

Communication from Public

Name: David Scott Kadin

Date Submitted: 10/06/2026 08:49 AM

Council File No: 09-0969-S4

Comments for Public Posting: To: ALL CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS: Subject: OPPOSE Non-Applicant Appeal Fee Increase — Council File 09-0969-S4
Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers and City Officials: I am writing to formally object to the proposed increase in non-applicant appeal fees under Council File 09-0969-S4, and I urge the Committee to reject Option B23 as recommended by the Planning and Land Use Management Committee. I ask the Committee to consider the following: 1. These fees are already a serious barrier for working people. Raising them by 10 times the current rate does not make the process more efficient — it simply excludes anyone who cannot absorb a four-figure fee to be heard. Also, there is no rational relationship to charge different fees based upon who was legally entitled to notice and who was not. A right that only the wealthy can afford to exercise is not meaningfully a right at all. 2. Appeals by “aggrieved persons other than the applicant” exist precisely to give affected communities a voice. Developers and applicants already have resources, attorneys, and staff dedicated to navigating city processes. Non-applicant appellants are ordinary residents — renters, small homeowners, and community organizations — pushing back on decisions that affect their daily lives. Pricing them out tilts the entire system toward developers and against the public. A tone-deaf act like this sends a poisonous message to your own constituents that you do not care about their welfare and only about ramming harmful projects through the City’s approval process. 3. Cost recovery should not come at the expense of civic participation. The City has other tools to fund its planning and appeals processes — through general revenue or a surcharge on applicant fees — that do not require closing the door on public participation. Hearing and deciding constitutional land use appeal hearings is a fundamental function of your job and the local government. It is a legitimate expense of the General Fund. 4. If costs are truly motivating a desire to recover the cost of the planning department, levy a surcharge on the cause of the need for our communities to appeal land use decisions: the developers whose projects impact communities. You currently surcharge applicant-developers on all permits to pay for the General Plan. If you want to recover more money so it does not come out of the General Fund to pay for processing the few appeals the City’s

Planning Commissions and City Council hear each year, levy a surcharge across all development activity as a legitimate cost of having real estate development in the City. If you must have full cost recovery instead of any General Fund subsidy, spread that cost across the entire system that generates the necessity of having a constitutional hearing system of Area Planning Commissions and City Council hearings. 5. This disproportionately harms lower-income communities and communities of color, who are statistically less likely to have the discretionary income to pay these fees, even as they are often the communities most affected by land use decisions such as upzoning, spot zoning, and large-scale development. On this point, the CAO's cruel proposal is inconsistent with your own adopted General Plan goals, policies and programs intended to make the City a healthy, affordable, and equitable place to live. Putting a commitment for an equitable Los Angeles in the Health Element is just words. This decision is an act that puts those words to action -- or defeats them. I respectfully request that the Committee: • Reject the proposed fee increase under Option B23, and maintain the current appeal fee which is already a significant barrier for most people in Los Angeles; • Direct staff to develop a surcharge fee, as part of the current Plan surcharge, to recover a portion or all of the General Fund costs of land use appeals by spreading the cost recovery across all development activity of the City. There is a strong nexus between development activity and the need of the City to provide an outlet to improve projects to achieve the goal of healthy and safe communities. Thank you for your time and consideration. I care deeply about keeping Los Angeles's land use process open, fair, and accessible to all residents — not just those in the wealthy class who can afford to pay for a seat at the table. Sincerely, David Kadin, President Benedict Canyon Association
1611 San Ysidro Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
info@benedictcanyonassociation.org

Communication from Public

Name: Jill Demko

Date Submitted: 10/06/2026 12:14 PM

Council File No: 09-0969-S4

Comments for Public Posting: To: ALL CITY COUNCIL EMAIL ADDRESSES Subject: OPPOSE Non-Applicant Appeal Fee Increase — Council File 09-0969-S4 Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers and City Officials: I am writing to formally object to the proposed increase in non-applicant appeal fees under Council File 09-0969-S4, and I urge the Committee to reject Option B23 as recommended by the Planning and Land Use Management Committee. It seems with each budget cycle the billionaire class encourages the City Council to increase land use appeal fees as a means to maintain complete control over this government and silence their legitimate critics. I object strongly. We still have a constitution. We still have a right to correct ill-conceived and environmentally damaging projects – at least we ought to if our elected officials truly represent the public interest. Under the current proposal, a neighbor or community member who is aggrieved by a discretionary land use decision — and who is not the applicant — would be required to pay \$1,145 to appeal a project within the noticing radius, or \$2,289 to appeal one outside it. These fees, characterized by the real estate industry as “cost recovery,” would price ordinary Angelenos out of a process that is supposed to belong to them and give them a voice in our democracy. I would note that recent amendments to the noticing requirements of the City have reduced the notice area to immediately adjacent landowners, so this illogical scheme is really just a more than 10 fold increase in the land use appeal fee. It sends a poor message to our communities. I ask the Committee to consider the following:

