



# City of Sierra Madre

Office of the City Clerk

232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.,

Sierra Madre, CA

(626) 355-7135

THE BROWN ACT PROVIDES THE PUBLIC WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS AT ANY PUBLIC MEETING.

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED IN ADVANCE OF THIS MEETING AND WILL BE POSTED ONTO THE CITY'S WEBSITE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS AND TRANSPARENCY.

THE COMMENTS ATTACHED ARE SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. THE CITY DOES NOT CONFIRM THE VERACITY OF THE STATEMENTS PROVIDED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Martin Ericks [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 13, 2023 3:45 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** 2 items 2/14 City Council meeting agenda on appeal fees and the Alverno use of parking lot appeal

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear City Council,

Please submit for public comment

Upon seeing this weeks agenda all I could think was WOW, just wow. The city government is supposed to be responsible for serving the needs of it's citizens. Not so in Sierra Madre after reading this week's agenda long form and the city attorney's letter.

### **1. CONSIDERATION TO AMEND APPEAL FEE SCHEDULE FOR LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS**

1. Count us as a family that wished to appeal the Planning Commission's approval of the CUP but when told the fees we knew we couldn't afford it. It was stupidly expensive and prevented us from doing it. My family is adversely affected by the noise unlike those who don't live by this school and are ignorant of our General Plan or the city code. Our General Plan and noise code in Sierra Madre applies to all the residents, not those bringing kids to a non-profit school that pays no taxes and schools mostly out of the area kids for a few years.

Please make the fees reasonable. 50% is not reasonable. I can't believe our city is trying to say a city employees time is \$244 an hour. If that was true we wouldn't have the turnover we do or asked to pay even more taxes to support our services.

### **2. Agenda item to APPEAL the PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION APPROVING AHA CUP and NMD**

We are asking that the City Council allow this failure to fully address the negative aspect of the CUP approved for Alverno's 2nd expansion to go back to the Planning Commission. Deal with the item of the appeal and not rehash the whole project. The way Michillinda parking lot is being used wasn't in the plan request. Using the parking lot wasn't ever on the signage project description. There wasn't even a sport court mentioned in the project description on the public notification. The use needs to be moved where the city gave approval in the last CUP. It isn't in the parking lot along Michillinda. It's clear the school realized their mistake and just thought the neighbors wouldn't care. We kept bringing it up though. The planning commission should have done a real study of the environmental impact. It's noisy as heck and if I could have afforded to appeal it and make the school use what was granted to them, I would have.

The purpose and power of city government is to adopt regulations to promote the public good within those areas. Attorney Giragosian, Vincent Gonzalez are showing their preference to cowtow to an entitled non-profit under the guise of being christian that the city has a contract with. They are favoring the applicant for a school that has more on their PTA, staff and Board of Trustees that continue to jam their noise and traffic upon the neighbors.

My family implores you to make the appeal fees reasonable so residents can exercise their right to appeal and send the item of appeal back to the planning commission. Done, no other discussion about the rest of Alverno's expansion should be accepted nor waste this city's time.

Thoughtfully submitted for your consideration.  
M.Ericks

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Jacqueline Tatum [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 13, 2023 11:38 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Sierra Madre Appeal fees and 2/14 agenda item Alverno appeal

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear City of Sierra Madre City Council and Mayor,

I have known the Stephens for many years. I visit them, bring my daughter and family. We have dinner, and even stayed overnight at their home when the hour has gotten too late. I have been following this expansion that they and their neighbor's have had to put up with the Alverno school expansion.

I am asking two things - reduce the appeal fees to something all of your residents can afford and send this back to the planning commission. The planning commission caved in and approved a CUP even after admitting the parking lot noise was a major environmental issue and never in the school's requested use.

I have seen the fees you have allowed Vincent Gonzalez to charge. Those kinds of fees are meant to deter ANY residents from appealing projects like this. It is untenable for all of your residents. All over the state the fees are more moderately set because the cities realize legally setting fees like Sierra Madre has would shut out their residents from appealing questionable or wrongfully arrived at decisions. This is not a frivolous appeal and clearly done with great financial sacrifice and concern by the Stephens. Many of the neighbors can't appeal the Alverno CUP because of these \$8000 fees plus another \$750 for noticing. It should not be any city governments purpose to make their residents pay for what is their right to exercise. Even 50% is outrageous and probably unlawful but I am not an attorney.

Please reduce the fees to an amount that is reasonable like the majority of California cities. San Marino only charges \$905 for an appeal of the Planning Commission or City council. Plus, we only charge \$70 for noticing. Sierra Madre is making a profit. I work for the government and our hourly is definitely not \$244 per hour.

Secondly, I am appalled to see the city attorney making recommendations in the agenda for something that the neighbors and the school spent 5 or 6 meetings before the planning commission already on but was not even in the plan the school submitted. The noise generated from using the land in a manner not in the plan is what is being appealed. Pretty sure the city cannot legally side with the applicant and just add it to the project plans. The city planning commission erred in the way they handled it. As the city council you really must send this back even if there are more pressing projects.

Noise is an environmental issue. I can't bring my daughter to the Stephens' home and watch her play outside when we visit anymore. The school sports are obnoxiously loud and right in front of the Stephens' home. We can't spend the night as we never know when we will be woken up by kids in the parking lot, or a late night film or drunk wedding guests carrying on in the lot. The school across the street produces a pervasive noise that never was a part of their home before. As I was told the neighbors have never expected this would be an issue because the school has a playing field and approval for a gym.

Please stop showing favoritism towards this school and ignoring your general plan. Your residents are counting on you to see the fallacy of this planning commission decision. Although the Stephens said the school's own noise reports were deficient I read where the noise consultant stated the lunch gatherings were going to be the noisiest activity. How is it these sports games and practices were agreed by the planning commission to be a problem then no more discussion and the expansion went through?

Please send this back to the planning commission to deal with this and not rehash the whole plan as the Mr. Gonzalez is planning to do per the agenda. It's a waste of your time to review anything but what the Stephens are appealing. Thank you for listening.

Yours truly,

Ms. Jacqueline Tatum

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Carolyn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 12, 2023 10:56 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Cc:** K. S.  
**Subject:** Appeal of Planning Commission Decision and appeal fees

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear City Council of Sierra Madre and Mayor.

My family and I were prepared to file an appeal but Sierra Madre city fees priced you out. The high price of fees make it difficult for most people to appeal. I'm asking that the city council send the application back to planning commission. The PC clearly agreed with the neighbors about the noise from Alverno's unregulated use of the parking lot since the K-8. It agreed and then it just caved in and did nothing. Why are you allowing this school/event venue/filming venue to bully both Sierra Madre and Pasadena neighbors? You still haven't fixed that horrendous 3pm traffic issue on Highland and Michillinda due to Alverno. And, now, Alverno parents are getting even more gutsy and u-turning south on Michillinda to get into the Alverno line up. Your police officers have been put on notice more times than I can count and are never out there on Michillinda at any time of the day. Oh, oops, I lied. I saw a police officer out on Michillinda at 6 am last Sunday morning. Yeah, that's a lot of help. That is not right.

Thank you so very much.

Carolyn Halpern & family

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Martha and Darryl Troedson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 11, 2023 11:13 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Alverno Heights Academy

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

I am a resident at [REDACTED] in Sierra Madre and have witnessed the changes at Alverno over the last 18 years. We purchased our home knowing that the school was across the street and fully expecting that some disruptions would occasionally occur. I appreciate the concern Alverno has shown for the neighbors in proximity and have attended several of the informational meetings held by the school. The traffic has increased at times due to the establishment of the lower school, but I have found that the congestion lasts only a few minutes before and after classes. I have never considered a few minutes of noise after a wedding or party as a serious concern, and, in fact, have often listened to any music with pleasure.

The Master Plan appears to have been thoughtfully designed to limit any disruption to our neighborhood. I am looking forward to seeing the school expand, and particularly to the possible use of the Multi-Purpose Building as a community room, something definitely needed in our city. I have faith that Alverno will continue to reach out to the neighbors and attempt to work out any problems in the future.

I support the Master Plan update and urge the Planning Commission to allow further construction, including remodeling of present structures, at Alverno Heights Academy.

Martha Troedson

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** robert NYDAM [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 9, 2023 8:33 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Cc:** Vincent Gonzalez; Julia Fanara  
**Subject:** Alverno Heights Academy Master Plan Update

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

I am writing to voice my tentative and conditional support of the Alverno Heights Academy Master Plan with a few qualifications.

My name is Robert Nydam, I live at [REDACTED] across the street from the school since 2003. We have had disagreements with the schools that have been resolved with civil negotiations and at times required attorneys. In the end, reasonable agreements were reached.

During the pandemic the school doubled in size overnight from 175 to approx. 400 students (400 is max student body) with the addition of a lower school of Pre-K through 8. This was an odd transition as it involved bringing students, families, faculty and administration from another local private school. Though awkward as it was it likely saved Alverno from going out of business. I would much prefer a school with its beautiful historic villa across the street for my home than a potential large housing development.

In the process, Alverno made concessions to mitigate the reduction in the quality of life on our little one block street as the traffic and noise has increased substantially. Studies and city parameters aside, we have lived on a little one block street for 23 years with very little traffic, very few parked cars, a very little noise. Call us spoiled but this was our normal. Alverno's addition of the lower school highly disrupted our normal and it will never be the same again. We and the neighbors on our street grieve what our pleasant little street was and what it will never be again because of Alverno's unannounced addition of a lower school.

We appreciate mitigations made by the school such as, the school asked their families and guests not to park on the neighbors side of the street, that traffic flows one direction only on Wilson, and Alverno has been responsive to concerns and complaints.

We continue to deal with issues of cumulative effects. Historically, **CUMULATIVE EFFECT** is the primary issue neighbors have with the school. Though the school unfairly portrays the neighbors as being hostile towards the students when conflict arises this was never the case. We all moved in with our eyes wide open that we lived across from a school. The addition of wedding, filming, city events, non-school sporting vents, non-school camps, city usage, etc plus all school activities is th cumulative effect. It is the cumulative effect of all these activities that causes a tipping point. All the neighbors support the school and good work they do. A minimum amount of additional non-school related, revenue enhancing or charitable activities is tolerable but there is a tipping point and in my experience Alverno is consistently pushing that cumulative effect tipping point line. Our message is just "Be a school". Be a great school; not a robust wedding business; not a constant filming location; not an all weekend sport team rental. Live out your mission to educate kids, do a few things to supplement your revenue but don't over do it. Stay away from the "cumulative effect tipping point" and

everything will be fine. Cross that line and there will be conflict because Alverno is being a bad neighbor then and disrupting the neighbors quality of life. As I've said in the past 20 years and I'll say it again--- This is all about being good neighbors. Alverno being a good neighbor to us and the Neighbors being good & reasonable neighbors to Alverno.

On to my condition to support---**SPEED BUMPS ON WILSON ST.** Most parents speed coming around the corner and down Wilson. I have kids. I get the urgency to get your kids to school on time and the tunnel vision that comes with that. I have gone over the speed limit myself to get them to school on time but it is a safety issue and it needs to be addressed and mitigated .

I will ONLY support the Alverno Master Plan update if Speed bumps are place between the corner of Grandview & Wilson to the school parking ingress and from the the parking egress to the corner of Highland & Wilson. This needs to be at the schools expense. The school built the lower school, the school brought the excessive traffic, the school is unable to deter speeding cars whipping around the corner of Grandview and then speeding towards Highland therefore the burden of responsibility lies on the school to physically slow cars down on Wilson St. permanently. If the mitigation of speed bumps above and below the ingress and egress on the Wilson St. Parking lot is executed then the school has my whole hearted support. Without the speed bumps, I do not support the master plan as it is incomplete and school is still a nuisance and disruptive to our quality of life.

Best,

Bob Nydam  
President/Owner  
Totally Kids Sun Valley 

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Lacy C Stephens [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 13, 2023 5:29 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public comment Feb 14 2 agenda items. City appeal fees and Appealing Alverno CUP

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear Honorable Mayor and City of Sierra Madre City Council,

Thank you for taking the time to review the two items before you and considering my public comment.

1. The Appeal fees are exorbitant and should be reduced to a nominal fee that allows your residents to appeal decisions like the Alverno CUP 12/1/2022 It would be inline with what other cities have done. Sierra Madre's fees are undemocratic.
2. Please do not listen to the recommendations of the city attorney or city director. This is my family home and where I will be soon be returning to and where I hope to own one day with my family.

I have not been able to escape the noise coming from this parking lot use since this temporary use. This new expansion and Alverno's decision not to build their multipurpose building or the courts by the field as approved in 2010 has been horrible.

My parent's lives have been irrevocably changed since Alverno started using the parking lot. Noise is an environmental issue that was never fully addressed or finished being reviewed. Alverno has thumbed their noses at my parent's numerous requests to work something out, to negotiate something for two years. My family gives just as much in service to the disabled, the girl scouts, the underprivileged and others seeking a hand up in our community. Our family has served and is still serving in the military to protect those rights. My parent's rights to a quiet enjoyment inside their home and outside of it should not be taken away by Alverno nor by the city attorney or city director because they favor Alverno.

This whole expansion has been detrimental to my mom's health, her work and volunteering. My dad is equally and unjustifiably burdened. My parents want to age in place. They worked sometimes 2-3 jobs to afford their home. They should not be forced to start all over elsewhere and endure the costs of moving because the city has some weird relationship with Alverno. Alverno has many other places on campus to conduct the activities they are in the parking lot and the playground. They should not have started a school without first having the gym, the lunchroom, or the playground appropriately built and placed before they started the K-8.

I hope you will agree to align the appeal fees with what is far more reasonable than 50%.

Please send this decision back to the Planning Commission to deal with the noise Alverno pushes onto the neighbors. Do not change the ambient level of our village neighborhood under the General Plan. Make Alverno build the gym they promise their families. Use the field that sits empty. Rent or negotiate the use of facilities such as Sierra Madre Middle or elementary and stop burdening my parents and my home with their failure to provide for the students they bring to the campus and the city.

Thank you .  
Lacy Stephens

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** Leesa Puleo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 11:32 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Tonight's Meeting

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Leesa A. Puleo  
[REDACTED]

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council,

I was planning on attending tonight's meeting, but I am ill with a severe case of gastritis. I am in support of Mr. and Mrs. Stephens' actions and wish I could be there with them and for them tonight.

I fully intended on filing my own appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the Alverno Heights Academy's Conditional Use Permit and Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, but the \$6,700 price tag made it impossible for me so. As a single working mom, I simply could not justify such an expenditure to the detriment of my family. I wrote several email messages imploring the City to reduce the fee, but was unsuccessful. We are all humble people of modest means and are no match for the deep-pocketed Alverno. Yet, the Stephens felt it was a worthwhile endeavor to file the appeal, and did what they needed to do to secure the funds. BRAVO! I applaud them for taking this financial risk and hope that the city offers them some remittance. They represent all of us living on Highland, Wilson, Grandview, and Michillinda, and I am forever indebted to them.

I beg the City Council to reconsider the decision made by the Planning Commission to approve the AHA CUP and MND. We have been working tirelessly for several years to get the City to hear our concerns with AHA's noise and traffic. Finally, the Planning Commission heard our cries and believe there has been significant impact to our lives. Yet, they chose to ignore us and approve the AHA CUP and MND that we, wholeheartedly, believe does very little to remedy our challenges with the school.

Thank you.  
Leesa A. Puleo

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 11:46 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Alverno

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear Mayor and City Council of Sierra Madre,

My family weighed in on the Alverno expansion request month after month since July 2021. In the end we were shocked to think the planning commission listened to our stories of the noise and traffic but then they stopped the conversation short of meaningful resolve and just approved the CUP.

This was after they sent Alverno back to the drawing board to deal with the issues! Even Alverno was discussing moving the parking lot use to an alternative spot. Alverno offered a temporary sports court until they build out their K-8 expansion. The planning commission clearly acknowledged the use of the parking lot was problematic. They discussed the noise was a problem not only for the school use but for filming and wedding rentals. They seemed to be getting it but then they abruptly approved the CUP. Commissioner wrongly stated where the noise wall was to be placed and they gave up. It was not right. It showed the commission failed to fully review the documents Alverno provided to them.

Please send this issue the Stephens's family are appealing back to be dealt with. The Michillinda parking lot being used and generating nerve grating noise was not even an expansion request and should have never been allowed. It needs to be stopped now. Do not let the city attorney waive all that the neighbors contributed and did to attend those meetings. We want to see that the noise code violating activity be placed where it belongs, on the playing field and in the multi-purpose building.

Alverno was allowed to start a school before they had the proper facilities. The school should not expect the neighbors to suddenly accept the excessive traffic and noise. We already have to deal with the additional use the city has allowed with the film and party rentals. Even Commissioner Hutt came out to witness the egregious noise and agreed the noise was horrendous.

As we understand the Stephens are only asking to appeal one aspect of the expansion. The city should not mount a whole new presentation and waste everyone's time going over the 800 pages we all had to meeting after meeting. It is a waste of your time. It is a waste of the city time. It is a waste of the Stephens and their attorney's time.

The City of Sierra Madre has prohibited almost any neighbor from appealing the planning commission's CUP approval with fees of \$7-8000 plus noticing fees of another \$800. That is too much. Even 50% is prohibitive. Fees like this are surely meant to keep the public from appealing in Sierra Madre decision that adversely affects our home and rights.

Please waive the fees to appeal as unreasonable and stick with the appeal at hand. This decision is unfinished and needs to go back to the planning commission.

Respectfully,

Chui Chow

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 1:49 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Agenda items - Appeal fees, and Alverno Appeal Public Comment

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Dear Mayor Garcia and City Council persons,

Please include our family when weighing in on the two matters:

The appeal fee made our ability to file an appeal out of our reach financially. We were aghast when we heard it was going to be about \$8000. Sierra Madre city hall is supposed to be for the people but the fees Mr. Gonzalez is proposing and had previously recommended are out of touch and greedy. Sierra Madre is becoming a city of elitist under such fees.

We did a broad search of fees in California. There are 500 cities. The majority of cities we polled had fees specific to appealing a Planning Commission decision to be under \$1000 and notifying was included. Our taxes are too much if Mr. Gonzalez is getting that kind of salary because he clearly favors Alverno in all of his staff reports.

The applicants who are challenging this appeal are to commended. We didn't think to do it. We urge the City Council to realign the fees so that appeals can be made by the everyday joe's like us. Even 50% is ghastly high. We can assure you the amount of time spent by neighbors of the Alverno project were not undertaken frivolously or without a great deal of blood, sweat and tears. Thank you.

Also, return the applicants fee by making this decision retrotractive. They were forced to pay or lose the ability to appeal.

Next, the Alverno appeal. It needs to be dealt with and not quashed.

