in seed round size: \$1,600,000

Proportion of new funding being taken by landlords: **less than \$1 out of every \$30.**

A median rent of \$3,650 is still ridiculous, but don't be fooled into thinking that number is at all representative of what the average SF tech working can expect to pay.

At [Avalon](#), rent for a 2br starts at \$4,895, or \$2,450/person.

At [Solaire](#), \$5,125, or \$2,550/person.

At [Ashton](#), it's \$4,900, again, \$2,450/person.

That's still expensive, but it's also top of market in brand new luxury apartment complexes.

2 seconds on [Craig's List](#), gets you 50+ postings for 3br apartments for under \$2,000/person, all in the heart of SF, many of which are even quite nice. Like this [SOMA 3br](#) for \$1930/person. Or this [4br](#) for \$1,450/person.

Another luxury apartment complex, the [Webster Tower and Terrace](#), has 2brs for \$1675/person, and 3brs for \$1,370/person.

To be clear, there is absolutely a housing crisis, just not for tech workers.

The most recent [Point-in-Time Count](#) shows homelessness up 17% since the last count in 2017. Unsheltered homelessness is up 19%.

Despite the popular narratives excusing homelessness, the [full report](#) shows that:

- 70% of homeless people were in San Francisco when they lost housing
- 65% have been homeless for over a year, (up from 51% in 2015)
- 63% cite the cost of rent as the obstacle to obtaining housing

There is Below Market Rate housing available, but it's given out through a lottery, with your odds of winning [hovering around 1.4%](#)

Keep in mind that this all goes directly against a national trend of [consistently decreasing homelessness](#).

Overall, this was a misguided article from Buss that misrepresented data to promote his political agenda.