



July 26, 2021

Dear Council Member Guerra:

We are writing to ask that you remove from consideration or vote no on the proposed Massage Therapy as a Home Occupation ordinance.

We object to this proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) Allowing up to 8 clients per day to be seen in a home is NOT in keeping with the intention of home occupation regulations which are: “to reduce and control the impact of a home occupation so that its effects on a neighborhood are undetectable from normal and usual residential activity.” Having clients come and go from a residence will not be “undetectable” from other usual residential activity. We further understand that these businesses would be allowed to operate from 6:30am to 10pm and to have three employees – provisions that make it even less likely that they will be “undetectable”.
- 2) This ordinance would set a negative precedent to allow clients and treatment for any “healing professional”. Under current law, office visits and treatment is not allowed at the permitted residences for “healing arts professional, including physician, surgeon, chiropractor, physical therapist, acupuncturist, and massage therapy practitioner.” As one of several neighborhoods heavily impacted by adjacent medical facilities, we do not want to open the door for these medical offices to operate in the homes in our neighborhoods.
- 3) Like other neighborhoods, we currently have illegal drug houses operating in our neighborhood with traffic coming and going. These have been reported to the police but continue to operate to the detriment of neighbors and the neighborhood. Given this situation with drug houses, if this ordinance were to be adopted, we question whether the police would be able to monitor or shut down an illegal massage therapy operation that could significantly contribute to sex trafficking.
- 4) Sacramento has a shortage of housing and underutilized commercial space. There is no need to turn homes into businesses as this proposal would do. Therapists can rent available suitable office space and also go to their clients’ homes to perform services.
- 5) Changes to ordinances should not be done to benefit a few at the expense of the many. This proposed ordinance is a prime example and should be turned down.

Please respond to our concerns. We are also happy to have a meeting with you and other concerned neighbors on this matter.

Sincerely,

*Elmhurst Neighborhood Association Board*

Cc Sacramento City Council, [publiccomment@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:publiccomment@cityofsacramento.org)