We urge you to do the right thing and make Alverno go back to the field and offsite sports until they build their gym. They started a school with PPE money and we are living with the consequences of their poor planning. They wanted a school amongst a neighborhood then they should live with that. Harabedian should never have poached student records and families to attend Alverno in the first place. We have accepted some noise but not what they have done since 2021.

We were friends for over a decade with Margueritte Dastoor and her husband Robert who lived at [REDACTED]. They were very vocal about the issues with the school, the filming and weddings. We commiserated about the noise never getting much help from our local police or that horrible woman who liasons for Alverno. Margueritte was very upset about the k-8 moving in and nothing was being done about the noise generated in front of her home. All we could surmise was those on Grandview who did not have something to hide or had an alumnae and afraid to speak up. Unfortunately Robert passed away from cancer having to live with the noise while in hospice. Then Margueritte passed away from covid and the house was sold to a young couple who won't speak up. We see them walking around their yard with noise cancelling headphones and know they have an illegal chicken coop. We knew the previous owners for years, Ted and Alice at [REDACTED]. After 30 years they moved to get away from the noise of the high school, weddings and filming. Now we are stuck with a family that runs an illegal bakery out of their home. It's just a tragedy that we keep losing good neighbors to those who don't care about towing the line morally so that Alverno can act contrary to what Sierra Madre stands for.

Through Margueritte we met their lovely neighbors the Stevens family. We understand they are appealing the CUP. Good for them. We support them and thank them for not letting the poor and sudden decision of the Planning

Commission to stand after they all sent Alverno back more than once to do something about the problems they have dumped on us, noise and traffic.

Grateful this isn't over yet. Ms. Rosadella and extended family

## Amber Tardif

---

**From:** P Thomas [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 2:15 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public comment regarding Agenda #1 Alverno CUP appeal and Appeal Fees

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

To the City of Sierra Madre City Council,

Please count us as another family that could never afford to appeal the Alverno CUP for what the Planning Department is currently charging. The city has priced us out and now it's too late for any appeal by my family. Please amend and make retroactive for the Stephens the appeal fee they paid under duress. The courts would agree it needs to be nominal so all residents are allowed to participate in the process. They did a lot of work to provide binders down to handing the city two sets of mailing labels.

Families like ours do not have deep pockets and understand how hard this has been for the Stephens. The city government is not a business. It is to serve the residents. Asking 75% of what Alverno paid for 2 CUPs is unbelievable. We couldn't comprehend being forced to pay \$7750 for an appeal plus a \$775 notification fee for sending a letter to the neighbors. Alverno is an institution that has a side hustle business of property and film rentals plus all that tuition. The city provided them not only with the school expansion application but a year later threw in the Villa CUP for FREE by Ken Farsing's own statements at the meetings. At the very least Alverno received 2 CUPs for the price of one. That has the look of impropriety.

Please reduce or waive the appeal fees at tonight's agenda for the Stephens. Any reduction should be retroactive because they have had to do the leg work and hire representation. San Marino only charges under a \$1000 and only \$70 to do what Vincent Gonzalez is claiming cost over \$8000.

As for agenda item #1, it needs to be dealt with as an environmental issue. The Planning Commission never fully finished their concerns and came up with a resolution to the noise. Alverno should not be given carte blanche to do things with the land that has not received a full review and was never in the project application. You also haven't address speed bumps on Wilson or who is responsible for signs that it's a school zone, crosswalks for the children crossing before and after school on Wilson and Michillinda. I am finding kids that say they are walking home on Sunnyside and parents are picking up there also. There are a lot of things that still haven't been thought out in the master plan that need to be dealt with.

As a Sierra Madre resident I, along with my family, implore you to grant the afore mentioned requests.

Yours truly,  
Colleen and Jeff Thomas

Sent from my iPhone



**Venskus & Associates**  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

603 WEST OJAI AVE., SUITE F  
OJAI, CALIFORNIA  
93023  
TEL: 805-272-8628

1055 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 1996  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA  
90017  
TEL: 213-482-4200

February 14, 2023

**APPEAL RE: THE SIERRA MADRE PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND ADDENDUM TO MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION TO UPDATE THE ALVERNO HEIGHTS ACADEMY MASTER PLAN TO ALLOW FOR PERMANENT CLASSROOMS FOR K-8 AND OTHER CAMPUS IMPROVEMENTS**

This letter is submitted in support of Kristin and Keith Stephens' appeal of the Sierra Madre Planning Commission's decision in the above-entitled proceeding pursuant to Sierra Madre Municipal Code § 17.66.020 (B). This letter, which must be placed into the council file and made a part of the administrative record, provides public comment in response to the staff report recommending a reduction of the appeal fee from 75% of the original application filing fee for land use entitlements to 50% of the original application filing fee for land use entitlements.

While appellants appreciate the acknowledgment by the city that the 75% appeal fee must be reduced, appellants dispute the city's methodologies in calculating the revised fee and recommendation that a 50% fee is appropriate.

**A. EVEN A 50% APPEAL FEE WILL PREVENT PROJECT OPPONENTS FROM EXHAUSTING THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES BEFORE PROCEEDING TO SUPERIOR COURT**

City Staff and indeed, the Sierra Madre Municipal Code ("SMMC") Section 17.66.060 fails to distinguish between appeal fees for applicants and non-applicants. The Staff Report on amending the fee schedule references SMMC Section 3.20.040 and its provision authorizing the city to, in essence, charge fees to recover the costs of necessary to provide, the regulation, product or service. (See Fee Schedule Amendment Staff Report p. 1.)

City Staff fails to acknowledge that project applicants, by definition, are asking for a service, because they are seeking an entitlement that will theoretically improve the value of the their property. Admittedly, the provision of that entitlement is a city service. And the city should seek cost recovery from the person requesting said entitlement, i.e. the applicant.

However, project opponents are not seeking entitlements. Rather they are seeking to enforce important constitutional rights to petition their government for redress. In fact, California Constitution Article 3 grants the right of citizens to instruct their representatives and petition

government for redress of grievances. The Sierra Madre Municipal Code even provides interested persons the right to appeal and an opportunity to be heard at hearing (See Section 17.66.010 and 17.66.030.) By providing an appeal hearing for a project opponent, i.e. a non-applicant, the city is not providing a service, but ensuring the provision of a constitutional right. Thus, in the context of non-applicant appeals, cost recovery under SMMC Section 3.20.040 is limited by the constitutional right to provide project opponents with a mechanism to petition their government for redress.

But, even if there is a 50% appeal fee, many project opponents will be priced out of exercising this constitutional right. If project opponents do not challenge a project at the administrative level, they cannot meet the requirement to exhaust administrative remedies before pursuing litigation in Superior Court. It follows that an unreasonable appeal fee impairs non-applicant appellants (i.e. project opponents) from exercising their the right to petition the local government for redress and to seek redress in the Superior Court. *Sea & Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Com.*, (1983) 34 Cal.3d 412 implied that an excessive and unreasonable appeal fee would infringe on the obligation to exhaust administrative remedies.

Here, the non-applicant appellants paid a \$7,444.00 appeal fee based on 75% of the original filing fee for the applicant's entitlement application. (See Exhibit A.) The fee was paid under protest and even if the fee is reduced to 50% of the original application fee, it would still be impossible for appellants and indeed many project opponents to clear this financial hurdle. **Appellants simply cannot afford to pay even 50% of the original application fee.** Sierra Madre's own mayor even alluded to this fact by stating that residents should not be 'priced-out' of an appeal and that the appeal fee. (See Exhibit B attached hereto.) It also appears that the city is not adverse to waiving filing fees for the Academy's CUP for the Villa. Appellants request that the city waive the appeal fee or in the alternative, reduce the fee to a nominal amount.

#### **B. EVEN A 50% APPEAL FEE IS WIDELY OUT OF PROPORTION WITH APPEAL FEES CHARGED IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS**

The City of Los Angeles has adopted the distinction between applicant appellants and non-applicant appellants. The Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") section pertaining to zoning and land use appeals makes a distinction between appeals filed by the applicant and those filed by the non-applicants. LAMC Sec. 19.01(B)(1)(a) states that "A fee equal to 85 percent of the total underlying application fees or \$15,811 for first level appeal and \$11,585 for additional level appeals, whichever is less when the appeal is made by the applicant." Meanwhile LAMC Sec. 19.01(B)(1)(b) states that "A fee of \$158 in the case of an appeal by an aggrieved person, other than the applicant." (See Exhibit C attached hereto)

In its December 29, 2016 report studying and recommending changes to the Fee Structure in Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles Planning Department indicated that a profit making objective should not be included in the assessment of fees and a factor weighing in setting fees at less than 100% is enabling the participation of individuals or groups that typically cannot afford services. (See Exhibit D attached hereto) The department in effect recommended that non-applicant appeal fees, in addition to some other fees, be subsidized by the city.

The Fee Survey conducted by the city of Los Angeles as part of its fee schedule amendment process revealed that Burbank, Glendale, Los Angeles County, Long Beach and San Jose all distinguished between appeal fees for applicants and non-applicants and showed that appeal fees for non-applicants were nominal. (Exhibit D - Appendix B p. 1 and Appendix C, p. 1.)

In *Citizens for Open Government v. City of Lodi* (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 865, there was only a \$250 appeal fee charged to project opponents. (*Id.* at 870.)

In the city of West Hollywood, appeal fees are waived for appeals that are accompanied by original petitions that are signed by a minimum of 50 residents or property or business owners within West Hollywood. (See West Hollywood Municipal Code Sec. 19.76.030 D and attached hereto as Exhibit E) As city Staff points out, the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia San Marino and South Pasadena all charge comparatively nominal amounts than Sierra Madre. (Fee Amendment Staff Report p. 2.)

Thus, the Staff's recommendation of an appeal fee of 50% of the original application filing fee is still out of proportion with the fees charged in other jurisdictions.

**C. THE METHODOLOGY USED BY CITY STAFF IN THE FEE AMENDMENT ANALYSIS IS FLAWED**

The "survey" conducted by Staff was deficient because staff only surveyed "neighboring cities in the San Gabriel Valley". This does not provide the decision-makers with an accurate picture of what other jurisdictions are charging and therefore what options are available for the decision-makers to consider. City staff did not conduct a survey of fees charged elsewhere in California or nationally.

Moreover, there was no explanation of why city Staff recommended a 50% appeal fee over the nominal fees charged by Arcadia, Monrovia San Marino and South Pasadena. *Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles*, 11 Cal. 3d 506 requires agencies to bridge the analytical gap between evidence and conclusion. City Staff has failed to do so with respect to its recommendation of the fee schedule amendment.

Thus, appellants again request that the appeal fee either be waived or reduced to a nominal fee.

Sincerely,



Jason Sanders

# EXHIBIT A



# APPEAL OF DECISIONS

City of Sierra Madre  
Development Services Department  
232 W. Sierra Madre Boulevard, Sierra Madre, CA 91024  
phone 626.355.7138 fax 626.355.2251

## APPELLANT INFORMATION

Name of Appellant: Kristin and Keith Stephens  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Phone Number: [REDACTED] Date: December 14, 2022

## APPEAL INFORMATION

Application Number: 211853 Appeal of:  Staff Decision  
 Planning Commission  
Decision Date: December 1, 2022

The Municipal Code provision for appeals is provided in Chapter 17.66 – "Appeals and Calls for Review". Please note that, pursuant to Code Section 17.66.050.A.1, appellate review under this code is de novo.

Please describe the specific decision being appealed and state the reasons for this appeal. If additional sheets are necessary, please attach them to this form.

APPEAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
AMENDMENT (RESOLUTION 11-10 AMENDED BY RESOLUTION 21-19) AND  
ADDENDUM TO THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION TO UPDATE THE  
ALVERNO HEIGHTS ACADEMY MASTER PLAN TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF  
PERMANENT CLASSROOM BUILDINGS TO ACCOMMODATE TRANSITIONAL  
KINDERGARTEN TO EIGHTH GRADE INSTRUCTION AND OTHER CAMPUS  
IMPROVEMENTS AT 200 NORTH MICHILLINDA AVENUE

THE BASIS, GROUNDS AND EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THIS APPEAL ARE SET FORTH  
IN THE ATTACHED APPEAL LETTER, WHICH IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE HEREIN.

Applicant's Signature

12/14/22

## FEES

\$ 1569.75 (75% of Original Application Fee)

Paid

# RECEIVED

Received By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: DEC 14 2022

**CITY OF SIERRA MADRE  
PLANNING & BUILDING**

CITY OF SIERRA MADRE  
232 W SIERRA MADRE BLVD  
SIERRA MADRE, CA 91024

DATE : 12/14/2022 2:39 PM  
OPER : Cashier2  
TKBY : Jn  
TERM : 4  
REC# : 00342398

200.00000 Building 7444.00  
Permits-Incode  
211858 7,444.00CR  
KEITH & KRISTIN STEPHENS  
200 N MICHILLINDA AVE  
CUP 7,444.00CR

Paid By: KEITH & KRISTIN STEPHENS  
2-Check 7444.00 REF:3267

APPLIED 7444.00  
TENDERED 7444.00  
CHANGE 0.00



Kristin Stephens  
Keith Stephens

16-66/1220

3267

12/14/2022

Pay to the Order of City of Sierra Madre \$ 7444  
Seven thousand dollars Four hundred forty four and 00/100

Bank of America - California

2180 Huntington Drive  
Sierra Madre, CA 91108  
626/453-8408

Signed under duress as cash  
unconstitutionally  
prohibitive # 211858

MP

## EXHIBIT B

**From:** Leesa Puleo [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Fees - City Council Appeal  
**Date:** December 12, 2022 at 4:09 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]



FYI.

On Mon, Dec 12, 2022, 1:44 PM Edward Garcia <[egarcia@cityoferramadre.com](mailto:egarcia@cityoferramadre.com)> wrote:

Ms. Puleo,

My apologies for my delayed response as I have been preparing finals, grading projects, running my consulting business etc.

I understand your concerns regarding the appeal process. The fee associated with an appeal, in my opinion, should accomplish two things. 1) It should be a mechanism for cost-recovery, and 2) it should be high enough as to avoid frivolous appeals. That being said, it should be in reach for everybody to be involved in the process. Residents should not be "priced-out" of an appeal.

As an elected official to a governing body, I obviously cannot make decisions/policy on my own (or even waive fees). Also, the council must meet with the public to perform our duties regarding policy decisions.

The only option that I can see is to contact the planning department and/or the city manager's office to see if there is a mechanism in place to assist you given your financial situation.

I really wish I had a better solution for you, but this is the only thing path I can think of.

In the spirit of public service,

Edward T. Garcia

**From:** Leesa Puleo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 10, 2022 12:15:21 AM  
**To:** Edward Garcia  
**Subject:** Fees - City Council Appeal

**CAUTION:** This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Mayor Pro Tem Garcia,

I'd like to file an appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of Alverno Height Academy's (AHA) CUP 21-3 and mitigated negative declaration, unfortunately, the cost to appeal is 75% of the applicant's fees or \$6,800. I will have to come up with this amount, or a deposit of estimated costs, by next Wednesday, and there is absolutely no way I can make that happen. Is there anything I can do to lower the fee? I've already emailed Mayor Goss on this matter and, although his response of "I'm not aware of any such waiver" is probably correct, there has to be something I can do. Maybe nobody has ever asked, so there isn't a process or precedent, but I'd like to try to create one.

It's been the worst few years, financially, for me, and probably most of the other residents of Sierra Madre. In fact, I was recently notified that [REDACTED], so my financial situation is dire. Additionally, I don't believe the average resident of Sierra Madre could come up with this kind of money, in this amount of time, without significant financial burden. I'm not asking for the fee to be waived, since the city will incur costs based on my appeal; I'm simply asking that amount required take into consideration the financial impact it will have on me and my family, or, at the very least, reflect the actual costs to the city that may result from my actions.

I've gone to my neighbors on Highland, Grandview, and Wilson, many of them support the decision to appeal, but nobody will hand over any significant amount of money because it's "a losing battle". In my particular situation, the chances of me winning the appeal may be slim, since I'm not a lawyer or an expert in this area, but I think I have some ability to read, understand, and apply state, federal, and city codes relevant in this matter, and can provide a fairly reasonable argument against approving the AHA CUP 21-3 and mitigated negative declaration as written or, at the very least, get the Council to take a closer look.

My property line is approximately **54 yards** from the school, so any decision made regarding the school significantly impacts me and my family, and, possibly, my future generations, as my home is the only significant asset I have. I've spent dozens of hours over the last year weeding through AHA's 400+ page CUP 21-3 application, addendum, attachments, etc., and I don't intend to base my appeal arguments on hearsay or personal experience, but actual, documented facts based on what I believe is the letter, spirit, and intent of the laws and codes that govern Sierra Madre. I've been allowed 3 minutes to present my concerns in front of the

Planning Commission and City Council and, thankfully, you have acknowledged that my/our challenges are real. But it hasn't been enough, in my opinion, to adequately argue the negative impact of the proposed project and the legal validity of the application itself. Additionally, I believe the Commission based its decision, in part, by information that was presented **for the very first time** on December 1, 2022, and **never** made available to the public, so public comment was not possible. The appeal process will allow me the time I need to present a comprehensive and compelling argument against the Commission's decision to approve AHA's CUP 21-3 and mitigated negative declaration, unfortunately, I can't afford it!

I believe the point of democracy as a whole, and local government processes in particular, is to give residents a say in what is happening in their neighborhoods and the opportunity to create positive change for themselves, their families, and those around them. I also understand that we elect city officials, like yourself, to be our representatives in the decision-making process for our city and, wholeheartedly, trust in your competency to do so. Unfortunately, I think something may have been overlooked in the approval of AHA's CUP 21-3 and mitigated negative declaration, and an appeal is warranted. I can't trust that someone else will come forward and appeal the Planning Commission's decision, and feel it is my obligation to myself, my family, and my neighbors, to take on the task myself.

Furthermore, I believe the amount of the filing fee makes perfectly good sense for the applicant, as a Planning Commission decision has significant financial and programmatic impacts on them. But, winning or losing an appeal made by a neighbor, like me, would have a much lesser impact, perhaps negligible. Although the result may affect quality of life and/or future home value, the losses could not be quantified or compensated to a neighbor in the foreseeable future. I believe the intent of the fee is based on the assumption that the applicant is filing the appeal and not a concerned neighbor.

I'm more than willing to appear in front of the Council next Tuesday to present my case, but, if I don't have a chance of lowering the fee, I'd prefer not to tell the entire City of my financial situation, personal feelings towards city government, and the appeal filing fee.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Leesa Puleo

[REDACTED]

Sierra Madre, CA 91024

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

# EXHIBIT C

## ARTICLE 9

### FEES

(Added by Ord No. 125,030, Eff. 8/15/63.)

