

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 03:41 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Council Member Hernandez@lacity.org, On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions drove the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-a>er-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-a>er-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance)

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 03:45 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Council member nazarian@lacity.org On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions drove the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-a>er-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-a>er-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance)

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 03:48 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Councilmember.blumenfield.lacity.org. On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions drove the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-a-er-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-a-er-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-a-er-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-a-er-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance)

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 03:51 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Council member anissa.raja@lacity.org, On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions drove the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-a>er-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-a>er-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance)

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 04:11 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Council member arus.grigoryan.lacity.org On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions drove the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance-underinsured/](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance-underinsured/) For example: • Los Angeles County has already waived rebuilding and permitting fees for victims of the Eaton Fire • After the Woolsey Fire, local jurisdictions reduced or waived rebuilding and permitting fees to help residents return more quickly. • Following the Camp Fire in Paradise, governments streamlined approvals and waived fees to avoid further financial harm to displaced residents. • After the Northridge Earthquake, Los Angeles itself reduced and waived fees to accelerate recovery and stabilize affected communities. These actions were taken because policymakers recognized the impact of long-term fiscal planning and this simple truth: disaster victims should not be penalized for events completely beyond their control. Residents who lost homes, duplexes, townhomes or condominiums in the Palisades fire are taxpayers who have contributed to this City for years and often decades. They did not ask for their properties to burn, and they should not be burdened with additional fees at the moment they are most vulnerable. Traci Park, our Councilwoman, supports waiving these fees because she sees the devastation.

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Rogers

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 04:13 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Building Permit Fees for Pacific Palisades Fire Victims Dear Council member .hutt.lacity.org, On the morning of January 7, 2025, thousands of Pacific Palisades residents woke up expecting an ordinary day. None of us chose to have our homes destroyed, our neighborhoods erased, or our lives abruptly upended by fire. Yet overnight, hardworking Los Angeles taxpayers lost everything and now face the prospect of being charged by their own city simply to rebuild what was taken from them. I am writing to urge you to rely on realistic assumptions, historical precedent, and long-term fiscal outcomes to support waiving building permit fees for Palisades residents. Mayor Bass issued an executive order on April 25, 2025, furthering a motion to waive plan check and permit fees for Angelenos rebuilding homes damaged or destroyed by the fires. The City Accounting Office (CAO) provided an estimate of \$86 million as the amount of potentially waived fees. 1 That estimate included single-family homes and duplexes to be rebuilt within 110% of the original footprint. Over the summer, the CAO released a revised estimate projecting \$278 million in potential waived permit and plan check fees. The revised maximum estimate expanded the scope of eligible projects to include multifamily and commercial properties, and it assumed that all affected property owners would rebuild with projects constructed up to 150% of the original structure size. These assumptions even the estimate dramatically upward but do not reflect how post-disaster rebuilding typically occurs. Experience from other large-scale fire events in California shows a different pattern. 2 A conservative assumption based on previous fires in California is that approximately 40% of properties are rebuilt, and that rebuilt homes are generally similar in size, not dramatically larger, due to insurance limits, financing constraints, zoning restrictions, and personal circumstances.3 Assuming universal rebuilding at the maximum allowable size significantly inflates the projected fee total beyond what is realistic. It is also important to note that the CAO's estimate is not a cost estimate, but rather a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. It represents the total fees the City could collect under the most aggressive rebuilding assumptions. Viewed through this lens, the estimate actually demonstrates that the City stands to realize substantial net revenue from post-fire rebuilding, even if certain fees are waived. For example, if 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners and the remaining 60% are sold and rebuilt at or near the maximum allowable size, the City would generate approximately \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fee revenue based on the CAO's own \$278 million estimate even after waiving building permit fees for original owners who rebuild. This represents \$166.8 million in incremental revenue attributable solely to post-fire rebuilding and property turnover which is revenue that would not exist if the fire didn't happen. There are other reasons to waive permit fees and encourage rebuilding. Rebuilt homes restore the property tax base; new construction increases assessed values; sales, use, and utility taxes rise with renewed occupancy; long-term economic activity resumes more quickly. There are also clear precedents for fee waivers after disasters. Waiving rebuilding fees after catastrophic events is not new, unusual, or fiscally reckless. It is a well-established practice throughout California and the nation following major disasters. 1 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass](https://www.la.mes.com/california/story/2025-07-17/six-months-after-palisades-fire-mayor-karen-bass) 2 [h#ps://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires](https://www.la.mes.com/homeless-housing/story/2025-09-30/rebuilding-california-after-major-wildfires) 3 [h#ps://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance-underinsured/](https://www.sfchronicle.com/projects/2025/california-home-insurance-underinsured/) For example: • Los Angeles County has already waived rebuilding and permitting fees for victims of the Eaton Fire • After the Woolsey Fire, local jurisdictions reduced or waived rebuilding and permitting fees to help residents return more quickly. • Following the Camp Fire in Paradise, governments streamlined approvals and waived fees to avoid further financial harm to displaced residents. • After the Northridge Earthquake, Los Angeles itself reduced and waived fees to accelerate recovery and stabilize affected communities. These actions were taken because policymakers recognized the impact of long-term fiscal planning and this simple truth: disaster victims should not be penalized for events completely beyond their control. Residents who lost homes, duplexes, townhomes or condominiums in the Palisades fire are taxpayers who have contributed to this City for years and often decades. They did not ask for their properties to burn, and they should not be burdened with additional fees at the moment they are most vulnerable. Traci Park, our Councilwoman, supports waiving these fees because she sees the devastation firsthand.

