clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 09-0969-S4 - Agenda Item Number: 35

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com> Tue, Nov 10, 2026 at 10:19 AM
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: hkatchen@shermanoaksnc.org, Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enable by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website.Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Councils rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

******** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. ********

Contact Information
Neighborhood Council: Sherman Oaks
Name: Howard Katchen
Email: hkatchen@shermanoaksnc.org
The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(11) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)
Date of NC Board Action: 11/09/2026
Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information
Date: 11/10/2026
Update to a Previous Input: No
Directed To: City Council and Committees
Council File Number: 09-0969-S4
City Planning Number:
Agenda Date: 11/10/2026
Item Number: 35
Summary: Please see the attached letter for details on Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC) position to reconsider and oppose the proposed increases in non-applicant appeal fees.

Planning Land Use Fees Update.pdf
180K

Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council

shermanoaksnc.org

November 10, 2026

Re: Council File No. 09-0969-S4 Planning Land Use Fees Update / Annual Inflation Adjustment Planning Land Use Fees Update / Annual Inflation Adjustment

The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC) Board passed the following motion by unanimous consent, which was presented by the Planning & Land Use Committee at a Brown Act compliant meeting on Monday, November 9, 2026

The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council urges you to **reconsider and oppose** the proposed increases in non-applicant appeal fees under Council File No. 09-0969-S4.

We understand the city's concern about the cost of processing appeals and the approximately $4 million in subsidies reportedly required. However, raising fees from $229 to $1,145 for residents within a project's noticing or mailing radius, and to $2,289 for those outside it, risks pricing ordinary residents out of meaningful participation in the planning process.

Appeals are not simply an administrative expense. They are one of the few formal mechanisms' residents must challenge government decisions they believe are flawed. Before imposing increases of this magnitude, the city should examine whether appeals are identifying errors or deficiencies in Planning decisions and whether processing can be made more efficient without creating substantial financial barriers to public participation.

These increases could disproportionately affect lower-income communities and communities of color, whose residents may have fewer resources to organize, hire professional assistance, or challenge development they believe will harm their neighborhoods. A project's impacts do not necessarily stop at a mailing radius or an arbitrary 500-foot boundary. Nor does a higher fee distinguish a frivolous appeal from a well-founded one. Los Angeles routinely subsidizes public programs and services when their broader public benefits justify the expense. Public oversight deserves similar consideration. Democracy is not a loss leader. The city should not evaluate appeals solely through a cost-recovery lens while overlooking their role in protecting the public against errors and inadequate decision-making. I respectfully ask the Council to reconsider these fee increases, assess their likely

impact on public participation, explore less burdensome alternatives, and establish safeguards so that the ability to challenge questionable government decisions does not depend on a resident's financial circumstances. Please reject excessive appeal-fee increases and preserve meaningful public oversight in Los Angeles's planning process.

Appeals are not simply an administrative expense. They are one of the few formal mechanisms' residents must challenge government decisions they believe are flawed. Before imposing increases of this magnitude, the city should examine whether appeals are identifying errors or deficiencies in Planning decisions and whether processing can be made more efficient without creating substantial financial barriers to public participation. These increases could disproportionately affect lower-income communities and communities of color, whose residents may have fewer resources to organize, hire professional assistance, or challenge development they believe will harm their neighborhoods. A project's impacts do not necessarily stop at a mailing radius or an arbitrary 500-foot boundary. Nor does a higher fee distinguish a frivolous appeal from a well-founded one.

Los Angeles routinely subsidizes public programs and services when their broader public benefits justify the expense. Public oversight deserves similar consideration. Democracy is not a loss leader. The city should not evaluate appeals solely through a cost-recovery lens while overlooking their role in protecting the public against errors and inadequate decision-making.

We respectfully ask the Council to reconsider these fee increases, assess their likely impact on public participation, explore less burdensome alternatives, and establish safeguards so that the ability to challenge questionable government decisions does not depend on a resident's financial circumstances.

The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council requests you reject excessive appeal fee increases and preserve meaningful public oversight in Los Angeles's planning process.

Contact Jeff Kalban, Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC) Chair, Planning & Land Use Committee with questions or for further information.
Email: jeff.kalban.sonc@gmail.com

Respectfully yours.

Howard M. Katchen

Howard M. Katchen, President
Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC)

Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council

shermanoaksnc.org