#### Section

- 19.00 Filing of Applications and Appeals.
- 19.01 Filing Fee - Applications and Appeals.
- 19.02 Filing Fees - Division of Land and Private Street Maps and Appeals.
- 19.03 Fees for General Plan Consistency.
- 19.04 Fees for Sign-off or Clearance Requests.
- 19.05 Filing Fees for Environmental Clearances.
- 19.06 Filing Fees for Coastal Development Permits.
- 19.07 Fees for Flood Hazard Reports and Compliance Checks.
- 19.08 Surcharge for Development Services Centers.
- 19.09 Project Development and Counseling Services.
- 19.10 Development Agreement Fees.
- 19.11 Annual Inspection of Compliance with Floor Area Ratio Averaging and Residential Density Transfer Covenants.
- 19.12 Deviations Pursuant to Section 16.03 E.
- 19.13 Surcharge for Automated Systems for the Department of City Planning.
- 19.14 Fees for Enforcement of Housing Covenants.
- 19.15 Department of Transportation Traffic Study Review, Condition Clearance and Permit Issuance Fees.
- 19.16 General Plan Maintenance Surcharge for the Department of City Planning.
- 19.17 Park Fee.
- 19.18 Affordable Housing Linkage Fee.
- 19.19 Westside Mobility Transportation Fees.

#### **SEC. 19.00. FILING OF APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS.**

(Amended by Ord. No. 187,237, Eff. 12/27/21.)

**A. Filing Date.** An application or appeal shall be considered as filed whenever it has been completed in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations, has been submitted to the Department together with the required filing fees, and a receipt for the filing fees has been issued. If at any time during the processing of an application it is discovered that an application has been improperly prepared, or required pertinent information has not been submitted in accordance with the previously established rules and regulations, upon notification to the applicant by the appropriate officer or employee, the time limits specified within this Code shall be suspended and not continue to run until the application has been rectified or the omitted information furnished in a proper manner.

**B. Time Limit - Appeals.** Notwithstanding any provisions of Articles 2, 3, or 4 of this chapter, whenever the final day for filing an appeal from any action, decision, or determination of the Director of Planning, Zoning Administrator, Area Planning Commission, or City Planning Commission falls on a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to the close of business on the next succeeding working day, and the effective or final date of any action, decision, or determination shall be extended to the close of that appeal period. No appeal shall be accepted or in any way considered as officially on file which is not presented in proper form and received within the

appeal period specified by other sections of this chapter or the extended period specified above in this section.

If in any individual case involving a 15-day appeal period, that appeal period fails to include at least ten business days, then the appeal period shall be extended as many days as the Director of Planning, Zoning Administrator, Area Planning Commission, City Planning Commission, or City Council determines are necessary to include ten business days.

**C. Place of Filing.** Whenever the provisions of Articles 2, 3, or 4 of this chapter provide that applications, requests, or appeals be filed with the Department of City Planning.

**D.** Whenever the provisions of this chapter provide that an applicant shall post notice of a public hearing or meeting, the applicant shall file a declaration in the appropriate public office prior to the date of the noticed public hearing or meeting. In this declaration, the applicant shall declare, under penalty of perjury, that notice has been posted in accordance with the applicable provisions of this chapter.

**E. Annual Inflation Adjustment.** The fees in Section 19.01 through 19.10, and Section 19.12 shall be automatically adjusted annually for inflation beginning on July 1, 2023, in accordance with the latest change in year-over-year Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the Los Angeles area, as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. An updated fee schedule shall be maintained by the Department of City Planning, which shall provide a copy of the adjusted schedule to the Mayor and City Council each year.

The Director of Planning shall have the authority to adopt guidelines consistent with this chapter for the posting of notices if the Director determines that guidelines are necessary and appropriate.

**SEC. 19.01. FILING FEE - APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS.**

**(Amended by Ord. No. 187,237, Eff. 12/27/21.)**

Before accepting for filing any application or appeal involving any of the matters specified in this section, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect for each application or appeal the following filing fees:

**A. Establishment or Change of Zones, Height Districts, or Supplemental Use Districts and Other Related Actions.** The following fees shall be charged for a zone change, height district, or supplemental use district when that action is consistent with the General Plan. (See Section 19.03 for zone change requests that are not consistent with the General Plan.)

**[FILING FEE]**

| <b>Establishment or Change of Zones, Height Districts, or Supplemental Use Districts and Other Related Actions</b> | <b>Fee*</b> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Establishment or Change of Zones, Height Districts, or Supplemental Use Districts and Other Related Actions</b> | <b>Fee*</b> |
| Zone Change - No New Construction<br>(Sections 12.32 C. and F.)  | \$24,844    |
| Zone Change - With New Construction<br>(Sections 12.32 C. and F.)  | \$29,468    |
| Clarification of Q Classifications or D Limitations  | \$9,614     |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| (Section 12.32 H.)  |           |
| Amendment of Council's Instructions involving (T) Tentative Classifications | \$6,728   |
| (Section 12.32 H.)  |           |
| Height District Change  | \$29,343  |
| (Section 12.32 F.)  |           |
| Supplemental Use District - Boundary Change or Repeal                       | \$69,210  |
| (Section 12.32 S.)  |           |
| Supplemental Use Distric - Establishment                                    | \$135,875 |
| (Section 12.32 S.)  |           |
| Conditions of Approval for Oil Drilling                                     | \$56,426  |
| (Section 13.01)   |           |
| Zone Boundary Line Adjustment   | \$10,534  |
| (Sections 12.30 H. and K.)  |           |
| Building Line - Establishment, Change or Removal                            | \$12,309  |
| (Section 12.32 R.)  |           |
| Surface Mining Permits  | \$3,506   |
| (Sections 13.03 D. and F.)  |           |

\* See Section 19.01 Q. for multiple applications.

## B. Appeal Fees.

1. Except as expressly provided in Subdivision 2., below, the following fees shall be charged and collected with the filing of all appeals.

a. A fee equal to 85 percent of the total underlying application fees or \$15,811 for first level appeal and \$11,585 for additional level appeals, whichever is less when the appeal is made by the applicant.

b. A fee of \$158 in the case of an appeal by an aggrieved person, other than the applicant.

2. An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.2. of this Code shall be accompanied by a filing fee as specified in Table 4-A of Section 98.0403.2 of the Code, to be collected by the Department. An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.6. of this Code shall be charged a fee in accordance with Subdivision 1., above.

3. An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.37 of this Code shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of \$1,570, to be collected by the Department.

## [FILING FEE]

# EXHIBIT D

DEPARTMENT OF  
CITY PLANNING

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ  
PRESIDENT

RENEE DAKE WILSON  
VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT L. AHN  
CAROLINE CHOE  
RICHARD KATZ  
JOHN W. MACK  
SAMANTHA MILLMAN  
VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS  
DANA M. PERLMAN

ROCKY WILES  
COMMISSION OFFICE MANAGER  
(213) 978-1300

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI  
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES  
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1271

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1272

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1274

JAN ZATORSKI  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1273

<http://planning.lacity.org>

December 29, 2016

The Honorable Eric Garcetti  
Mayor, City of Los Angeles  
City Hall, Room 303  
Mail Stop 370

Honorable Members of the City Council  
c/o Office of the City Clerk  
City Hall, Room 395  
Mail Stop 160

**DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING 2016 COMPREHENSIVE FEE STUDY AND  
RECOMMENDED FEE CHANGES**

The Department of City Planning (Department) has completed a comprehensive fee study with a goal of achieving full cost recovery for project planning services. Through the contracted services of NBS, a fee study and final report indicate the City is recovering approximately 74% of the estimated full cost of providing most fee related services, where the annual revenue collected is less than the estimated fully burdened costs of providing those services.

Based on the fee study findings, the Department recommends revising Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 19.01 through 19.10 to more accurately represent the cost of providing planning and land use services, subject to review and discussion of particular policy issues outlined in this report.

**Background**

The Fiscal Year 2014-15 adopted budget approved funding for a comprehensive fee study. While the study was initiated in early 2015, several revisions were required as a result of the Department's geographic restructuring of its case processing functions. Changes resulting from the restructuring needed to be incorporated into the time estimate process, and in some cases, new estimates were necessary. In addition, the Department received six new position authorities in the Fiscal Year 2016-17 budget without funding subject to completion of the fee study recommendations to achieve full cost recovery.

## Fee Study Results

NBS conducted its fee study using three distinct areas of analysis: Cost of Service Analysis, Cost Recovery, and Fee Establishment. The Cost of Service Analysis considers both direct and indirect costs which typically include: direct salaries and benefits, operating services and supplies, departmental and divisional overhead and Citywide overhead. Cost Recovery reviews existing fee revenues to determine the percentage of costs being collected. The Fee Establishment portion reviewed the fee structure to see if it met current industry standards and the needs of the Department's new operational structure, as well as documented the level of effort required for the services being charged.

In addition, NBS performed cross checks by collecting data on the estimated workload for each fee to confirm the validity of the analytical model. This method provided assurance that 100% of staff resources were accounted for and allocated to either a fee for service or non-fee service category to ensure that services provided are not modeled to exceed budgeted resource capacity. A more extensive explanation of the analysis methods may be found in the NBS Final Study dated November 14, 2016. (Attachment 1).

The total estimated cost of departmental programs studied by NBS is approximately \$73 million per year. As shown in the table below, costs are further broken down by activities eligible for recovery through fees or surcharges and those not eligible for recovery.

| Program  | Activities Recoverable from Case Processing Fees | Activities Recoverable from Surcharge Fees | Activities Requiring Non-fee Funding Sources | Total                |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------|
| Development Services                               | \$ 4,977,703                                     | \$ 319,206                                 | \$ 4,459,188                                 | \$ 9,756,098         |
| Geographic Project Planning                        | \$ 17,246,538                                    | \$ 51,193                                  | \$ 6,922,715                                 | \$ 24,220,446        |
| Major Projects and Project Plan Support            | \$ 4,318,567                                     | \$ -                                       | \$ 667,866                                   | \$ 4,986,433         |
| Major Projects and Project Plan Support -Expedited | \$ 4,612,462                                     | \$ -                                       | \$ -   | \$ 4,612,462         |
| Historic Resources                                 | \$ 386,119                                       | \$ -                                       | \$ 2,276,970                                 | \$ 2,663,088         |
| Citywide Planning                                  | \$ -   | \$ 2,324,837                               | \$ 2,929,693                                 | \$ 5,254,530         |
| Community Planning                                 | \$ 205,950                                       | \$ 10,040,995                              | \$ 910,161                                   | \$ 11,157,105        |
| Technology Support                                 | \$ -   | \$ 10,006,414                              | \$ 186,433                                   | \$ 10,192,846        |
| Department General Administration                  | <i>Included above</i>                            |  | \$ 86,474                                    | \$ 86,474            |
|  | <b>\$ 31,747,338</b>                             | <b>\$ 22,742,644</b>                       | <b>\$ 18,439,500</b>                         | <b>\$ 72,929,482</b> |

Activities eligible for recovery in general case processing are approximately \$31.7 million, or 44% of total program costs. Roughly \$22.7 million, or 31%, is further eligible to be recovered by surcharges for technology support and advance planning services. Activities not eligible for fee recovery is approximately 25% or \$18 million.

## Comparative Fee Surveys

As part of the scope of work, NBS conducted a survey of both regional and national comparable cities and agencies. The regional comparisons were performed on the following cities and agencies: Los Angeles County, Burbank, Glendale, Long Beach,

Pasadena, and Santa Clarita. National cities compared were Dallas, Denver, Oakland, Portland, San Jose, San Francisco, and Seattle. While these comparisons can be useful, the different processes and procedures utilized among cities make direct comparisons somewhat challenging.

From the regional perspective, current Department fees range by category and are higher than other local jurisdictions in the categories of conditional uses, signage, density bonus, site plan review, zone changes, and condominium conversions. The Department's fees are generally lower in the areas of appeals, adult entertainment, and environmental services.

Nationally, Department fees are typically higher in most categories except for some historic preservation fees where San Jose and San Francisco charge higher fees. However, it should be noted that many fees were not directly comparable to these national cities and, therefore, comparisons are difficult to make. Comparison charts are included in the NBS Final Report as Appendix B and C.

### **Policy Considerations**

The City provides many types of general services to its constituents. While all services are beneficial to the community, some services can be classified as globally beneficial to all citizens, while others provide more of a direct benefit to a specific group or individual. In the latter, services should almost entirely be funded by user fee revenue.

The following are two central concepts regarding the establishment of user fees:

- Fees should be assessed according to the degree of individual or private benefit gained from services; and
- A profit making objective should not be included in the assessment of user fees.

Therefore, it is commonly accepted that user fees are established at a level that will recover up to, and not more than, the cost of providing a particular service. Undoubtedly, there are programs, circumstances, and services that may justify a subsidy from the General Fund. Some of the factors to consider in setting fees at less than 100% are whether lower fees would:

- Overcome limits imposed by external agencies;
- Encourage desired behavior – for example, historic preservation, green building, etc.;
- Affect demand for a particular service;
- Enable participation of individuals or groups that typically cannot afford services; or
- Provide a benefit to both the individual and community at large.

The Department reviewed every fee from the fee study and is recommending that the following fees receive some level of subsidy:

- HPOZ Certificates of Appropriateness
- Mills Act Applications
- Minor and/or Single Family Project Permit Compliance cases
- Appeals (other than the applicant)
- Reasonable Accommodation Determinations

The specific fee recommendations can be found in Attachment 2. All other fees proposed provide for full cost recovery.

### **Expedited Processing and Billable Services**

The Department offers applicants an option to process cases using an expedited model. This alternative, which charges a higher rate, is limited to certain cases and generally provides that a case will proceed to hearing within 120 days. The billing process has been to bill actual time and include overhead rates. The Fee Study reviewed those processes and charges and determined a fully burdened flat rate could improve the internal administrative process for the Department. The billing includes tracking time toward the project and adding multiple rates to cover the full costs. Currently, an initial deposit is paid and a refund is required if not fully utilized. The recommendation is to go to a fully burdened flat rate of \$219 per hour, which helps when calculating costs.

Environmental cases also require a deposit and time is charged against the deposit. Once the draw down account has been depleted, applicants are billed by the hour based on the staff job rate with overhead charges. To simplify billing and processing and allow for rate predictability, the Department recommends charging a flat rate of \$192 per hour for all case processing services for all programs except Expedited Processing, which will use the higher hourly rate discussed above. The recommendation to go with this fully burdened flat rate will allow for rate fluctuations in job classifications, incremental step increases, and CAP rate changes in a two to three year time span.

### **Conclusions**

The final fee study report concludes that the City should try to recover as much of the cost of services as is feasible, but recognizes there are policy factors that often warrant adoption of fee levels at less than 100%. The recommendations and proposed fee structures in the fee study report are legally defensible and establish a nexus between costs of providing services and each specific user fee that is charged.

For the time period reviewed, the cost of case processing related services was approximately \$29.8 million while revenues from these services was \$22.1 million, resulting in a difference of \$7.7 million (or 74%). Based on these findings, the Department needs to increase fees by roughly 25% to achieve a greater amount of cost recovery. However, as indicated earlier, economic policy factors require that some fees be subsidized, such as appeals and historic clearances. The estimated value of the subsidies is roughly \$3 million, which will require an appropriation from the General Fund for case processing related services provided by the Department.

## Recommendations

That the City Council, subject to approval by the Mayor:

- 1) Approve amending the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 19.01 through 19.10 to revise fees to more accurately represent the cost of providing planning and land use services to achieve full cost recovery where applicable, as outlined in the attached fee schedule.
- 2) Instruct the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance to amend the LAMC Sections 19.01 through 19.10 in accordance with the proposed fee changes.

## Fiscal Impact

The recommended changes to the Department of City Planning fee schedule have the potential to increase the City Planning Case Processing Special Fund revenues by \$6 to \$8 million annually depending on case volume. The Department's case processing functions will become more fully cost recoverable and reduce reliance on the General Fund for these activities.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Deputy Director of Planning Jan Zatorski at (213) 978-1271.

Sincerely,



VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
Director of Planning

Attachments:           1 – NBS Final Report (Comparative Fee Tables – Appendix B & C)  
                              2 – Department Proposed Fee Changes

c:     Raymond Chan, Deputy Mayor  
       Sharon M. Tso, Chief Legislative Analyst  
       Miguel A. Santana, City Administrative Officer  
       Adrienne Khorasanee, Deputy City Attorney

VPB:JZ:clf



**City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning**

**Fee Study**

**Final Report**

**November 14, 2016**

32605 Temecula Parkway, Suite 100  
Temecula, CA 92592  
Toll free: 800.434.8349 Fax: 951.296.1998

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary .....                         | 1  |
| Section 1 – Introduction and Fundamentals ..... | 2  |
| Methods of Analysis.....                        | 2  |
| Cost of Service Analysis.....                   | 2  |
| Cost Recovery Evaluation.....                   | 4  |
| Fee Establishment .....                         | 5  |
| Comparative Fee Survey .....                    | 7  |
| Data Sources .....                              | 8  |
| Section 2 – Fee Study Results.....              | 9  |
| Cost of Service Analysis Outcomes .....         | 10 |
| Cost Recovery Evaluation Outcomes .....         | 12 |
| Fee Establishment Outcomes .....                | 13 |
| Section 3 – Conclusion.....                     | 15 |

### Appendices

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| <b>Cost of Service Analysis per Fee Item Studied</b> | <b>Appendix A</b> |
| <b>Regional Comparative Fee Survey</b>               | <b>Appendix B</b> |
| <b>National Comparative Fee Survey</b>               | <b>Appendix C</b> |

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to describe the findings and recommendations of the Fee Study performed by NBS for the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning (Department). This Study intends to update and establish user and regulatory fees for all processing, development review application, and permitting services provided by the Department.

The Department's chief purposes in conducting this Study were to ensure that existing fees are calibrated to the costs of providing services, and to provide an opportunity for the City to optimize its revenue sources, provided that any increased cost recovery from user fees and regulatory fees would not conflict with broader City goals and values.

The Fee Study examined all user and regulatory fees managed by the Department, with a primary focus on reviewing and updating each fee item listed in the *City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1: General Provisions and Zoning, Article 9 Fees*.

The Study identified approximately \$22.2 million in average annual costs of providing services that are recovered from current fees, as compared to approximately \$29.8 million in costs that are eligible for recovery from fees.

| Fee Category                     | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit) | Existing Cost Recovery % |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| Regular Case Processing Requests | \$ 16,773,498   | \$ 25,233,969  | (8,460,471)                              | 66%                      |
| Expedited Requests               | \$ 5,400,000  | \$ 4,612,462   | 787,538                                  | 117%                     |
| Total                            | \$ 22,173,498   | \$ 29,846,430  | \$ (7,672,933)                           | 74%                      |

Overall, the City is recovering approximately 74% of the costs of providing user and regulatory fee related services.

This report documents the Study's analytical methods and data sources, presents analytical results regarding current levels of cost recovery achieved from user and regulatory fees, and provides a high level comparative survey of fees for a chosen set of regional and national cities.