Communication from Public

Name: John Emerson
Date Submitted: 01/17/2026 01:09 PM
Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, My name is John Emerson. Our family home of over 30 years was destroyed in the Palisades fire. My wife Annette Yu and I raised three beautiful daughters in that home. They lost all of their treasured possessions as did we. Most of our neighbors lost their home and our community was destroyed. Before the fire, Annette and I were content knowing that the house was paid off, the kids grown, and we would finally be able to enjoy retirement. Now we're looking at a thirty year mortgage on a fixed income to be able to rebuild our home. We did not sign up for this. I find myself asking, "Where was the water to fight the fire?", "Where were the fireman to fight the fire?", "Where was the evacuation plan to help people escape the fire?", "Why didn't the fire department use IR to detect hot spots after the January 1st fire?". In short, I'm very upset with the city for having failed us. The least the city can do for us now is to support what Karen Bass has already promised. I am writing to implore you to vote to waive plan check and permit fees for the rebuilds of ALL homes (i.e., single family, duplex, condominiums, and townhouses) destroyed in the Palisades Fire. This matter is critical as the change impacts all homeowners whose homes were destroyed in the wildfires. Further, in the case of condominiums and townhouses, the costs additionally will be borne by all HOA members as they will be impacted through loss assessments levied by their respective HOAs. Early estimates indicate these fees could range from \$30,000 to more than \$100,000 per single-family homeowner/HOA. The City Council must include in this ordinance ALL impacted homeowners if you are truly committed to expediting the recovery effort until EVERY family is back home. As a community, we are interdependent and cannot fully recover when parts of the community are excluded. A high percentage of homeowners, particularly condominium and townhouse owners, are retired, on fixed incomes, underinsured, or have lower incomes. We all vote and pay property, income, and sales taxes and are entitled to the same public recovery resources. There is plenty of precedent in California for waiving these fees in response to natural disasters: In 1994, in response to the Northridge Earthquake, the Los Angeles City Council waived all plan-check and permit fees for repairing, demolishing, or rebuilding structures damaged or destroyed in the disaster. https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/los_angeles/latest/lamc/0-0-0-190107 In 2018, in response to the Woolsey Fire, the City of Malibu waived planning and building permit fees for properties destroyed in the disaster. <https://www.malibucity.org/DocumentCenter/View/24698/Fee-Waiver-FAQ> In 2020, in response to the Glass Fire in Northern California, the City of Santa Rosa waived planning and other permit fees. <https://www.srcity.org/2674/Resilient-City-Zoning> In 2021, in response to the Dixie Fire in Northern California in 2021, Nevada County waived planning and building permit fees for properties destroyed in the disaster. <https://yubanet.com/regional/nevada-county-provides-priority-permitting-and-fee-waiver-for-winter-storm-damage/> We are prepared to invest in our city's future, but we cannot move forward until we know that all rebuilding-related plan check and permit fees have been waived, not simply deferred. Please help us right this wrong and clear the way for the entire Palisades community to recover, rebuild, and restart our lives. Sincerely, John J Emerson 17030 Bollinger Drive Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/17/2026 06:43 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Plan Check and Building Permit Fees for All Pacific Palisades Fire Survivors Dear Councilmember, A Year and one week ago my family lost our family home that we built 25 years ago. Our Children were raised in that home. We also lost everything in the home, all that is left is memories, and hope. A hope to rebuild. I respectfully urge you to vote yes on waiving plan check and building permit fees for all Pacific Palisades fire survivors—especially owners of condominiums, townhomes, mobile homes, and apartment buildings, which constitute the community’s remaining affordable housing. Waiving rebuilding fees for all Palisadians is a matter of equity. Failure to waive these fees will directly cause displacement. Rebuilding fees are not a minor inconvenience; for multi-unit homeowners and renters, they are a decisive barrier to recovery. Residents in these housing types are disproportionately retirees, underinsured households, and people with limited access to credit. Without relief, many will never return. This displacement is already happening. Two condominium/townhome HOAs—representing 61 households—have been forced to sell their land because they could not afford to rebuild. This is not an anomaly; it is a warning. Without immediate and universal fee relief, more multi-unit housing will fail, more land will be sold, and more affordable housing will be permanently lost. The City Administrative Officer’s estimate of the cost to waive fees is fundamentally flawed. The revised \$278 million figure assumes that 100% of affected properties will rebuild at 150% of their original size. This assumption is contradicted by decades of post-fire rebuilding data in California, which shows that only about 40% of properties are rebuilt by original owners. Multi-unit housing is typically rebuilt at or near original size due to insurance limits, HOA rules, zoning constraints, and financing realities. Plan check and permit fees for multi-unit housing represent a negligible portion of overall rebuilding costs, yet they are enough to prevent recovery for the most vulnerable residents. Worse still, denying this relief is fiscally unsound. Approximately 60% of all properties will be sold and rebuilt by new owners, generating an estimated \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fees—revenue the City would not otherwise receive. Waiving fees for original owners does not deprive the City; it accelerates