1. These fees are already a serious barrier for working people. Raising them by 10 times the current rate does not make the process more efficient — it simply excludes anyone who cannot absorb a four-figure fee to be heard. Also, there is no rational relationship to charge different fees based upon who was legally entitled to notice and who was not. A right that only the wealthy can afford to exercise is not meaningfully a right at all.
2. Appeals by “aggrieved persons other than the applicant” exist precisely to give affected communities a voice. Developers and applicants already have resources, attorneys, and staff dedicated to navigating city processes. Non-applicant appellants are ordinary residents — renters, small homeowners, and community organizations — pushing back on decisions that affect their daily

lives. Pricing them out tilts the entire system toward developers and against the public. A tone-deaf act like this sends a poisonous message to your own constituents that you do not care about their welfare and only about ramming harmful projects through the City's approval process. 3. Cost recovery should not come at the expense of civic participation. The City has other tools to fund its planning and appeals processes — through general revenue or a surcharge on applicant fees — that do not require closing the door on public participation. Hearing and deciding constitutional land use appeal hearings is a fundamental function of your job and the local government. It is a legitimate expense of the General Fund. 4. If costs are truly motivating a desire to recover the cost of the planning department, levy a surcharge on the cause of the need for our communities to appeal land use decisions: the developers whose projects impact communities. You currently surcharge applicant-developers on all permits to pay for the General Plan. If you want to recover more money so it does not come out of the General Fund to pay for processing the few appeals the City's Planning Commissions and City Council hear each year, levy a surcharge across all development activity as a legitimate cost of having real estate development in the City. If you must have full cost recovery instead of any General Fund subsidy, spread that cost across the entire system that generates the necessity of having a constitutional hearing system of Area Planning Commissions and City Council hearings. I respectfully request that the Committee:

- Reject the proposed fee increase under Option B23, and maintain the current appeal fee which is already a significant barrier for most people in Los Angeles;
- Direct staff to develop a surcharge fee, as part of the current General Plan surcharge, to recover a portion or all of the General Fund costs of land use appeals by spreading the cost recovery across all development activity of the City.

There is a strong nexus between development activity and the need of the City to provide an outlet to improve projects to achieve the goal of healthy and safe communities. Thank you for your time and consideration. I care deeply about keeping Los Angeles's land use process open, fair, and accessible to all residents — not just those in the wealthy class who can afford to pay for a seat at the table. Jill Demko 1676 Ferrari Dr., Beverly Hills , CA 90210 frigidfanny@sbcglobal.net

Communication from Public

Name: Amy Ludwig

Date Submitted: 10/06/2026 03:35 PM

Council File No: 09-0969-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I object to the proposed increase in non-applicant appeal fees under Council File 09-0969-S4, and urge the Committee to reject Option B23 as recommended by the PLUM Committee. The City Council increases land use appeal fees as a means to maintain complete control over this government and silence their legitimate critics. I object strongly. We still have a constitution. We still have a right to correct ill-conceived and environmentally damaging projects – at least we ought to if our elected officials truly represent the public interest. Under the current proposal, a neighbor or community member who is aggrieved by a discretionary land use decision — and who is not the applicant — would be required to pay \$1,145 to appeal a project within the noticing radius, or \$2,289 to appeal one outside it. These fees, characterized by the real estate industry as “cost recovery,” would price ordinary Angelenos out of a process that is supposed to give them a voice in our democracy. I would note that recent amendments to the noticing requirements of the City have reduced the notice area to immediately adjacent landowners, so this illogical scheme is really just a more than 10 fold increase in the land use appeal fee. It sends a poor message to our communities. I ask the Committee to consider the following: 1. These fees are already a serious barrier for working people. Raising them by 10 times the current rate does not make the process more efficient — it simply excludes anyone who cannot absorb a four-figure fee to be heard. Also, there is no rational relationship to charge different fees based upon who was legally entitled to notice and who was not. A right that only the wealthy can afford to exercise is not meaningfully a right at all. 2. Appeals by “aggrieved persons other than the applicant” exist precisely to give affected communities a voice. Developers and applicants already have resources, attorneys, and staff dedicated to navigating city processes. Non-applicant appellants are ordinary residents — renters, small homeowners, and community organizations — pushing back on decisions that affect their daily lives. Pricing them out tilts the entire system toward developers and against the public. A tone-deaf act like this sends a poisonous message to your own constituents that you do not care about their welfare and only about ramming harmful projects through the City’s approval process. 3. Cost recovery should not come at the expense of civic

participation. The City has other tools to fund its planning and appeals processes — through general revenue or a surcharge on applicant fees — that do not require closing the door on public participation. Hearing and deciding constitutional land use appeal hearings is a fundamental function of your job and the local government. It is a legitimate expense of the General Fund. 4. If costs are truly motivating a desire to recover the cost of the planning department, levy a surcharge on the cause of the need for our communities to appeal land use decisions: the developers whose projects impact communities. You currently surcharge applicant-developers on all permits to pay for the General Plan. If you want to recover more money so it does not come out of the General Fund to pay for processing the few appeals the City's Planning Commissions and City Council hear each year, levy a surcharge across all development activity as a legitimate cost of having real estate development in the City. If you must have full cost recovery instead of any General Fund subsidy, spread that cost across the entire system that generates the necessity of having a constitutional hearing system of Area Planning Commissions and City Council hearings. 5. This disproportionately harms lower-income communities and communities of color, who are statistically less likely to have the discretionary income to pay these fees, even as they are often the communities most affected by land use decisions such as upzoning, spot zoning, and large-scale development. On this point, the CAO's cruel proposal is inconsistent with your own adopted General Plan goals, policies and programs intended to make the City a healthy, affordable, and equitable place to live. Putting a commitment for an equitable Los Angeles in the Health Element is just words. This decision is an act that puts those words to action -- or defeats them. I respectfully request that the Committee:

- Reject the proposed fee increase under Option B23, and maintain the current appeal fee which is already a significant barrier for most people in Los Angeles;
- Direct staff to develop a surcharge fee, as part of the current General Plan surcharge, to recover a portion or all of the General Fund costs of land use appeals by spreading the cost recovery across all development activity of the City.

I care deeply about keeping Los Angeles's land use process open, fair, and accessible to all residents — not just the wealthy ones.