- Section 1 of the report outlines the foundation of the study and general approach.
- Section 2 discusses the results of the cost of service analysis performed, which falls into studies of: the fully-burdened hourly rate(s), the calculation of the costs of providing service, the cost recovery policies of each fee category, and the recommended fees for providing services.
- Section 3 provides the grand scope conclusions of the analysis provided in the preceding sections.
- Appendices to this report include the Cost of Service Analysis at the individual fee level, and the Comparative Fee Survey results.

City's staff report will include an updated version of Article 9, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council.

## Section 1 – Introduction and Fundamentals

It is generally accepted in California that cities are granted the authority to charge user fees and regulatory fees for services and activities they provide through provisions of the State Constitution. First, cities are granted the ability to perform broad activities related to their local policing power and other service authority as defined in Article XI, Sections 7 and 9. Second, cities are granted the ability to establish fees for service through the framework defined in Article XIII B, Section 8. Under this latter framework, a fee may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service or performing the activity. For a fee to qualify as such, it must relate to a service or activity under the control of the individual/entity on which the fee is charged. For example, the individual/entity requests service of the municipality or his or her actions specifically cause the municipality to perform additional activities. In this manner, the service or the underlying action causing the municipality to perform service is either discretionary and/or is subject to regulation. As a discretionary service or regulatory activity, the user fees and regulatory fees considered in this Study fall outside requirements that must otherwise be followed by the City to impose taxes, special taxes, or fees imposed as incidences of property ownership.

Furthermore, this Study relies on the guidance provided by Government Code Section 66014 (a), which is specific to development review and regulation, and requires that "...fees may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged...".

The fees examined in this Study specifically excluded development impact fees and/or special assessments, all of which fall under distinct analytical and procedural requirements different from the body of user/regulatory fees analyzed in this effort. Additionally, this Study excluded any fines and penalties that may be imposed by the City for violations to its requirements or codes, unless the City specifically asked NBS to identify the estimated and reasonable cost of the service as part of the study. The City is not limited to the costs of service when imposing fines and penalties.

### Methods of Analysis

NBS approaches every user and regulatory fee study with three distinct areas of analysis: Cost of Service Analysis, Cost Recovery Evaluation, and Fee Establishment.

#### Cost of Service Analysis

A cost of service analysis is a quantitative effort that compiles the full cost of providing governmental services and activities. There are two primary types of costs considered: direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are those that specifically relate to the individual fee activity in question, including the real-time provision of the service. Indirect costs are those that support the provision of services but cannot be directly or easily assigned to the activity in question. An example of a direct cost is the salary and benefit expense associated with an individual performing a service. In the same example, an indirect cost would include the expenses incurred to provide an office and equipment for that individual to perform his or her duties, including (but not exclusive to) the provision of the service in question.

Components of the full cost of service include direct labor costs, indirect labor costs, specific direct non-labor costs (where applicable), allocated non-labor costs, and allocated organization-wide overhead costs. Definitions of these cost components are as follows:

- **Labor costs** – These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for City personnel specifically involved in the provision of services and activities to the public.
- **Indirect labor costs** – These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for City personnel supporting the provision of services and activities. This can include line supervision and departmental management, administrative support within a department, and staff involved in technical activities related to the direct services provided to the public.
- **Specific direct non-labor costs** – These are discrete expenses incurred by the City due to a specific service or activity performed, such as contractor costs, third-party charges, and very specific materials used in the service or activity. (In most fee types, this component is not used, as it is very difficult to directly assign most non-labor costs at the activity level.)
- **Allocated indirect non-labor costs** – These are expenses other than labor involved in the provision of services. In most cases, these costs are allocated across all services provided by a department, rather than directly assigned to fee categories.
- **Allocated indirect organization-wide overhead** – These are expenses, both labor and non-labor, related to the City's support services. Support services typically include general administrative services provided internally across the City's departments such as the City Administrative Office, City Clerk, City Attorney, Human Resources, Finance, etc., as well as cost burdens for building use, and building maintenance. The amount of costs attributable to the Department of City Planning were sourced from separate documentation provided by the City.

These cost components were expressed using annual (or annualized) figures, representing a twelve-month cycle of expenses incurred by the City in the provision of all services and activities agency-wide.

Nearly all of the fees under review in this study require specific actions on the part of City staff to provide the service or conduct the activity. Because labor is an underlying factor in these activities, the full cost of service was most appropriately expressed as a fully burdened cost per hour (fully burdened hourly rate). One composite rate was developed for all programs within the Department that provide routine case processing services, and a separate rate was developed for the Expedited Processing Unit. These rates serve as the basis for further quantifying the average full cost of providing individual services and activities.

Two basic criteria are needed to develop the fully burdened hourly rate: the total estimated annual costs of providing services, and the number of hours available to perform those services. The costs of service were quantified generally through the earlier steps described in each bullet, above. The number of hours were derived from a complete listing of Department personnel, as follows:

- Each employee was assigned a full-time equivalent factor. An employee working full-time would have a factor of 1.0; an employee working exactly half-time would have a factor of 0.5. A full-time employee is paid for roughly 2,080 hours per year of regular time. Using this as an initial benchmark of labor time, each employee's full-time equivalent factor was applied to this amount of hours to generate the total number of regular paid hours in each department.
- Each employee's annual paid leave hours were approximated. Paid leave included holidays, vacation, sick leave, and any other regular leave indicated in personnel data. Once quantified for the entire department, annual paid leave hours were removed from the total number of regular paid hours to generate the total number of available labor hours for the Department.

- Available hours were further categorized into various direct services, indirect support services, and non-recoverable services, which formed the basis for a robust cost allocation exercise and rate calculation outcome. Resulting available labor hours were divided into the full costs of service for fee recoverable service categories to derive a composite fully burdened rate for the Department.

This rate was used in the Fee Study to estimate the average full cost of providing each fee related service or activity included in the Study. This step required the development of staff time estimates for the services and activities listed in the fee schedule or identified as new fee items. With the exception of Major Projects, Environmental Impact Report review, and Expedited Processing requests, the Department does not systematically track activity service time at a level of detail that could be used to provide analysis of the time typically required to perform an individual request for service. Consequently, interviews and questionnaires were used to develop the necessary data sets describing estimated labor time. In most cases, Department staff were asked to estimate the average amount of time (in minutes and hours) it would take to complete a typical occurrence of each service or activity considered. Every attempt was made to ensure that each Department program area having a direct role in the provision of each service or activity provided a time estimate.

Development of these time estimates was not a one-step process: estimates from the Department's prior fee study were reviewed with staff, revised estimates were received and carefully reviewed by both consultant and departmental management to assess the reasonableness of such estimates. Based on this review, sometimes estimates were reconsidered until all parties were comfortable that they reasonably reflected average efforts required. Once finalized, the staff time estimates were then applied to the fully burdened rate to yield an average full cost of the service or activity.

The Department does not currently have the systems in place to charge fees for every service or activity based on the actual amount of time it takes to serve each individual. Moreover, such an approach is almost universally infeasible without significant – if not unreasonable – investments in costly technology. Much of the Department's current fee schedule is composed of flat fees, which by definition, are linked to an average cost of service; thus, use of this average cost method was the predominant approach in proceeding toward a schedule of revised fees. Flat fee structures based on average costs of service are widely applied among other California municipalities, and it is a generally accepted approach. (Refer to the subsection below regarding "Fee Establishment" for further discussion.)

### **Cost Recovery Evaluation**

To evaluate the current level of cost recovery achieved from existing fee revenues, the Study compared the existing cost recovery amount for each service or activity to the average full cost of service quantified through the Cost of Service Analysis. Throughout this report and its attachments, cost recovery is expressed as a percentage of the full cost of service calculation. A cost recovery rate of 0% means no costs are recovered from fee revenues. A rate of 100% means that the full cost of service is recovered from the fee. A rate between 0% and 100% indicates partial recovery of the full cost of service through fees. A rate greater than 100% means that the existing cost recovery amount exceeds the full cost of service.

User fees and regulatory fees examined in this study should not exceed the estimated and reasonable cost of providing services. In other words, the cost recovery rate achieved by a fee should not be greater than 100%. As such, local governments in California typically perform fee studies on a routine basis

(approximately every five years as a Best Management Practice) in order to recalibrate fee amounts to reflect up to, and not more than, the cost of providing each service. Periodic comprehensive studies of this nature assist each agency in reflecting the operational, procedural, and fiscal changes that occur over time within the details of their fee schedule. From one study to the next, it is therefore not uncommon to find that some fees require reduction, while others can afford an increase in order to realign fees for service with the current operating procedure unique to each agency.

## Fee Establishment

The scope of this Study also included a comprehensive fee structure review, as well as assistance to the Department in determining recommended fee amounts for adoption by City Council.

## Comprehensive Fee Structure Review

NBS worked with Department staff to consider how well the number of existing fees, names of existing fees, structure of existing fees is working for both the Department and its customers. A range of conversations and edits to the Department's existing fee schedule encompassed the following key concepts:

- **Addition to and deletion of fees** – The Study process provided the opportunity to propose additions and deletions to the fee schedule, as well as rename, reorganize, and classify fees differently as needed. Many such revisions were performed to better conform fees to current operational and/or regulatory practices, as well as improve the general application, calculation, and collection of fees. In other words, as staff is more knowledgeable and comfortable working with the fee schedule, greater accuracy is achieved in both assessing fees to customers and collecting revenues. Beyond this, some additions to the fee schedule were made for existing services or activities performed by Department staff for which no current fee is charged, as well as deletion of fees for services no longer provided.
- **Revision to the structure of fees** – In most cases, the current structure of fees was sustained; the level of the fee was simply recalibrated to match the costs of service. In several cases, however, the manner in which a fee charged to a user was changed. In the majority of cases in which this was done, the primary objective was to simplify the fee structure, or increase the likelihood that the full cost of service would be recovered.
- **Documentation of tools to calculate special cost recovery** – Documenting the fully burdened hourly rates developed by this Study within the fee schedule provides an opportunity for the City Council to approve rates that should be used whenever the Department computes a special form of cost recovery under a “time and materials” approach. It also provides clear publication of those rates, so ultimate fee payers of any uniquely determined fee can reference the amounts. Publication of these rates in the fee schedule should be accompanied by language providing that special forms of cost recovery for activities and services not contemplated by the standard adopted fee schedule can be computed at the discretion of the Department's Director, following the rates adopted by the City Council in the fee schedule.

Because most of the Department's fees are flat fees, they correspond directly to the average full cost of service result. For the few activities where estimating an average was impossible – due to the highly variable nature of the service – use of fully burdened hourly rates coupled with time-tracking was suggested as the fee structure. (In other words, the City would charge a fee per hour of staff time, requiring some degree of time estimation or outright time-tracking at the case level.)

## Recommended Fee Amounts

The Cost of Service Analysis provides the estimated total cost of providing each service. The Cost Recovery Evaluation provides information about the percentage of costs recovered through current fee amounts as compared to the full cost of providing each service. However, determining the resulting “price” charged for each service and/or establishing targeted level of cost recovery for an existing or new fee is not an analytical exercise. Instead, the resulting fee amounts that are actually adopted from this Study typically reflect agency-specific judgments linked to a variety of factors, such as existing City policies, agency-wide or departmental revenue objectives, economic goals, community values, market conditions, level of demand, and others.

A general means of selecting an appropriate cost recovery target is to consider the public and private benefits of the service or activity in question.

- To what degree does the public at large benefit from the service?
- To what degree does the individual or entity requesting, requiring, or causing the service benefit?

When a service or activity completely benefits the public at large, it can be argued reasonably that there should be no cost recovery from fees (i.e., 0% cost recovery): that a truly public-benefit service is best funded by the general resources of the City, such as General Fund revenues (e.g., taxes). Conversely, when a service or activity completely benefits an individual or entity, it can be argued reasonably that 100% of the cost should be recovered from fees collected from the individual or entity. An example of a completely private benefit service may be a request for exemption from a City regulation or process.

Under this approach, it is often found that many governmental services and activities fall somewhere between these two extremes, which is to say that most activities have a mixed benefit. In the majority of those cases, the initial cost recovery level targeted may attempt to reflect that mixed public and private benefit. For example, an activity that seems to have a 40% private benefit and a 60% public benefit would yield a cost recovery target from fees of 40%.

In some cases, a strict public-versus-private benefit judgment may not be sufficient to finalize a cost recovery target. Any of the following other factors and considerations may influence exclusively or supplement the public/private benefit of a service or activity:

- If optimizing revenue potential is an overriding goal, is it feasible to recover the full cost of service?
- Will increasing fees result in non-compliance or public safety problems?
- Are there desired behaviors or modifications to behaviors of the service population that could be helped or hindered through the degree of pricing for the activities?
- Could fee increases adversely affect City goals, priorities, or values?

For specific subsets of fees, even more specific questions may influence ultimate cost recovery targets:

- Does current demand for services support a fee increase without adverse impact to the citizenry served or current revenue levels? (In other words, would fee increases have the unintended consequence of driving away the population served?)

- Is there a good policy basis for differentiating between type of users (e.g., residents and non-residents, residential and commercial, non-profit entities and business entities)?
- Are there broader City objectives that inform a less than full cost recovery target from fees, such as economic development goals and local social values?

Because this element of the study is subjective, the consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the Department of City Planning – has provided initial recommendations regarding appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. Please consult the Department’s staff report to Council for that information.

### Comparative Fee Survey

Often policy makers request a comparison of their jurisdiction’s fees to surrounding communities or similar scopes of operations. The purpose of a comparison is to provide a sense of the local market pricing for services, and to use that information to gauge the impact of recommendations for fee adjustments proposed by the consultant’s report and/or staff recommendations.

Appendices B and C to this report provides the results of the Comparative Fee Survey conducted for the Los Angeles Department of City Planning. NBS worked with the Department to choose the following regional and national candidates for the comparison:

| Comparison Cities |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Regional          | National      |
| Burbank           | Dallas        |
| Glendale          | Denver        |
| LA County         | Oakland       |
| Long Beach        | Portland      |
| Pasadena          | San Jose      |
| Santa Clarita     | San Francisco |
|                   | Seattle       |

It should be noted that comparative surveys do not provide information about the cost recovery policies or procedures inherent in each comparison agency. A “market based” decision to price services at below the cost of service analysis results, is the same as making a decision to subsidize that service. Comparative agencies may or may not base their fee amounts on the estimated and reasonable cost of providing services.

Additionally, comparative fee survey efforts are often non-conclusive for many fee categories. Regional and national comparison agencies typically use varied terminology for provision of similar services. In general, NBS conducts a reasonable attempt to source each comparison agency’s fee schedule from the Internet, and compile a comparison of fee categories and amounts for the most readily comparable fee items that match the client’s existing fee structure. A reasonable attempt to contact each agency for clarification regarding fee categories and amounts is also made; however, satisfactory feedback and response is not always received.

## Data Sources

The following data sources were used to support the cost of service analysis and fee establishment phases of this study:

- The Los Angeles Department of City Planning's Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-16, with incorporation of Fiscal Year 2016-17 proposed staffing changes and requests.
- A complete listing of all Department personnel, salary/wage rates, regular hours, paid benefits, and paid leave amounts, as provided by the Department.
- Various correspondences with Department staff supporting the adopted budgets and current fees, including budget notes and expenditure detail not shown in the published document.
- Prevailing fee schedules provided by the City's Municipal Code.
- Annual volumetric (workload) data from the prior fiscal year.

The City's adopted budget is the most significant source of information affecting cost of service results. It should be noted that consultant did not conduct separate efforts to audit or validate the City's financial management and budget practices, nor was cost information adjusted to reflect different levels of service or any specific, targeted performance benchmarks. This study has accepted the City's budget as a legislatively adopted directive describing the most appropriate and reasonable level of City spending. Consultants accept the City Council's deliberative process and ultimate acceptance of the budget plan and further assert that through that legislative process, the City has yielded a reasonable expenditure plan, valid for use in setting cost-based fees.

Beyond data furnished by the City, original data sets were also developed to support the work of this study: primarily, estimated staff time at various levels of detail. To develop these data sets, consultants prepared questionnaires and conducted meetings and interviews with Department staff. In the fee establishment phase of the analysis, staff provided estimates of the average time spent providing a service or activity corresponding with an existing or new fee. Consultants and departmental management reviewed and questioned responses to ensure the best possible set of estimates.

## Section 2 – Fee Study Results

The Department of City Planning is charged with the responsibility of preparing, maintaining, and implementing a General Plan for the development of the City of Los Angeles. The Department serves the residents and businesses of the City of Los Angeles by regulating the use of land based on the General Plan and City's Zoning Code, which contain the City's adopted policies and regulations.

The Department is organized into various programs, summarized as follows:

- **Development Services** - This program provides a full range of pre- and post-entitlement development consultation to properly advise applicants on the development path; serves as the point of entry for all discretionary land use applications; conducts technical research and troubleshoots problematic projects; and manages and monitors condition compliance.
- **Geographic Project Planning** - This program, organized by geographic units, is responsible for the processing of all discretionary land use entitlement applications, reviewing them for compliance with applicable policies and plans and issuing a letter of determination for all Director of Planning determinations, Office of Zoning Administration functions, subdivision of land applications, and entitlements that require Commissions and Council consideration. Review and documentation for projects requiring review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is a major function within the project planning program.
- **Major Projects and Project Plan Support** - This program processes large scale developments, zoning administration, subdivision, and City Planning Commission cases as well as the associated environmental analysis including Environmental Impact Reports and Development Agreements. This program includes the Expedited Processing Section for the Department which provides the public with a faster alternative for processing entitlement applications. This program also provides design guidelines, standard operating procedures for all project planning functions, and training for Department staff.
- **Historic Resources** - This program identifies, designates, and promotes the preservation of historically and culturally significant properties in the City. This program also develops historic preservation policies.
- **Citywide Planning** - This program develops and maintains the City's General Plan (except the Community Plans), updates and implements housing, health, transportation, and environmental policies and regulation, and performs research, analysis, and updates of the Zoning Code.
- **Community Planning** - This program prepares, updates, and maintains the City's 35 Community Plans that collectively constitute the required Land Use Element of the City's General Plan.
- **Neighborhood Initiatives and Transit Oriented Planning** - This program provides targeted neighborhood plans to address more localized land-use issues and challenges through Specific Plans, zoning overlays, transportation plans, streetscape plans, and other planning tools. This program also prepares transit-oriented plans in conjunction with other transportation agencies using grant funds. This program was excluded from the Fee Study's scope of review.

- **Technology Support** – This program coordinates and implements efficient technology solutions in support of the Department’s business needs.
- **General Administration** - This program provides department-wide management in budget development, budget implementation, general administration, fiscal services, procurement and contracting, human resource management, record management, and facility management services. Additionally, this program oversees the coordination of Commission meetings and provides direct staff support for operating programs.

