

From: **Barbara Broide** <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jun 11, 2010 at 2:51 PM

Subject: WNC passed the motion below in support of 09-0969-S1 last night

To: Christopher Koontz <chris.koontz@lacity.org>, Jay Greenstein <jay.greenstein@lacity.org>, David Hersch - CD 5 <david.hersch@lacity.org>

At last night's June 10 Westside NC meeting, we passed (by vote of 6-4 with 6 abstaining) the motion below in support of Councilmember Koretz's CF No. 09-0969-01 motion.

Since the hearing on this matter comes before Council on Tuesday, I doubt that any formal transmittal will be sent by WNC to the City Clerk by WNC. I will ask chair Tippit to forward the motion to the City Clerk, but I would suggest that your office transmit it to whomever you believe should have it.

Thanks,
Barbara

From: bbroide@hotmail.com
To: tmtippit@ca.rr.com
CC: jay.greenstein@lacity.org; chris.koontz@lacity.org
Subject: RE: May Minutes
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 2010 12:39:22 -0700

Motion --That the:

Westside Neighborhood Council endorses/supports Councilmember Koretz's motion (Council File No. 09-0969-S1) to accelerate the phase-in of full cost recovery for development entitlements (as described and reviewed in a 2008 comprehensive fee study report prepared by the Planning Dept. in 2008). We urge the approval of the full Council in its consideration of this motion which has the potential of bringing in reimbursements of over \$ 840,000 in the coming fiscal year -- enough to save 8 or more staff positions.

Background:

This motion seeks full cost-recovery for entitlements for deviations from the zoning code. This halts the practice of general funds/tax revenues being used to subsidize development and implements a policy that was adopted by the full City Council in 2009. At that time the City sought to phase in the fee schedules over three years. No phase in was implemented at that time in 2009 so this measure seeks to take action now by halting the phase in (that never occurred) and implementing full cost recovery. The accelerated phase-in would result in \$ 844,000 in FY 2010-2011 General Fund revenue savings which can be used for more critical General Fund needs given the current budget situation.

Appeal fees remain unaffected and the Council has voted to adopt a fee of \$ 89 for appeals by aggrieved (non-applicant) parties. That fee is not proposed to change.

Homeowners seeking to remodel their homes will experience no impact due to no planning entitlement. There will be no impact on new home construction. Major Design Review for a single family home will result in a \$ 310 increase. Single family homes seeking oversized permits under the mansionization ordinance will have a \$ 308 increase. Again, this reflects the seeking of entitlements beyond what the code allows. Properties in Historic Preservation Districts (HPOZ) that are conforming will not be affected.

The CAP increase will not increase the cost for a small business to obtain building permits to buildout new stores or offices, will not increase their business license, taxes or fees. Small businesses requiring entitlements will see a marginal increase in fees in order to fulfill the council's policy of full cost-recovery. The most common small-business entitlement is an alcohol conditional use permit. The increased cost of the full acceleration vs. phased acceleration would be \$ 749 (\$6540 vs. \$ 5791).

The increase will be seen in larger projects where that cost will be negligible in impact in relation to the cost of a given project. The example of a 150 unit residential project requiring a tract map, site plan review and a mitigated negative declaration will result in an increase of \$ 3067 (\$ 27,697 vs. \$ 24,630).

to seek accelerated reimbursement of permit fees to halt subsidization.