

Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

Fwd: In Support of Quality Sober Living Homes and Opposed to Proposed Brdng Hse Ordinance

1 message

Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Wed, Mar 23, 2011 at 5:01 PM

To: Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message ------

From: LA County Sober Living Coalition CPC Petition < lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 23, 2011 at 4:19 PM

Subject: Fwd: In Support of Quality Sober Living Homes and Opposed to Proposed Brdng Hse

Ordinance

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org, Ed.Reyes@lacity.org, Paul.Krekorian@lacity.org, Jose.

Huizar@lacity.org

From: Carleen Dougherty < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 4:04 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

We here in this Petition,

Oppose Ordinance CPC-2009-800-CA – Council File 07-34-27 as currently constituted, and find it to be discriminatory against Sober Living Homes and to the families that such institutions help to create and maintain. We wish to bring to the attention of the City Planning Commission and the City Council the following:

Sober living homes provide housing and supportive family environments and resources to people in recovery from addiction. Sober living has been an integral, clinical part of recovery for over 75 years.

As presently constituted, this ordinance will have a disparate impact on groups of disabled persons, including those on parole and probation, seeking single family housing. We believe that this ordinance is supported by an illegitimate and discriminatory intent, ignoring fair housing and reasonable accommodation case law for "families of disabled persons living together in mutual support (Sober Living)".

This ordinance cannot justify its proposed redefinition of family, single housekeeping units, and reclassification of penal institutions which will severely restrict the way unrelated people can live together in low density residential areas, (zones R1, R2, RD) since the principal means for this type of shared housing is through multiple leases or other individual financial arrangements.

We, the undersigned agree with the findings of the 1997 American Planning Association, Policy Guide on Community Residences (1) which include:

- 1) Community residences (sober living homes) are a legitimate residential use of property, and are not boarding houses.
- 2) Community residences have no effect on the value of neighborhood properties, established by over 50 studies, even for immediately adjacent properties.
- 3) Community residences have no effect on neighborhood safety. In fact residents of group homes are far less likely to commit crimes than members of the general population.
- (1) American Planning Association Policy Guide on Community Residences, 1997 Adopted by Special Delegate Assembly, September 21, 1997; Ratified by Board of Directors, September 22, 1997. The full report can be downloaded at http://www.planning.org/policy/guides/adopted/commres.htm

We recognize and value the many benefits sober living homes can provide to the City including; reduced crime, reduced homelessness, reduced dependency on City and other public services, reduced family and neighborhood violence and other benefits. We also recognize that these benefits, unlike other social service programs, are provided at virtually no cost to the City and its residents.

By affixing our names to this document, we implore the City of Los Angeles to reject the proposed ordinance as presently constituted and to provide reasonable access to treatment and recovery for all families.

Carleen Dougherty Encino, CA

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/las-war-on-renters---opposed-to-boarding-house-proposal-and-supporting-quality-sober-living-homes. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

From: Helene Heurtin < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 4:50 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Helene Heurtin Northridge, CA

From: Linda Perez < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 7:21 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Linda Perez Chatsworth, CA -----

From: Maria F. < mail@change.org > Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 8:04 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Maria F. Verona, Italy

From: Clifford Richardson < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 9:47 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Clifford Richardson London, United Kingdom

From: **Sharon Dunas** < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 12:01 PM To: <u>lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com</u>

Sharon Dunas Los Angeles, CA

From: Gail Evanguelidi < mail@change.org>

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 1:07 PM To: <u>lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com</u>

I am an NAMI (National Alliance on Mental Illness) Board of Director for the state of California. If you close these facilities it will cost the county about \$250,000 to \$900,000per person in future treatment and county fundings. It is cost effective to maintain these facilities and give the basic need for housing to those in need.

Gail Evanguelidi Beverly Hills, CA

From: **STELLA MARCH** < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 3:10 PM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

STELLA MARCH

LOS ANGELES, CA

From: Louis Goldsmith < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 3:22 PM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Louis Goldsmith Sherman Oaks, CA

From: Rosina Ehrlich < mail@change.org >

Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 4:37 PM To: <u>lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com</u>

Rosina Ehrlich Los Angeles, CA

From: **lyn slotky** <<u>mail@change.org</u>>
Date: Mon, Feb 7, 2011 at 10:59 PM
To: <u>lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com</u>

lyn slotky La Candada, CA

From: Marillyn Smith < mail@change.org >

Date: Tue, Feb 8, 2011 at 1:38 AM To: lacslccpcpetition@gmail.com

Marillyn Smith Pasadena, CA