A working understanding of the Department’s programs, services, and organizational structure informed each phase of the Fee Study conducted by NBS. The following subsections summarize the Cost of Service Analysis, Cost Recovery Evaluation, and Fee Establishment outcomes of the Study.

### Cost of Service Analysis Outcomes

With each Departmental Program area, NBS identified services eligible for recovery in fees for service, either in whole or in part, as well as services and program which, in NBS’ professional opinion, are not eligible for recovery in fees for service:

| Program  | Activities Recoverable from Case Processing Fees | Activities Recoverable from Surcharge Fees | Activities Requiring Non-fee Funding Sources | Total         |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| Development Services                               | \$ 4,977,703                                     | \$ 319,208                                 | \$ 4,459,188                                 | \$ 9,756,098  |
| Geographic Project Planning                        | \$ 17,246,538                                    | \$ 51,193                                  | \$ 6,922,715                                 | \$ 24,220,446 |
| Major Projects and Project Plan Support            | \$ 4,318,567                                     | \$ -                                       | \$ 667,866                                   | \$ 4,986,433  |
| Major Projects and Project Plan Support -Expedited | \$ 4,612,462                                     | \$ -                                       | \$ -   | \$ 4,612,462  |
| Historic Resources                                 | \$ 386,119                                       | \$ -                                       | \$ 2,276,970                                 | \$ 2,663,088  |
| Citywide Planning                                  | \$ -   | \$ 2,324,837                               | \$ 2,929,693                                 | \$ 5,254,530  |
| Community Planning                                 | \$ 205,950                                       | \$ 10,040,995                              | \$ 910,161                                   | \$ 11,157,105 |
| Technology Support                                 | \$ -   | \$ 10,006,414                              | \$ 186,433                                   | \$ 10,192,846 |
| Department General Administration                  | <i>included above</i>                            |  | \$ 86,474                                    | \$ 86,474     |
|  | \$ 31,747,338                                    | \$ 22,742,644                              | \$ 18,439,500                                | \$ 72,929,482 |

The total estimated costs of Departmental Programs studied by NBS is approximately \$72.9 million per year, including all direct and indirect cost components as described in the Section 1 of this report. As shown in the table above:

- Approximately \$31.7 million (44%) in annual service costs are eligible for recovery in general case processing fees and expedited processing requests.
- Approximately \$22.7 million (31%) in annual service costs are attributable to technology support and advance planning services. Recovery of these costs are structured as surcharge fees on top of case processing fees. Revenues are tracked to separate funds, and expended for those designated purposes.
- Approximately \$18.4 million (25%) in costs were identified as services that are not eligible for recovery in the Department’s case processing fees.

For purposes of evaluating the costs of individual case processing fees and expedited processing requests, NBS developed a fully burdened cost per hour.

| Program                                 | Activities Recoverable from Case Processing Fees | Available Direct Service Hours | Fully Burdened Cost per Hour |
|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Case Processing Services - All Programs | \$ 27,134,876                                    | 141,658                        | \$192                        |
| Expedited Processing Requests           | \$ 4,612,462                                     | 21,091                         | \$219                        |

All subsequent cost of service calculations at the individual case processing fee level assume a fully-burdened hourly rate of \$192, with potential to recover approximately \$27.1 million in costs from fees for service. For expedited processing requests, the Department could charge up to \$219 per hour against the deposits collected from applicants. The degree of cost differential in these two hourly rates was determined by looking at the ratio of direct time spent on case processing services, versus time spent on indirect support activities within individual staff job duties. In the Expedited Processing Unit, staff are available on an "on-call" basis to provide faster turnaround on project application review. This Unit is staffed specifically for this purpose, and therefore has a higher degree of indirect support activities in the form of stand-by availability.

The \$18.4 million identified in "Activities Requiring Non-Fee Funding Sources" identifies service areas that NBS recommends as best funded via alternate revenue sources than user or regulatory fees. Significant analytical and policy decisions revolved around inclusion of categorized service costs in the fully-burdened hourly rates developed for case processing. The decision whether to include or exclude some or all of a particular cost category in fees for service is guided by basic fee setting parameters offered by the California State Constitution and Statutes, which require that any new fee levied or existing fee increased should not exceed the estimated amount required to provide the service for which the charge is levied. Summaries of non-fee funded costs per departmental program area are provided, below:

- Development Services** - Typically, some portion of costs for provision of general public information and assistance are not linked for recovery from fees for planning applications. Planning staff estimated approximately 25% (\$694,000) should be not be considered in the calculation of fees for services. These costs represent the function of local government to provide general information and assistance to the public. In addition, Development Services provides assistance to other divisions and departments outside of the Department of City Planning (\$1.1 million), responds to Public Records Act Requests (\$105,000), and provides zoning review support to the Building and Safety Permit Fund (\$2.6 million).
- Geographic Project Planning** - This Program contains multiple sub-programs. The Conditional Compliance Unit (\$4.6 million) does charge fees for service but was studied recently under a separate analysis and therefore not reconsidered within the context of this Study. The Revocations and Nuisance Abatement Unit provides community group liaison and abatement services (\$284,000), which should be funded separately than their case processing fees through fines, penalties, or general fund resources. Similar to Development Services, the Geographic Project Planning Program as a whole also provides general public information services, Public Records Act request responses, support to external City departments, and actively supports a myriad of special project and City Council research requests. The Program's costs for responding to Public Records Act requests (\$274,000) are not recoverable in fees by law, whereas all other support activities as described (\$1.8 million) are not considered either directly or indirectly supportive of case processing fee related services.
- Major Projects and Project Plan Support** – This Program also contains multiple sub-programs. The estimated annual cost of the Urban Design Studio's initiatives (\$241,000) which are not related to case processing requests, are not recoverable in fees for service. The Department-wide Training Program

is also housed within this Program, the costs of which have been allocated separately to all other Programs within the Department as an indirect service cost. Similar to Development Services and Geographic Project Planning programs, Major Projects also responds to Public Records Act Requests (\$249,000), and provides support to external City departments (\$75,000).

- **Historic Resources** - This Program develops and implements policies and procedures for the City's historic resources. These costs are not considered within the case processing fees (\$1.2 million). Additionally, this program provides general public information services (\$207,000), support to external City departments (\$90,000), general public outreach activities (\$229,000), and continued efforts and maintenance of the Survey LA program (\$502,000).
- **Citywide Planning** – The Study identified approximately \$2 million in special projects and code studies activities that are not targeted for recovery in the Department' advance planning surcharge. In addition, this Program provides general public information and response to Public Records Act requests (\$614,000), and targeted code updates for Building and Safety (\$274,000).
- **Community Planning** - This Program provides services for which grants or other types of reimbursements offset the costs of providing services (\$594,000), as well as general public information services (\$125,000), response to Public Records Act requests (\$38,000), and support to special projects and Council requests (\$153,000).
- **Technology Support** – This Program provides support to the Building and Safety fund, estimated at approximately \$186,000 per year.
- **General Administration** - This Program provides response to Public Records Act requests (\$86,000).

The results of this Cost of Service Analysis conclude that the Department may recover approximately 75% of services provided through case processing fees or accompanying surcharges, while 25% of service costs require alternate funding sources. For case processing services and expedited processing requests, a fully burdened cost per hour of \$192, and \$219, respectively, were derived. The Fee Establishment section of this chapter will provide additional analysis and description of outcomes for recovery of these costs in user fees for services.

The majority of technology support and advance planning services are currently recovered through surcharges assessed on top of planning application fees. Per the request of the Department, NBS did not further analyze or re-calibrate the surcharge calculations as part of this Study's scope of work

#### **Cost Recovery Evaluation Outcomes**

The Department of City Planning's case processing fees recover approximately 74% of the total estimated eligible costs of providing services:

| Fee Category                     | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit) | Existing Cost Recovery % |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| Regular Case Processing Requests | \$ 16,773,498   | \$ 25,233,969  | (8,460,471)                              | 66%                      |
| Expedited Requests               | \$ 5,400,000  | \$ 4,612,462   | 787,538                                  | 117%                     |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>\$ 22,173,498</b>                                      | <b>\$ 29,846,430</b>                                   | <b>\$ (7,672,933)</b>                    | <b>74%</b>               |

At the average current demand for fee related services, the Planning Department collects approximately \$22.2 million per year in revenue. At the full cost recovery fee amount calculated by NBS for each fee for service, the same demand for services would generate approximately \$29.8 million. The City is currently subsidizing case processing requests at approximately \$7.7 million per year.

Appendix A presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for fee recoverable services. The "Total Cost of Service per Activity Column" establishes the maximum at which a fee could be charged for the corresponding service identified in the "Fee Description" list. NBS worked extensively with Department staff to gather estimates of time required to perform each service identified in the Appendix. Time estimates were evaluated on separate occasions by staff members and also reviewed by NBS to determine whether the time estimates provided seemed reasonable.

When the Total Cost of Service per Activity is compared to the Division's "Current Cost Recovery Amount", some items will appear to under recover their costs, some will come close to 100% recovery, and some will appear to collect more than the cost of providing services. This is a typical outcome of any Cost of Service Analysis. For all routine, "regular" case processing requests, the Study's findings indicate the need for recalibration of existing fee amounts to reflect their cost of providing services. For Expedited service requests, NBS did not study the fee program on a case by case basis; however, overall cost recovery results for this program exceeded 100%. NBS recommends the City implement an hourly rate of \$219 per hour, as well as reconsider the existing practice of retaining the initial case processing fee in addition to deposits for hourly billing.

### Fee Establishment Outcomes

As described in Section 1 of this report, NBS approached establishment of resulting fees from two perspectives.

First, a comprehensive fee structure review was completed whereby consultants and City staff reviewed existing fee categories for relevance to the current operational and regulatory environment, as well as fairness and equitability to the customer and City's cost recovery objectives. Overall, the Department made few changes or deviations from the current fee structure as shown in Article 9. The format of Appendix A to this report provides tracking of new fees added, and existing fee categories deleted. The following provides several summarized examples of changes proposed and evaluated:

- A collection of fees for miscellaneous clearance requests and plan approvals, as performed by the Development Services Program, were moved to a designated section of the fee schedule, now shown as 19.04 "Fees for Sign off Requests".

- Fees for Historic Related Applications in Section 19.01 F were reviewed and revised. Several existing fee categories were deleted, reformatted, or renamed to better comply with the way in which services are delivered by the Program.
- Section 19.01 Y, Green Building Permit Application, was removed from the fee structure. This fee is a Building and Safety processing fee, and no longer applies.
- Section 19.02 E, fee for Relocation Assistance Plan Approval was deleted.
- Several fee items in 19.02 E and F were renamed to better reflect project types and sizes processed.
- The deposit fee structure for Environmental Impact Report review (Section 19.05), was consolidated and simplified to a single initial deposit amount.
- Fees in Section 19.07 for Flood Hazard Reports and Compliance Checks were removed. These are Bureau of Engineering fees.
- Fees in Section 19.09 for Land Development Counseling Services were renamed and restructured to reflect the Development Services Case Management Program service offerings related to pre-application review and project navigation.
- Fees in section 19.12, Deviations Pursuant to Section 16.03 E, were removed

Second, consultants worked with Department staff and management to review cost of service analysis outcomes at the individual fee level, and collect an initial round of "recommended fee amounts", which may be equal to or less than the total cost of service per fee item evaluated. Appendix A presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for fee recoverable services, and the Department's staff report to Council may be consulted to view initial recommended fee amounts proposed for Council's consideration.

### Section 3 – Conclusion

Based on the Cost of Service Analysis, Cost Recovery Evaluation, and Fee Establishment phases of analysis in this study, all proposed updates to Article 9 are included in the City's accompanying staff report.

As discussed throughout this report, the proposed fee schedule includes fee increases intended to improve the City's recovery of costs incurred to provide individual services, as well as to adjust fees downward where fees charge exceed the average costs incurred.

Predicting the amount to which any adopted fee increases will affect Department revenues is difficult to quantify. For the near-term, the City should not count on increased revenues to meet any specific expenditure plan. Experience with these fee increases should be gained first before revenue projections are revised. However, unless there is some significant, long-term change in activity levels at the City, the proposed fee amendments should – over time – enhance the Department's revenue capabilities, providing it the ability to stretch other resources further for the benefit of the public at large.

The Department's Fee Schedule should become a living document but handled with care:

- A fundamental purpose of the fee schedule is to provide clarity and transparency to the public and to staff regarding fees charged by the City. Once adopted by the Council, the fee schedule is the final word on the amount and manner in which fees should be charged by the Department. Old fee schedules should be superseded by the new master document. If the master document is found to be missing fees, those fees need eventually to be added to the master schedule and should not continue to exist outside the consolidated, master framework.
- The City should consider adjusting these user fees and regulatory fees on an annual basis to keep pace at least with cost inflation. For all fees and charges, the City could use either a Consumer Price Index adjustment or a percentage of Labor Cost increase, and that practice would be well applied to the new fee schedule. Conducting a comprehensive user fee study is not an annual requirement; it becomes worthwhile only over time as significant shifts in organization, local practices, legislative values, or legal requirements change. In NBS' experience, a comprehensive analysis such as this should be performed every three to five years. It should be noted that when an automatic adjustment is applied annually, the City is free to use its discretion in applying the adjustment; not all fees need to be adjusted, especially when there are good policy reasons for an alternate course. The full cost of service is the City's only limit in setting its fees.

As a final note in this study, it is worth acknowledging the path that fees in general have taken in California. The public demands ever more precise and equitable accounting of the basis for governmental fees and a greater say in when and how they are charged. It is inevitable in the not too distant future that user fees and regulatory fees will demand an even greater level of analysis and supporting data to meet the public's evolving expectations. Technology systems will play an increased and significant role in an agency's ability to accomplish this. Continuous improvement and refinement of time tracking abilities will greatly enhance the Department's ability to set fees for service and identify unfunded activities in years to come.

In preparing this report and the opinions and recommendations included herein, NBS has relied on a number of principal assumptions and considerations with regard to financial matters, conditions and events that may occur in the future. This information and assumptions, including the City's budgets, time estimate

data, and workload information from City staff, were provided by sources we believe to be reliable; however, NBS has not independently verified such information and assumptions.

While we believe NBS' use of such information and assumptions is reasonable for the purpose of this report, some assumptions will invariably not materialize as stated herein and may vary significantly due to unanticipated events and circumstances. Therefore, the actual results can be expected to vary from those projected to the extent that actual future conditions differ from those assumed by us or provided to us by others.