recovery. Los Angeles is one city. This is not a request to subsidize a single neighborhood—it is a choice about whether the City will allow displacement to cascade across the housing system. Preventing the loss of multi-unit housing in Pacific Palisades reduces pressure on already scarce housing citywide, protects the tax base, and supports jobs. If a disaster struck your district tomorrow, your constituents would expect fairness, urgency, and leadership. Pacific Palisades residents deserve the same. I urge you to stand for equity, prevent permanent displacement, and vote to waive plan check and building permit fees for all impacted Palisadians—especially owners of condominiums, townhomes, mobile homes, and apartment buildings. Sincerely, Jason Clark 941 Kagawa Street Pacific Palisades, Ca 90272

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy Fracchiolla

Date Submitted: 01/16/2026 09:55 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Subject: Please Waive Plan Check and Building Permit Fees for All Pacific Palisades Fire Survivors I respectfully urge you to vote yes on waiving plan check and building permit fees for all Pacific Palisades fire survivors, including owners of condominiums, townhomes, mobile homes, and apartment buildings that make up much of the community's remaining affordable housing. On January 7, 2025, thousands of Angelenos lost their homes overnight to a catastrophic fire. They did not choose this loss, yet they now face city fees simply to rebuild. For many, especially seniors and residents of multi-unit housing, these fees are not incidental—they are a decisive barrier that will force displacement. Without universal fee relief, our most vulnerable residents and much of the community's affordable housing will be permanently lost. Waiving rebuilding fees is a matter of fairness and common sense. The City Administrative Officer's \$278 million estimate of potentially waived fees is based on unrealistic assumptions—that every affected property will rebuild at up to 150% of its original size. Decades of post-fire rebuilding data in California show that only about 40% of properties are typically rebuilt by original owners, and most rebuilds are close to original size due to insurance limits, zoning rules, HOA restrictions, and financing constraints. The estimate significantly overstates any potential loss. This figure is not a cost; it is a theoretical maximum revenue estimate. Under realistic assumptions, the City will still collect substantial new revenue from post-fire rebuilding. If roughly 60% of properties are sold and rebuilt by new owners, the City would generate an estimated \$166.8 million in permit and plan check fees—revenue that would not exist without the fire. Waiving fees for original owners does not deprive the City; it accelerates recovery. Los Angeles is one city. This is not a request to subsidize a single neighborhood—it is a choice about whether the City will allow displacement to cascade across the housing system. Preventing the loss of houses and multi-unit housing in Pacific Palisades reduces pressure on already scarce housing citywide, protects the tax base, and supports jobs. If a disaster struck your district tomorrow, your constituents would expect fairness, urgency, and leadership. Pacific Palisades residents deserve the same. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of waiving plan check and building permit fees for all Pacific

Palisades fire survivors. Sincerely, Nancy Fracchiolla

Communication from Public

Name: Diane Elander

Date Submitted: 01/20/2026 01:19 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S57

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council Members, January 7th left us with the TOTAL destruction of our home of 25 years in Pacific Palisades. The fire wiped out our treasured photos, family heirlooms, musical instruments, files of professional work both for mine and my husband professions, and countless pieces of our 40 years of marriage and childhood memories for our 3 children, that we can never replace or recapture. It also destroyed our mature, enchanted garden that I toiled on monthly for the 25 years we owned our home- making it our oasis for rest, play, gatherings and production of food for our family, friends and neighbors. To REBUILD what we built 25 years ago is impossible. The insurance and time it would take are prohibitive. To walk away now would mean throwing money away as a loss. Money will not bring back what we have lost, but it is needed to rebuild a place to live, in a neighborhood and community which we also invested in heavily for the good of our family and community. Despite the fact that we have been financially responsible as we near retirement age, we never could have been prepared for this disaster. We ask that you consider not only the mental anguish this has caused, but also the disruption to our financial stability the fire and subsequent events have thrown upon us and our entire community . please vote to WAIVE the rebuild permit and associated fees so that we can return to our beloved community and once again support our neighbors and the greater city of Los Angeles.