## **APPENDIX A**

---

### ***Cost of Service Analysis per Fee Item Studied***

| Fee No.   | Fee Description  | Article           | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---|--|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |  |                   |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| <b>19.01 FILING FEES FOR APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS</b> |  |                   |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.01 A</b>  | <b>Establishment or Change of Zones, Height Districts or Supplemental Use Districts and Other Related Actions.</b><br><i>The following fees shall be charged for a zone change, height district or supplemental use district when that action is consistent with the General Plan. (See Section 19.03 for zone change requests that are not consistent with the General Plan.)</i> |                   | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Zone Change - No New Construction  | 12.32             | [1]   | 60.00   | \$ 11,609               | \$ 11,734                    | 101%                     | 31                                       | \$ 357,887  | \$ 354,076  |
| 2   | Zone Change - With New Construction  | 12.32             |       | 120.00  | \$ 20,229               | \$ 5,747                     | 28%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3   | Clarification of Q Classifications or D Limitations  | 12.32 H           |       | 21.71   | \$ 4,158                | \$ 4,428                     | 107%                     | 8  | \$ 36,531   | \$ 34,301   |
| 4   | Land Use Determinations by CPC   | 12.24.1           |       | 7.75  | \$ 1,485                | \$ 11,060                    | 745%                     | 1  | \$ 11,060   | \$ 1,485  |
| 5   | Amendment of Council's Instructions involving (T) Tentative Classifications  | 12.32             |       | 24.21   | \$ 4,637                | \$ 4,264                     | 92%                      | 1  | \$ 2,132  | \$ 2,318  |
| 6   | Height District Change   | 12.32             |       | 100.60  | \$ 19,270               | \$ 11,123                    | 58%                      | 9  | \$ 94,546   | \$ 163,797  |
| 7   | Supplemental Use District: Change or Removal   | 12.32 S           |       | 342.88  | \$ 65,680               | \$ 67,915                    | 103%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 8   | Supplemental Use District: Establishment   | 12.32 S           |       | 682.36  | \$ 130,708              | \$ 134,608                   | 103%                     | 2  | \$ 269,216  | \$ 261,416  |
| 9   | Conditions of Approval for Oil Drilling  | 13.01 H           |       | 46.00   | \$ 8,811                | \$ 7,650                     | 87%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 10  | Zone Boundary Line Adjustment  | 12.30 H           |       | 27.94   | \$ 5,352                | \$ 5,473                     | 102%                     | 5  | \$ 25,997   | \$ 25,422   |
| 11  | Building Line - Establishment, Change or Removal   | 12.32             |       | 37.40   | \$ 7,164                | \$ 8,833                     | 123%                     | 6  | \$ 48,582   | \$ 39,402   |
| 12  | Surface Mining Permits   | 13.03             |       | 12.58   | \$ 2,410                | \$ 2,640                     | 110%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 B</b>  | <b>Appeal Fees</b>   |                   | [2]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Appeal Fee - Applicant (first level appeal)  |                   |       | 70.68   | \$ 13,538               | \$ 13,277                    | 98%                      | 24                                       | \$ 321,967  | \$ 328,296  |
| 2   | Appeal Fee - Applicant (addl level appeal)   |                   |       | 53.48   | \$ 10,243               | \$ 11,211                    | 109%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3   | Person other than the applicant  |                   |       | 70.68   | \$ 13,538               | \$ 89                        | 1%                       | 198                                      | \$ 17,622   | \$ 2,680,520  |
| <b>19.01 C</b>  | <b>Commission Conditional Uses and Other Similar Quasi-judicial Approvals and Public Benefit Approvals</b>   |                   | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Conditional Use by APC or CPC<br><i>Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project) - Moved to 19.04</i>  | 12.24U and 12.24V |       | 65.95   | \$ 12,633               | \$ 13,224                    | 105%                     | 8  | \$ 102,486  | \$ 97,905   |
| 2   | Public Benefits Alternative Compliance Proposal  | 14.00B            |       | 68.20   | \$ 13,064               | \$ 16,938                    | 130%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3   | Modification of Existing CUP by APC or CPC   | 12.24B            |       | 67.07   | \$ 12,846               | \$ 8,878                     | 69%                      | 5  | \$ 44,390   | \$ 64,232   |
| 4   | Letters of Correction, Modification or Clarification of a determination by a ZA or the Director initiated by Applicant   |                   |       | 7.76  | \$ 1,486                | \$ 1,331                     | 90%                      | 8  | \$ 10,648   | \$ 11,892   |
| <b>19.01 D</b>  | <b>Variances, Adjustments or Modifications from the Regulations and Requirements of the Zoning Ordinances</b>  |                   |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Variance   | 12.24Y and 12.27  |       | 29.02   | \$ 5,558                | \$ 6,448                     | 116%                     | 120                                      | \$ 773,760  | \$ 666,948  |
| 2   | Adjustment by ZA except SF dwelling  | 12.28A            |       | 26.87   | \$ 5,146                | \$ 5,370                     | 104%                     | 35                                       | \$ 186,608  | \$ 178,826  |
| 3   | Adjustment by ZA for SF dwelling   | 12.28A            |       | 22.57   | \$ 4,322                | \$ 2,685                     | 62%                      | 69                                       | \$ 184,594  | \$ 297,164  |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Article                        | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|----------------|--|--------------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|                |  |                                |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 4              | Slight Modification by ZA  | 12.28B.2                       |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 3,941                     | 71%                      | 1  | \$ 1,971  | \$ 2,758  |
| 5              | Reasonable Accommodation Determination   | 12.22A.27                      | [3]   | 11.60   | \$ 2,222                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 E</b> | <b>Zoning Administrator Conditional Uses, Interpretations and Various Quasi-judicial Approvals</b>   |                                | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>E.1</b>     | <i>The following fees shall be charged pursuant to Section 12.24 of this Code to applicants seeking certain permits, interpretations or approvals</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1              | ZA Interpretation of Yard or Use Regulations   | 12.21A.2                       |       | 29.19   | \$ 5,591                | \$ 5,831                     | 104%                     | 3  | \$ 14,578   | \$ 13,979   |
| 2              | Conditional Use by ZA - Alcohol and Entertainment  | 12.24W.1 and 12.24W.18         |       | 33.47   | \$ 6,412                | \$ 6,459                     | 101%                     | 254                                      | \$ 1,640,586  | \$ 1,628,539  |
| 3              | Conditional Use by ZA - all other uses   | 12.24W                         |       | 29.55   | \$ 5,660                | \$ 5,358                     | 95%                      | 167                                      | \$ 894,786  | \$ 945,283  |
| 4              | Modification or Review by ZA   | 12.24J, 12.24L, and 12.24M     |       | 29.85   | \$ 5,718                | \$ 5,754                     | 101%                     | 174                                      | \$ 999,758  | \$ 993,576  |
| 5              | Relief from Fence Height Limitation  | 12.24X.7, 12.24X.8, and 12.28  |       | 28.37   | \$ 5,434                | \$ 4,525                     | 83%                      | 35                                       | \$ 158,375  | \$ 190,202  |
| 6              | Child Care less than or equal to 50 children in the R-3 zone or Large Family Daycare   | 12.24X                         |       | 22.35   | \$ 4,281                | \$ 4,601                     | 107%                     | 3  | \$ 11,503   | \$ 10,703   |
| 7              | Certified Farmers' Market  | 12.24X.6                       |       | 13.03   | \$ 2,495                | \$ 2,641                     | 106%                     | 1  | \$ 2,641  | \$ 2,495  |
| 8              | Service of Alcohol in a small restaurant less than or equal to 50 seats  | 12.24X.2                       |       | 19.77   | \$ 3,787                | \$ 6,040                     | 159%                     | 1  | \$ 6,040  | \$ 3,787  |
| 9              | Approval to Erect Amateur Radio Antenna  | 12.24X.3                       |       | 12.11   | \$ 2,320                | \$ 2,592                     | 112%                     | 0  | \$ 648  | \$ 580  |
| 10             | ZA Determination under Section 12.24 X unless listed separately  | 12.24X                         |       | 28.59   | \$ 5,476                | \$ 6,093                     | 111%                     | 56                                       | \$ 341,208  | \$ 306,630  |
|                | <i>Items 11 and 12 moved to 19.04</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>E.2</b>     | <i>The following fee shall be charged pursuant to Section 12.24 B.1. of this Code to applicants seeking a conditional use permit that requires a consultation with the Department for preliminary project review:</i>                              |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1              | Pre-Application Review and Research for Conditional Uses (moved to section 19.09)  | 12.24 F                        |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>E.3</b>     | <i>The following fees shall be charged pursuant to Sections 12.24 F. and 12.24 Z.2. of this Code for costs associated with permit clearance, condition compliance monitoring and inspections conducted by the City, and revocation proceedings</i> |                                | [16]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                | <i>Miscellaneous Clearance - Zoning Administrator (moved to 19.04)</i>   |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                | <i>Miscellaneous Clearance - Zoning Administrator Single Family Dwellings with No Exceptions (moved to 19.04)</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1              | Monitoring of Conditional Use Permits  | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 952                       |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Article                        | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|----------------|--|--------------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|                |  |                                |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 2              | Field Verification Prior to Operations   | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 253                       |                          |  |   |   |
| 3              | Inspection and Field Compliance Review of Operations   | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 746                       |                          |  |   |   |
| 4              | Revocation, Suspension or Restriction Proceedings for Non-Compliance of Conditions (Deposit)                                 | 12.24Z                         | [17]  |   |                         | \$ 5,000                     |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.01 F</b> | <b>Fees for Historic Related Applications</b>  |                                | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1              | HPOZ: Establishment, Change or Removal   | 12.20.3                        | [7]   | 664.00  | \$ 127,191              | \$ 138,017                   | 109%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 2              | HPOZ Preservation Plan   |                                |       | 165.00  | \$ 31,606               | \$ 30,998                    | 98%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness: not involving new construction or additions   | 12.20.3                        |       | 22.25   | \$ 4,262                | \$ 473                       | 11%                      | 4  | \$ 1,892  | \$ 17,048   |
| 4              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, up to 750 sq ft              | 0                              |       | 23.25   | \$ 4,454                | \$ 708                       | 16%                      | 23                                       | \$ 15,930   | \$ 100,206  |
| 5              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, greater than 750 sq ft       | 12.20                          |       | 29.75   | \$ 5,699                | \$ 1,706                     | 30%                      | 27                                       | \$ 45,647   | \$ 152,440  |
| 6              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 1 to 4 units                         | 12.20                          |       | 38.25   | \$ 7,327                | \$ 1,706                     | 23%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 7              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 5 units or more                      | 12.20                          |       | 45.25   | \$ 8,668                | \$ 1,706                     | 20%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 8              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, up to 5,000 s.f.        | 12.20                          |       | 38.25   | \$ 7,327                | \$ 1,706                     | 23%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 9              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, greater than 5,000 s.f. | 12.20                          |       | 45.25   | \$ 8,668                | \$ 1,706                     | 20%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 10             | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new accessory building construction                                | 12.20                          |       | 23.25   | \$ 4,454                | \$ 1,706                     | 38%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 11             | Historic Resources Building Permit Clearance (Larger Project)  | 12.20                          |       | 18.75   | \$ 3,592                | \$ 783                       | 22%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 12             | APC/DEM (Historic) demolition of main structure  | 0                              |       | 43.75   | \$ 8,380                | \$ 4,317                     | 52%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 13             | Mills Act Application - Part 1 - City Application Processing Fee   | 19.144                         | [19]  | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 250                       | 33%                      | 53                                       | \$ 13,250   | \$ 40,609   |
| 14             | Mills Act Application - Part 2 - City Contract Execution Processing Fee  | 19.144                         | [19]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                | City Administrative Fee  |                                |       | 7.00  | \$ 1,341                | \$ 1,142                     | 85%                      | 18                                       | \$ 20,556   | \$ 24,136   |
|                | Mills Act Contract - Inspection - Contract Services Provider (Charged at actual cost)  | 19.144                         | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,654                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 71                                       | \$ -  | \$ 117,440  |
| 15             | Mills Act Application (Valuation Exemption)  | 19.144                         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                | City Administrative Fee  |                                |       | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 473                       | 62%                      | 7  | \$ 3,311  | \$ 5,363  |
|                | Contract Services Provider (Charged at Actual Cost)  |                                | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,500                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 16             | Mills Act Application (Appeal to Cultural Heritage Commission)   | 19.144                         |       | 8.00  | \$ 1,532                | \$ 473                       | 31%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 17             | Mills Act Inspection (once every 5 years)  |                                | [19]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article                   | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---------|--|---------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|         |  |                           |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
|         | City Administrative Fee  |                           |       | 3.00  | \$ 575                  | \$ 1,142                     | 199%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
|         | Mills Act Contract - Inspection - Contract Services Provider (Charged at actual cost)              | 19.144                    | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,500                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 18      | Technical Corrections to previously certified Historic Resource (Applicant Initiated)              | 0                         | [7]   | 13.00   | \$ 2,490                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 19      | Historic Resources - Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND | 0                         |       | 0.00  | \$ -                    | \$ -                         | n/a                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 20      | Historic Resources - Environmental Impact Report Review - (hourly)                                 | 0                         |       | 1.00  | \$ 192                  | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 21      | Major Conforming Work on Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements                                | 0                         |       | 8.00  | \$ 1,532                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 22      | Modification of a Certificate Determination  | 0                         |       | 10.00   | \$ 1,916                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 23      | Preliminary Evaluation of Demolition or Relocation without Permit                                  | 12.20.Q                   | [16]  | 48.00   | \$ 9,195                | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
|         | <b>19.01 G Sign Application</b><br><i>section deleted</i>  |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|         | <b>19.01 H Temporary Subdivision Direction Signs</b><br><i>moved to 19.04</i>                      |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|         | <b>19.01 I Fees for Plan Approvals</b><br><i>moved to 19.04</i>                                    |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|         | <b>19.01 J Commission or Director Approvals</b>  |                           | [8,9] |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1       | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Minor                | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 16.91   | \$ 3,239                | \$ 1,477                     | 46%                      | 89                                       | \$ 131,453  | \$ 288,234  |
| 2       | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard             | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 22.58   | \$ 4,326                | \$ 3,244                     | 75%                      | 30                                       | \$ 97,320   | \$ 129,775  |
| 3       | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard (SF)        | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 19.75   | \$ 3,782                | \$ 1,622                     | 43%                      | 2  | \$ 3,244  | \$ 7,564  |
| 4       | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major                | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 4,787                     | 74%                      | 57                                       | \$ 271,662  | \$ 368,894  |
| 5       | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major (SF)           | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 2,393                     | 37%                      | 92                                       | \$ 218,960  | \$ 594,781  |
| 6       | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor   | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 29.68   | \$ 5,685                | \$ 2,496                     | 44%                      | 17                                       | \$ 42,432   | \$ 96,643   |
| 7       | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard  | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 4,167                     | 64%                      | 23                                       | \$ 93,758   | \$ 146,258  |
| 8       | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard (SF)   | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 2,083                     | 32%                      | 1  | \$ 2,083  | \$ 6,500  |

| Fee No.  | Fee Description   | Article                   | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|  |   |                           |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 9  | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major  | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 43.87   | \$ 8,403                | \$ 5,628                     | 67%                      | 13                                       | \$ 73,164   | \$ 109,239  |
| 10   | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major (SF)   | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 41.03   | \$ 7,859                | \$ 2,814                     | 36%                      | 59                                       | \$ 166,026  | \$ 463,705  |
| 11   | DRB - Preliminary   | 16.50E.3                  |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 3,044                     | 68%                      | 1  | \$ 3,044  | \$ 4,482  |
| 12   | DRB - Preliminary for SF residential dwelling   | 16.50E.3                  |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 1,522                     | 34%                      | 8  | \$ 12,176   | \$ 35,859   |
| 13   | Project Permit Modification   | 11.5.7D                   |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 3,308                     | 74%                      | 7  | \$ 23,156   | \$ 31,376   |
| 14   | Project Permit Adjustment   | 11.5.7E                   |       | 25.53   | \$ 4,890                | \$ 4,901                     | 100%                     | 15                                       | \$ 72,290   | \$ 72,128   |
| 15   | Specific Plan Exception   | 11.5.7F                   |       | 74.92   | \$ 14,350               | \$ 14,932                    | 104%                     | 10                                       | \$ 149,320  | \$ 143,502  |
| 16   | Specific Plan Amendment   | 11.5.7                    |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 40,560                    | 191%                     | 1  | \$ 40,560   | \$ 21,227   |
| 17   | Specific Plan Interpretation  | 11.5.7                    |       | 30.50   | \$ 5,841                | \$ 2,994                     | 51%                      | 3  | \$ 9,731  | \$ 18,985   |
| 18   | CPIO Fees (place holder)  |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.01 K Fees - Exceptions</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <i>Placeholder - see existing fee ordinance</i>  |   |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.01 L Transfer Plan</b>   |   |                           | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - less than and including 49,999 sq ft                                    | Article 4.5               |       | 84.00   | \$ 16,090               | \$ 16,292                    | 101%                     | 8  | \$ 122,190  | \$ 120,678  |
| 2  | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - 50,000 sq ft and greater  | Article 4.5               |       | 99.75   | \$ 19,107               | \$ 16,292                    | 85%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 M Extension of Time or Suspension of Time Limits for Planning and Zoning Matters</b>    |   |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Time Extension for other than Maps  |                           |       | 1.76  | \$ 336                  | \$ 708                       | 211%                     | 25                                       | \$ 17,700   | \$ 8,404  |
| <b>19.01 N Adult Entertainment Business Exception</b>  |   |                           | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Adult Entertainment Business Exception within 500 ft of another Adult Entertainment Establishment                 | 12.22A.20                 |       | 38.15   | \$ 7,308                | \$ 5,317                     | 73%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 O Density Increase</b>  |   |                           | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for one or more Incentives included in the Menu of Incentives | 12.22A.25 (g)(2)          |       | 38.02   | \$ 7,282                | \$ 7,115                     | 98%                      | 110                                      | \$ 780,871  | \$ 799,186  |
| 2  | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for an Incentive not included in the Menu of Incentives       | 12.22A.25 (g)(3)          |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 23,287                    | 110%                     | 14                                       | \$ 326,018  | \$ 297,177  |
| 3  | Application for a Density Bonus in excess of that permitted by Section 12.22 A.26                                 | 12.24U.26                 |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 20,718                    | 98%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 P Modifications or Discontinuance of Use Pursuant to Nuisance Abatement Proceedings</b> |   |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description   | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---|---|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |   |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 1   | Imposition of Conditions (City Initiated)   | 12.27.1 |       | 304.64  | \$ 58,354               | \$ 26,680                    | 46%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 2   | Reconsideration (Applicant Initiated)   | 12.27.1 |       | 251.54  | \$ 48,182               | \$ 29,866                    | 62%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3   | Plan Approval for Revocation Case   | 12.27.1 |       | 251.54  | \$ 48,182               | \$ 5,000                     | 10%                      | 5  | \$ 25,000   | \$ 240,911  |
| <b>19.01 S Site Plan Review</b>   |   |         | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Site Plan Review Application for Residential Project of 50 or more dwelling units | 16.05   |       | 47.06   | \$ 9,014                | \$ 7,806                     | 87%                      | 26                                       | \$ 201,005  | \$ 232,098  |
| 2   | For Non-Residential or Mixed Use Building Site Plan Review Application            | 16.05   |       | 47.06   | \$ 9,014                | \$ 7,925                     | 88%                      | 8  | \$ 63,400   | \$ 72,108   |
| <b>19.01 U Hillside</b>   |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Hillside Permit Filing Fee  | 12.24X2 |       | 29.55   | \$ 5,660                | \$ 6,094                     | 108%                     | 15                                       | \$ 88,363   | \$ 82,076   |
| <b>19.01 V Multiple or Combination Applications</b>   |   |         | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <p><i>If more than one application is filed at the same time for the same project and the fee for each separate application is set forth in sections 19.01, 19.03, 19.06 or 19.10, then the charges will be as follows: 100% for the highest application fee, 50% for the second application (second highest fee), and 25% for each additional application fee.</i></p>   |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.01 W Expedited Permit Fee</b>   |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <p><i>At the request of the applicant, the Department may, at its discretion, charge a fee to offset expenses for additional human and physical resources necessary to expedite the permit process for development projects upon application by an applicant. An initial amount of \$5,000, in addition to fees charged elsewhere in this code, by the Director of Planning, including any additional costs to the City that exceed the fees collected by the Planning Department for this service, shall be collected at the time of the request. The Department shall cause all money collected pursuant to this section to be deposited into the Planning Case Processing Fund described in Chapter 6, Section 5.121.9.2 of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code for purposes of disbursement as permitted therein.</i></p> |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|   | Expedited Review Services (hourly)  |         |       | 1.00  | \$ 219                  | varies                       | n/a                      | n/a                                      | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.01 X Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application</b>  |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application                                     | 14.3.1  |       | 38.85   | \$ 7,442                | \$ 6,369                     | 86%                      | 2  | \$ 9,554  | \$ 11,163   |
| <b>19.02 FILING FEES - DIVISION OF LAND AND PRIVATE STREET MAPS AND APPEALS</b>   |   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.                         | Fee Description  | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|                                 |  |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| <b>19.02 A Subdivision Maps</b> |  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>1. Tentative Map</b>         |  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1                               | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                            |         |       | 51.05   | \$ 9,779                | \$ 11,219                    | 115%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 2                               | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                           |         |       | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,662                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3                               | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots            |         |       | 20.95   | \$ 4,013                | \$ 3,867                     | 96%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 4                               | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                            |         |       | 45.89   | \$ 8,790                | \$ 10,165                    | 116%                     | 7  | \$ 71,155   | \$ 61,532   |
| 5                               | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                           |         |       | 51.05   | \$ 9,779                | \$ 11,257                    | 115%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 6                               | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots            |         |       | 17.51   | \$ 3,354                | \$ 3,073                     | 92%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 7                               | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 5-49 Units  |         |       | 50.75   | \$ 9,721                | \$ 10,416                    | 107%                     | 113                                      | \$ 1,177,008  | \$ 1,098,506  |
| 8                               | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 50-99 Units   |         |       | 68.09   | \$ 13,043               | \$ 13,856                    | 106%                     | 8  | \$ 110,848  | \$ 104,343  |
| 9                               | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 100 Units or More                                       |         |       | 86.15   | \$ 16,502               | \$ 17,611                    | 107%                     | 11                                       | \$ 193,721  | \$ 181,525  |
| 10                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area |         |       | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,552                    | 113%                     | 3  | \$ 37,656   | \$ 33,290   |
| 11                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 50,000-99,999 sq ft of Floor Area    |         |       | 66.53   | \$ 12,744               | \$ 14,309                    | 112%                     | 1  | \$ 14,309   | \$ 12,744   |
| 12                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 100,000-249,999 sq ft of Floor Area  |         |       | 75.13   | \$ 14,391               | \$ 16,065                    | 112%                     | 2  | \$ 32,130   | \$ 28,783   |
| 13                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More  |         |       | 83.73   | \$ 16,039               | \$ 17,822                    | 111%                     | 1  | \$ 17,822   | \$ 16,039   |
| 14                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - Less than 1 Acre                    |         |       | 52.77   | \$ 10,108               | \$ 11,498                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 15                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 1 to Less than 5 Acres              |         |       | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,552                    | 113%                     | 2  | \$ 25,104   | \$ 22,193   |
| 16                              | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 5 Acres or More                     |         |       | 63.09   | \$ 12,085               | \$ 13,608                    | 113%                     | 1  | \$ 13,608   | \$ 12,085   |
| 17                              | Phasing of Map<br>Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone                                    | 17.07   |       | 36.43   | \$ 6,978                | \$ 545                       | 8%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 18                              | Mixed Use Projects   |         | [10]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 19                              | BOE Fees - Tentative Maps  |         | [11]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 |  |         | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 | <b>2. BOE Fees - Final Maps</b>  |         | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 | <b>3. BOE Fees - Improvement Plans</b>   |         | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 | <b>4. Appeals - reference 19.01 B</b>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 | <b>5. Modifications - reference 19.02 F</b>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.02 B Parcel Maps</b>      |  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 |  |         | [10]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|                                 |  |         | [11]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.  | Fee Description  | Article       | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|--|--|---------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|  |  |               |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| <b>1. Preliminary Parcel Map</b>   |  |               |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE40 or More Restrictive Zones                            |               |       | 68.36   | \$ 13,095               | \$ 9,989                     | 76%                      | 2  | \$ 19,978   | \$ 26,189   |
| 2  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones                            |               |       | 58.90   | \$ 11,282               | \$ 8,935                     | 79%                      | 20                                       | \$ 178,700  | \$ 225,649  |
| 3  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - Multi-Family  |               |       | 75.80   | \$ 14,520               | \$ 10,416                    | 72%                      | 2  | \$ 20,832   | \$ 29,039   |
| 4  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |               |       | 57.18   | \$ 10,953               | \$ 12,552                    | 115%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 5  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |               |       | 65.78   | \$ 12,600               | \$ 14,309                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 6  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |               |       | 76.10   | \$ 14,577               | \$ 16,065                    | 110%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 7  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |               |       | 82.98   | \$ 15,895               | \$ 17,822                    | 112%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 8  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 1 Acre in Area                       |               |       | 52.02   | \$ 9,965                | \$ 11,498                    | 115%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 9  | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area                 |               |       | 57.18   | \$ 10,953               | \$ 12,552                    | 115%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 10   | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 5 Acres or More in Area                        |               |       | 62.34   | \$ 11,941               | \$ 13,608                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 11   | Other Preliminary Parcel Map Actions - Preliminary Parcel Map Exemption (Lot Line Adjustment)                                | 17.50 B.3     |       | 18.14   | \$ 3,474                | \$ 3,507                     | 101%                     | 63                                       | \$ 220,941  | \$ 218,862  |
| 12   | Other Preliminary Parcel Map Actions - Preliminary Parcel Map Waiver   | 17.50 B.3 (d) |       | 18.14   | \$ 3,474                | \$ 3,729                     | 107%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 13   | Mixed Use Projects   |               | [11]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 14   | BOE Fees - Parcel Maps   |               | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>2. Certificate or Conditional Certificate of Compliance-Determination</b> |  |               |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|  | 2. BOE Fees - Final Parcel Maps  | 66499.35      |       | 17.62   | \$ 3,375                | \$ 3,683                     | 109%                     | 30                                       | \$ 110,490  | \$ 101,255  |
|  | 4. Appeals - reference 19.01 B   |               | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|  | 5. Modifications - reference 19.02 F   |               |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.02 C Private Street Map</b>  |  |               |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Filing - Deemed to be Approved Private Street  | 18.00C        |       | 16.76   | \$ 3,210                | \$ 3,787                     | 118%                     | 5  | \$ 18,935   | \$ 16,052   |
| 2  | Filing - Private Street Map  |               |       | 70.94   | \$ 13,589               | \$ 15,421                    | 113%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3  | Filing - Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Private Street Map  |               |       | 104.48  | \$ 20,013               | \$ 22,415                    | 112%                     | 2  | \$ 44,830   | \$ 40,027   |
| 4  | BOE Fees - Private Street Maps   |               | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.02 D Mobile Home Park Impact Reports</b>                               |  |               |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description  | Article      | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---|--|--------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |  |              |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 1   | Mobile Home Park Impact Report   | 17.04        |       | 62.23   | \$ 11,920               | \$ 13,992                    | 117%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.02 E Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps</b> |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>1. Residential</b>   |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Condominium Conversion for Parcel Maps - Residential - 1-4 Units   |              |       | 70.94   | \$ 13,589               | \$ 8,055                     | 59%                      | 3  | \$ 24,165   | \$ 40,766   |
| 2   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 5-49 Units  |              |       | 84.53   | \$ 16,192               | \$ 16,109                    | 99%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 50-99 Units   |              |       | 103.10  | \$ 19,750               | \$ 19,575                    | 99%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 4   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 100 Units or More   |              |       | 116.52  | \$ 22,320               | \$ 22,161                    | 99%                      | 1  | \$ 22,161   | \$ 22,320   |
| <b>2. Commercial / Industrial</b>                                     |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 5   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |              |       | 61.48   | \$ 11,777               | \$ 13,430                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 6   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area   |              |       | 65.78   | \$ 12,600               | \$ 14,309                    | 114%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 7   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |              |       | 70.08   | \$ 13,424               | \$ 15,187                    | 113%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 8   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More   |              |       | 74.38   | \$ 14,248               | \$ 16,065                    | 113%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>3. Mixed Use</b>   |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|   |  |              | [11]  |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.02 F Map Related Fees</b>                                       |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map  |              |       | 13.28   | \$ 2,543                | \$ 889                       | 35%                      | 1  | \$ 889  | \$ 2,543  |
| 2   | Modification to Approved Tentative/Preliminary Map or Recorded Final Map   | 17.14, 17.59 |       | 38.24   | \$ 7,324                | \$ 8,052                     | 110%                     | 16                                       | \$ 128,832  | \$ 117,184  |
| 3   | Reversion to Acreage   | 17.10        |       | 39.96   | \$ 7,653                | \$ 8,876                     | 116%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 4   | Quimby Fee Calculation   |              |       | 2.12  | \$ 405                  | \$ 276                       | 68%                      | 16                                       | \$ 4,416  | \$ 6,482  |
| 5   | Time Extension for Maps  |              |       | 5.56  | \$ 1,064                | \$ 793                       | 75%                      | 36                                       | \$ 28,548   | \$ 38,307   |
| 6   | Letter of Clarification or Correction (Initiated by Applicant)   |              |       | 15.02   | \$ 2,876                | \$ 1,331                     | 46%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.03 FEES FOR GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY</b>                        |  |              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|   | <i>The following fees shall be charged when a zone change is requested by an applicant that necessitates the initiation of a General Plan Amendment to achieve consistency between the requested zone change and the General Plan:</i> |              | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description  | Article                      | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---|--|------------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |  |                              |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 1   | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                                    | 11.5.6                       |       | 130.54  | \$ 25,004               | \$ 23,884                    | 96%                      | 14                                       | \$ 334,376  | \$ 350,060  |
| 2   | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use             | 11.5.6                       |       | 147.74  | \$ 28,299               | \$ 32,116                    | 113%                     | 2  | \$ 64,232   | \$ 56,598   |
| 3   | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                        | 11.5.6                       |       | 438.20  | \$ 83,938               | \$ 46,357                    | 55%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 4   | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use | 11.5.6                       |       | 446.20  | \$ 85,471               | \$ 62,566                    | 73%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 5   | Street Re-Classification   |                              |       | 67.26   | \$ 12,884               | \$ -                         | 0%                       | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.04 FEES FOR SIGN OFF REQUESTS</b>               |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project)   |                              |       | 7.50  | \$ 1,437                | \$ 338                       | 24%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 2   | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA   | 12.24 and all other projects |       | 11.25   | \$ 2,155                | \$ 1,722                     | 80%                      | 170                                      | \$ 292,740  | \$ 366,344  |
| 3   | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA SF dwellings with no exceptions   | 12.24 and all other projects |       | 11.25   | \$ 2,155                | \$ 861                       | 40%                      | 24                                       | \$ 20,664   | \$ 51,719   |
| 4   | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (First Sign)   |                              |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 1,052                     | 366%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 5   | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (Each Additional Sign)   |                              |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 383                       | 133%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 6   | Miscellaneous Clearance - Director   | [9]                          |       | 11.75   | \$ 2,251                | \$ 745                       | 33%                      | 184                                      | \$ 137,080  | \$ 414,137  |
| 7   | Miscellaneous Clearance - Commission   | [9]                          |       | 6.50  | \$ 1,245                | \$ 647                       | 52%                      | 48                                       | \$ 31,056   | \$ 59,764   |
| 8   | Landscape Plan Approval as part of a Discretionary Approval  | [9]                          |       | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 647                       | 84%                      | 48                                       | \$ 31,056   | \$ 36,778   |
| 9   | Landscape per tract  | [9]                          |       | 4.50  | \$ 862                  | \$ 199                       | 23%                      | 154                                      | \$ 30,646   | \$ 132,746  |
| 10  | Building Permit Sign-off for minor Projects  | [9]                          |       | 1.25  | \$ 238                  | \$ 199                       | 83%                      | 154                                      | \$ 30,646   | \$ 36,726   |
| <b>19.05 FILING FEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCES</b> |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.05 A Fees</b>                                   |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>1. Environmental Clearances Except EIRs</b>        |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Categorical Exemption  |                              |       | 1.95  | \$ 373                  | \$ 81                        | 22%                      | 1,033                                    | \$ 83,673   | \$ 384,865  |
| 2   | EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND or any other State exemptions   |                              |       | 30.15   | \$ 5,774                | \$ 2,280                     | 39%                      | 701                                      | \$ 1,598,280  | \$ 4,047,822  |
| 3   | MND - Expanded / Initial Study   |                              | [15]  | 58.13   | \$ 11,134               | \$ 1,953                     | 18%                      | 6  | \$ 11,718   | \$ 66,804   |
| 4   | Reconsideration-Addendum or Supplemental to Prior Environmental Determination  |                              |       | 9.97  | \$ 1,909                | \$ 703                       | 37%                      | 62                                       | \$ 43,586   | \$ 118,347  |
| 5   | Publication Fee for ND or MND (pass through of publishing costs)   |                              |       | n/a   | \$ 676                  | \$ 946                       | 140%                     | 756                                      | \$ 715,176  | \$ 511,317  |
| <b>2. Environmental Impact Reports</b>                |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
|   |  | [13]                         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No.  | Fee Description   | Article                   | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis             |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|  |   |                           |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount       | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| 6  | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposit)                          |                           |       | 0.00  | varies                  | Average Initial Deposit - \$15,125 | n/a                      | 19                                       | \$ 287,375  | n/a   |
| 7  | Environmental Impact Report Review Services (hourly)                    |                           |       | 1.00  | \$ 192                  | varies                             | n/a                      | n/a                                      |   |   |
| <b>19.06 FILING FEES FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMITS</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
|  |   | [9]                       |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Coastal Development Permit - SF and MF residential dwelling             | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 7,057                           | 51%                      | 23                                       | \$ 162,311  | \$ 316,330  |
| 2  | Coastal Development Permit - SF residential dwelling with no exceptions | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 3,528                           | 26%                      | 71                                       | \$ 249,606  | \$ 973,059  |
| 3  | Coastal Development Permit - Non-residential                            | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 7,798                           | 57%                      | 13                                       | \$ 97,475   | \$ 171,918  |
| 4  | Coastal Development Permit - Exemption Determination                    | 12.20.2.1                 |       | 7.50  | \$ 1,437                | \$ 684                             | 48%                      | 273                                      | \$ 186,732  | \$ 392,204  |
| 5  | Coastal Development Permit - Approval in Concept                        | 12.20.2                   |       | 3.00  | \$ 575                  | \$ 703                             | 122%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 6  | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment                                  | 12.20.2.1Q and 12.20.2O   |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 6,456                           | 117%                     | 7  | \$ 41,964   | \$ 35,859   |
| 7  | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment with no exceptions               | 12.20.2.1Q and 12.20.2O   |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 3,228                           | 59%                      | 0  | \$ 807  | \$ 1,379  |
| 8  | Coastal Development Permit - Mello Compliance Review - City Review      | 12.20.2                   | [6]   | 34.18   | \$ 6,547                | \$ 828                             | 13%                      | 13                                       | \$ 10,971   | \$ 86,751   |
| 9  | Mello Compliance Review - 3rd Party Consultant                          |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | Fee + Actual Cost                  | n/a                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| <b>19.07 FEES FOR FLOOD HAZARD REPORTS AND COMPLIANCE CHECKS</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <i>Section Deleted</i>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.08 SURCHARGE FOR ONE-STOP PERMIT CENTER</b>  |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <i>There shall be added to each fee imposed for any permit, license or application provided for in this article a surcharge in an amount equal to the greater of two percent of the fee or \$1.00.</i> |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.09 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND COUNSELING SERVICES</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| 1  | Pre-Application Review and Research                                     | 12.24 and all other appl. |       | 2.00  | \$ 383                  | \$ 293                             | 76%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 2  | Zoning Pre-Check (per project, per request)                             |                           |       | 6.00  | \$ 1,149                | \$ 432                             | 38%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 3  | Pre-development Meeting   |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
|  | Per meeting   |                           |       | 9.00  | \$ 1,724                | \$ 432                             | 25%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
|  | Additional assistance as required, per hour                             |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                             | 150%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
|  | Technical Counseling (per meeting)                                      |                           |       | 4.50  | \$ 862                  | \$ 432                             | 50%                      | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
| 4  | Project Navigation Services (deposit required, per hour)                |                           |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
|  | Project not requiring EIR   |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                             | 150%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |
|  | Project including EIR   |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                             | 150%                     | 0  | \$ -  | \$ -  |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description                                     | Article                     | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis             |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |   |                             |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount       | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| <b>19.10 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FEES</b>   |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Initial Development Agreement Application-(Deposit) | 12.32                       |       | 0.00  | varies                  | \$29,690 Initial Deposit           | n/a                      | 3  | \$ 89,070   | \$ -  |
| <b>19.11. ANNUAL INSPECTION OF COMPLIANCE WITH FLOOR AREA RATIO AVERAGING AND RESIDENTIAL DENSITY TRANSFER COVENANTS.</b> |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Annual Inspection of Compliance                     | 12.24 B.25, and 12.24 C.58. | [14]  |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.12. [DEVIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 16.03 E.]</b>   |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <i>Section Deleted</i>  |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.13 SURCHARGE FOR AUTOMATED SYSTEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING</b>  |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| 1   | Operating Surcharge                                 |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 7% of the fee or \$1.00 |                          |  |   |   |
| 2   | Development Surcharge                               |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 6% of the fee or \$1.00 |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.14 FEES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF HOUSING COVENANTS</b>  |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| NONE LISTED   |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.15 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRAFFIC STUDY REVIEW, CONDITION CLEARANCE AND PERMIT ISSUANCE FEES.</b>             |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| [14]  |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
| <b>19.16 GENERAL PLAN MAINTENANCE SURCHARGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING</b>                                       |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  |   |   |
|   |   |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 5% of the fee or \$1.00 |                          |  |   |   |
|   |   |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                          |  | \$ 16,773,498   | \$ 25,233,969                                       |

Notes

- [1] A filing fee of \$149.00 shall accompany each application for a credit pursuant to Section 12.33 B. A fee equal to 85% of the filing fee shall accompany each appeal of a determination of credit made pursuant to Section 12.33 B.
- [2] (a) A fee equal to 85% of the underlying application or the set fee will be charged, whichever is lower. An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.2. of this Code, shall be accompanied by a filing fee as specified in Table 4-A of Section 98.0403.2 of the Code, to be collected by the Department. (b) An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.6. of this Code shall be charged a fee in accordance with Subdivision 1., above.

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---------|--|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|         |  |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| [3]     | City can not charge a fee  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [4]     | See Section 19.01 A (Sign Districts)   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [5]     | See Section 19.01 G (Comprehensive Sign Program)   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [6]     | Fee is for City administration and Consultant fees will be added to City fee   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [7]     | HPOZ fees are not to be charged for technical corrections to a previously certified Historic Resource Survey.<br><br>Minor cases are defined as three signs or less or a change of use. Standard cases are defined as more than three signs, wireless cases, or projects with additions of less than 200 square feet. Major cases are all other projects not falling into the categories of Minor or Standard projects.  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [8]     | Multiple or Combination Applications. If more than one application is filed at the same time for the same project and the fee for each separate application is set forth in sections 19.01, 19.03, 19.06 or 19.10, then the charges will be as follows: 100% for the highest application fee, 50% for the second application (second highest fee), and 25% for each additional application fee.  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [9]     | Subdivision Maps: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. For tentative maps within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, as described in Section 57.4908 of this Code, a surcharge of one-half the sum of the fees paid pursuant to paragraphs (a) through (c) shall be paid.  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [10]    | Parcel Maps: For preliminary parcel maps within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, as described in Section 57.4908 of this Code, a surcharge of one-third the sum of the fees paid pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) shall be paid.  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [11]    | Subdivision Maps - Mixed Use. Where the project involves a combination of Single-Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee, including modifications to the base fee, shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the surcharge required by paragraph (e) of this subdivision.<br><br>Parcel Maps - Mixed Use. Where the project involves a combination of Single-Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee, including modifications to the base fee, shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the surcharge required by paragraph (d) of this subdivision.<br><br>Condominium Conversions - Mixed Use: Where the project involves a combination of Residential, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the fee required by paragraph (b) of subdivision 1. of subsection E. of this Section 19.02 of this Code, above. |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [12]    |  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [13]    | The Planning Department shall calculate the actual costs and resultant fee, in accordance with Chapter 35, Section 5.403(b)3 of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code and shall maintain appropriate accounting records of the actual costs. The Director of Planning shall resolve any dispute related to the fee. The Director shall exclude from consideration any cost incurred or attributed to the processing of appeals.  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                          | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |   |   |
|---------|--|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|         |  |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Existing Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Cost Recovery Amount | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee |
| [14]    | Fee collected by the BOE, DBS, or DOT  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [15]    | Fee is applied in addition to Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [16]    | NBS did not evaluate; fees were adopted per ordinance specific to CCU  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [17]    | The Planning Department shall calculate actual costs and the resultant fee in accordance with Chapter 6, Section 5.121.9.2 of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, and shall maintain appropriate accounting records of the actual costs. The Director of Planning shall resolve any dispute related to the fee. The Director shall exclude from consideration any cost incurred or attributed to the processing of appeals. |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [18]    | NBS did not evaluate - fee set per City Policy   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |
| [19]    | Fees reflect pass through of average contractor costs.   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                          |  |   |   |

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### ***Regional Comparative Fee Survey***

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank  | Glendale        | LA County           | Long Beach                                  | Pasadena                        | Santa Clarita |
|----------------|--|-------|-------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>19.01 A</b> |  | [1,5] |             |  |                 |                     |   |                                 |               |
| 1              | Zone Change - SF and MF dwelling up to 49 Units  |       | \$ 11,734   | \$ 3,188   | no comparison   |                     | \$ 10,000                                   | \$ 15,986                       | \$ 19,565     |
| 2              | Zone Change - SF and MF dwelling - additional fee for each 50 units over 49  |       | \$ 5,747    | \$ 3,188   | no comparison   | \$13,335 + \$180    | \$ 10,000                                   | \$ 15,986                       | \$ 19,565     |
| 3              | Zone Change - Non-residential less than and including 49,999 sq ft   |       | \$ 11,737   | \$ 3,188   | no comparison   | if referred to Fire | \$ 10,000                                   | \$ 15,986                       | \$ 19,565     |
| 4              | Zone Change - Non-residential 50,000 sq ft and greater   |       | \$ 16,440   | \$ 3,188   | no comparison   |                     | \$ 10,000                                   | \$ 15,986                       | \$ 19,565     |
| 5              | Clarification of Q Classifications or D Limitations  |       | \$ 4,428    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 6              | Land Use Determinations by CPC   |       | \$ 11,060   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 7              | Amendment of Council's Instructions involving (T) Tentative Classifications  |       | \$ 4,264    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 8              | Height District Change   |       | \$ 11,123   | no comparison  | \$ 13,572       | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 9              | Supplemental Use District: Change or Removal   |       | \$ 67,915   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 10             | Supplemental Use District: Establishment   |       | \$ 134,608  | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 11             | Conditions of Approval for Oil Drilling  |       | \$ 7,650    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | \$ 1,080                                    | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 12             | Zone Boundary Line Adjustment  |       | \$ 5,473    | \$ 1,028   | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 13             | Building Line - Establishment, Change or Removal   |       | \$ 8,833    | \$ 1,028   | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 14             | Surface Mining Permits   |       | \$ 2,640    | no comparison  | \$5,000 Deposit | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 B</b> |  | [2]   |             |  |                 |                     |   |                                 |               |
| 1              | Appeal Fee - Applicant (first level appeal)  |       | \$ 13,277   | \$ 254   | \$ 2,000        | \$ 7,425            | \$ 3,500                                    |                                 | no comparison |
| 2              | Appeal Fee - Applicant (add level appeal)  |       | \$ 11,211   | \$254 Flat Fee   | \$ 2,000        | no comparison       | no comparison                               | 65% of original application fee | no comparison |
| 3              | Person other than the applicant  |       | \$ 89       | \$ 127   | \$ 2,000        | \$ 755              | \$ 50                                       |                                 | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 C</b> |  |       |             |  |                 |                     |   |                                 |               |
| 1              | Conditional Use by APC or CPC  |       | \$ 13,224   | no comparison  | \$ 4,414        | \$ 8,966            | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | \$ 6,304      |
| 2              | Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project)   |       | \$ 338      | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | \$ 42                           | no comparison |
| 3              | Public Benefits Alternative Compliance Proposal  |       | \$ 16,938   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 4              | Modification of Existing CUP by APC or CPC   |       | \$ 8,878    | no comparison  | no comparison   | \$ 7,223            | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 5              | Letters of Correction, Modification or Clarification of a determination by a ZA or the Director Initiated by Applicant |       | \$ 1,331    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 D</b> |  |       |             |  |                 |                     |   |                                 |               |
| 1              | Variance   |       | \$ 6,448    | \$1,001 - Single Family Residential;<br>\$1,753 - Multi-Family/Commercial/Industrial | \$ 12,000       | \$ 8,966            | New Construction \$5,500<br>Remodel \$3,500 | \$ 4,498                        | \$ 5,599      |
| 2              | Adjustment by ZA except SF dwelling  |       | \$ 5,370    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | \$ 5,906                        | \$ 1,162      |
| 3              | Adjustment by ZA for SF dwelling   |       | \$ 2,685    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | \$ 5,906                        | \$ 1,162      |
| 4              | Slight Modification by ZA  |       | \$ 3,941    | no comparison  | no comparison   | \$ 7,223            | \$ 4,000                                    | no comparison                   | no comparison |
| 5              | Reasonable Accommodation Determination   | [3]   | No Fee      | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison       | no comparison                               | no comparison                   | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank   | Glendale      | LA County     | Long Beach    | Pasadena                                    | Santa Clarita |
|----------------|--|-------|-------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| <b>19.01 E</b> |  |       |             |   |               |               |               |   |               |
| 1              | ZA Interpretation of Yard or Use Regulations   |       | \$ 5,831    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 2              | Conditional Use by ZA - Alcohol and Entertainment                                    |       | \$ 6,459    | \$ 1,928  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,000      | \$ 657                                      | \$ 6,304      |
| 3              | Conditional Use by ZA - all other uses   |       | \$ 5,358    | \$ 1,913  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | \$ 6,304      |
| 4              | Modification or Review by ZA   |       | \$ 5,754    | no comparison   | no comparison | \$ 7,223      | \$ 4,000      | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 5              | Relief from Fence Height Limitation  |       | \$ 4,525    | \$103 - Minor in hillside area;<br>\$242 - Minor;<br>\$401 - Major  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 500        | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 6              | Child Care less than or equal to 50 children in the R-3 zone or Large Family Daycare |       | \$ 4,601    | \$563 - Single Family Residence;<br>\$1,090 - Commercial/Industrial | no comparison | \$ 3,018      | Fee Exempt    | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 7              | Certified Farmers' Market  |       | \$ 2,641    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | 1-20 producers \$232<br>>20 producers \$332 | no comparison |
| 8              | Service of Alcohol in a small restaurant less than or equal to 50 seats              |       | \$ 6,040    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 9              | Approval to Erect Amateur Radio Antenna  |       | \$ 2,592    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,155                                    | no comparison |
| 10             | ZA Determination under Section 12.24 X unless listed separately                      |       | \$ 6,093    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 11             | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA   |       | \$ 1,722    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | no comparison |
| 12             | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA SF dwellings with no exceptions                         |       | \$ 861      | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                               | no comparison |

| Fee No. | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee               | Burbank       | Glendale      | LA County     | Long Beach    | Pasadena      | Santa Clarita |
|---------|---|-------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 19.01 F |   | [7]   |                           |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| 1       | HPOZ: Establishment, Change or Removal  |       | \$ 138,017                | no comparison |
| 2       | HPOZ Preservation Plan  |       | \$ 30,998                 | no comparison |
| 3       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness: not involving new construction or additions  |       | \$ 473                    | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 426        | \$ 400        | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, up to 750 sq ft                                   |       | \$ 708                    | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, greater than 750 sq ft, or second story additions |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 6       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 1 to 4 units  |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 7       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 5 units or more   |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, up to 5,000 s.f.                             |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 9       | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, greater than 5,000 s.f.                      |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 10      | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new accessory building construction   |       | \$ 1,706                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 910        | \$ 1,720      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 11      | Historic Resources Building Permit Clearance (Larger Project)   |       | \$ 783                    | no comparison |
| 12      | APC/DEM (Historic) demolition of main structure   |       | \$ 4,317                  | no comparison | \$ 4,500      | no comparison | \$ 3,035      | \$ 1,181      | no comparison |
| 14      | Mills Act Application (Single Family Residential)   |       | \$ 250                    | no comparison | \$ 1,250      | \$ 1,021      | \$ 1,010      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 15      | Mills Act Application (MF/Commercial/Industrial)  |       | \$ 1,142                  | no comparison | \$ 1,250      | \$ 1,021      | \$ 1,010      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 16      | Mills Act Application (Valuation Exemption)   |       | \$ 473                    | no comparison | \$ 1,250      | \$ 1,021      | \$ 1,010      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 17      | Mills Act Application (Appeal to Cultural Heritage Commission)  |       | \$ 473                    | no comparison | \$ 1,250      | \$ 1,021      | \$ 1,010      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 18      | Mills Act Contract Execution (Single Family Dwelling)   |       | \$1 per \$1,000 valuation | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 564        | no comparison | \$ 2,147      | no comparison |
| 19      | Mills Act Contract Execution (MF/Commercial/Industrial)   |       | \$ 1,886                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 564        | no comparison | \$ 2,147      | no comparison |
| 20      | Mills Act Inspection (once every 5 years)   |       | \$ -                      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 200        | no comparison | no comparison |
| 21      | Technical Corrections to previously certified Historic Resource (Applicant Initiated)   | [7]   | \$ -                      | no comparison |
| 22      | Historic Resources - Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND  |       | \$ -                      | no comparison |
| 23      | Historic Resources - Environmental Impact Report Review - (hourly)  |       | \$ -                      | no comparison |
| 24      | Major Conforming Work on Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements   |       | \$ 352                    | no comparison |
| 25      | Modification of a Certificate Determination   |       | \$ 440                    | no comparison |
| 26      | Preliminary Evaluation of Demolition or Relocation without Permit   |       | \$ 2,112                  | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank                       | Glendale      | LA County     | Long Beach    | Pasadena      | Santa Clarit.                                |
|----------------|--|-------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| <b>19.01 G</b> |  |       |             |                               |               |               |               |               |  |
| 1              | Sign Modification by ZA  |       | \$ 6,448    | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 2              | Comprehensive Sign Program   | [4]   | \$ 11,738   | \$425 min<br>or \$105 per hr. | \$ 4,043      | no comparison | \$ 750        | \$ 741        | <12 Signs<br>\$1,393<br>>12 Signs<br>\$2,778 |
| 3              | Amendment of Comprehensive Sign Program  | [4]   | \$ 5,748    | no comparison                 | \$ 356        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| <b>19.01 H</b> |  |       |             |                               |               |               |               |               |  |
| 1              | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (First Sign)           |       | \$ 1,052    | no comparison                 | \$ 500        | \$ 8,966      | \$ 328        | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 2              | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (Each Additional Sign) |       | \$ 383      | no comparison                 | \$ 500        | \$ 8,966      | \$ 71         | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| <b>19.01 I</b> |  |       |             |                               |               |               |               |               |  |
| 1              | Miscellaneous Clearance - Director   |       | \$ 745      | no comparison                 | no comparison | \$ 483        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 2              | Landscape Plan Approval as part of a Discretionary Approval                                  |       | \$ 647      | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 3              | Building Permit Sign-off for minor Projects  |       | \$ 199      | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| <b>19.01 J</b> |  |       |             |                               |               |               |               |               |  |
|                |  | [8]   |             |                               |               |               |               |               |  |
| 1              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Minor          |       | \$ 1,477    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,186      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 2              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard       |       | \$ 3,244    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,186      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 3              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard (SF)  |       | \$ 1,622    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,186      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 4              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major          |       | \$ 4,787    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,186      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 5              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major (SF)     |       | \$ 2,393    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,186      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 6              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor   |       | \$ 2,496    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 7              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor (SF)  |       | \$ 1,248    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 8              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard  |       | \$ 4,167    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 9              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard (SF)   |       | \$ 2,083    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 10             | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major   |       | \$ 5,628    | no comparison                 | \$ 7,442      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 11             | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major (SF)  |       | \$ 2,814    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 12             | DRB - Preliminary  |       | \$ 3,044    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 676        | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 13             | DRB - Preliminary for SF residential dwelling  |       | \$ 1,522    | no comparison                 | \$ 5,000      | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 2,211      | \$ 1,067                                     |
| 14             | Project Permit Modification  |       | \$ 3,308    | no comparison                 | no comparison | \$ 1,535      | \$ 1,375      | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 15             | Project Permit Adjustment  |       | \$ 4,901    | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 5,906      | no comparison                                |
| 16             | Specific Plan Exception  |       | \$ 14,932   | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 17             | Specific Plan Amendment  |       | \$ 40,560   | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 18             | Specific Plan Interpretation   |       | \$ 2,994    | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |
| 19             | CPIO Fees (place holder)   |       | \$ -        | no comparison                 | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                                |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank       | Glendale                              | LA County     | Long Beach                                    | Pasadena      | Santa Clarita |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.01 L</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - less than and including 49,999 sq ft                                    |       | \$ 16,292   | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - 50,000 sq ft and greater  |       | \$ 16,292   | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 M</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Time Extension for other than Maps  |       | \$ 708      | \$ 571        | \$ 141                                | \$ 1,185      | \$ 1,000                                      | \$ 154        | \$ 186        |
| <b>19.01 N</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Adult Entertainment Business Exception within 500 ft of another Adult Entertainment Establishment                 |       | \$ 5,317    | no comparison | no comparison                         | \$ 8,966      | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 O</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for one or more Incentives included in the Menu of Incentives |       | \$ 7,115    | no comparison | Density Bonus Housing Plan - \$1,624; | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for an Incentive not included in the Menu of Incentives       |       | \$ 23,287   | no comparison | Density Bonus Agreement - \$1,135     | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Application for a Density Bonus in excess of that permitted by Section 12.22 A.26                                 |       | \$ 20,718   | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 P</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Imposition of Conditions (City Initiated)   |       | \$ 26,680   | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Reconsideration (Applicant Initiated)   |       | \$ 29,866   | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Plan Approval for Revocation Case (Deposit)   |       | \$ 5,000    | no comparison | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison                                 | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 S</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Site Plan Review Application for Residential Project of 50 or more dwelling units                                 |       | \$ 7,806    | no comparison | \$ 7,442                              | \$ 1,037      | \$6,000 plus \$3.00 for each 100 square feet. | no comparison | \$ 4,688      |
| 2              | For Non-Residential or Mixed Use Building Site Plan Review Application  |       | \$ 7,925    | no comparison | \$ 7,853                              | \$ 1,418      |   | no comparison | \$ 4,688      |
| <b>19.01 U</b> |   |       |             |               |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1              | Hillside Permit Filing Fee  |       | \$ 6,094    | no comparison | \$ 3,945                              | \$ 1,037      | no comparison                                 | \$ 5,847      | \$ 3,031      |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Notes    | Current Fee             | Burbank        | Glendale      | LA County        | Long Beach               | Pasadena        | Santa Clarita |
|---------|--|----------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 19.01 W |  |          |                         |                |               |                  |                          |                 |               |
|         | Expedited Permit Fee Filing Deposit  |          | \$ 5,000                | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison    | no comparison            | no comparison   | no comparison |
| 19.01 X |  |          |                         |                |               |                  |                          |                 |               |
| 1       | Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application  |          | \$ 6,369                | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison    | no comparison            | no comparison   | no comparison |
| 19.02 A |  | [10, 11] |                         |                |               |                  |                          |                 |               |
| 1       | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                            |          | \$ 11,219               | \$2,005        | no comparison | \$15,674         | \$5,000                  | \$4,647         | no comparison |
| 2       | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                           |          | \$ 12,662               | + \$52 per Lot | no comparison | includes \$4,000 | + \$125 per Lot          | + \$173 per Lot | no comparison |
| 3       | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots            |          | \$ 3,867                |                | no comparison | Deposit          |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 4       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                            |          | \$ 10,165               | \$2,005        | no comparison | \$15,674         | \$5,000                  | \$4,647         | no comparison |
| 5       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                           |          | \$ 11,257               | + \$52 per Lot | no comparison | includes \$4,000 | + \$125 per Lot          | + \$173 per Lot | no comparison |
| 6       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots            |          | \$ 3,073                |                | no comparison | Deposit          |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 7       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 5-49 Units  |          | \$ 10,416               | \$2,005        | no comparison | \$22,014         | \$5,000                  | \$4,647         | no comparison |
| 8       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 50-99 Units   |          | \$ 13,856               | + \$52 per Lot | no comparison | includes \$5,000 | + \$125 per Lot          | + \$173 per Lot | no comparison |
| 9       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 100 Units or More                                       |          | \$ 17,611               |                | no comparison | Deposit          |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 10      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area |          | \$ 12,552               | \$2,005        | no comparison | \$22,014         | \$5,000                  | \$4,647         | no comparison |
| 11      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 50,000-99,999 sq ft of Floor Area    |          | \$ 14,309               | + \$52 per Lot | no comparison | includes \$5,000 | + \$125 per Lot          | + \$173 per Lot | no comparison |
| 12      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 100,000-249,999 sq ft of Floor Area  |          | \$ 16,065               |                | no comparison | Deposit          |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 13      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More  |          | \$ 17,822               |                | no comparison |                  |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 14      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - Less than 1 Acre                    |          | \$ 11,498               | \$2,005        | no comparison | \$22,014         | \$5,000                  | \$4,647         | no comparison |
| 15      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 1 to Less than 5 Acres              |          | \$ 12,552               | + \$52 per Lot | no comparison | includes \$5,000 | + \$125 per Lot          | + \$173 per Lot | no comparison |
| 16      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 5 Acres or More                     |          | \$ 13,608               |                | no comparison | Deposit          |                          |                 | no comparison |
| 17      | Phasing of Map   |          | \$ 545                  | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison    | no comparison            | no comparison   | no comparison |
| 18      | Final Map - fewer than 20 Lots   | [14]     | \$ 8,000                | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 1,000         |                          | no comparison   | no comparison |
| 19      | Final Map - more than 20 Lots  | [14]     | Actual Cost and Deposit | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 1,000         | \$2,000 + \$125 per unit | no comparison   | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes    | Current Fee | Burbank         | Glendale        | LA County                             | Long Beach    | Pasadena       | Santa Clarita |
|----------------|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| <b>19.02 B</b> |  | [10, 11] |             |                 |                 |                                       |               |                |               |
| 1              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE40 or More Restrictive Zones                            |          | \$ 9,989    | \$1,876 - Basis | \$16,850        | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$4,647        | \$ 13,635     |
| 2              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones                            |          | \$ 8,935    | +\$52 per Lot   | +\$500 per Unit | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison  | \$ 1,365      |
| 3              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - Multi-Family  |          | \$ 10,416   |                 |                 | no comparison                         | no comparison | +\$173 per Lot | \$ 13,635     |
| 4              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |          | \$ 12,552   |                 |                 | no comparison                         | no comparison |                | \$ 13,635     |
| 5              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |          | \$ 14,309   | \$1,876 - Basis | \$16,850        | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$4,647        | \$ 13,635     |
| 6              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |          | \$ 16,065   | +\$52 per Lot   | +\$500 per Unit | no comparison                         | no comparison | +\$173 per Lot | \$ 13,635     |
| 7              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |          | \$ 17,822   |                 |                 | no comparison                         | no comparison |                | \$ 13,635     |
| 8              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 1 Acre in Area                       |          | \$ 11,498   |                 |                 | no comparison                         | no comparison |                | \$ 13,635     |
| 9              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area                 |          | \$ 12,552   | \$1,876 - Basis | \$16,850        | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$4,647        | \$ 13,635     |
| 10             | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 5 Acres or More in Area                        |          | \$ 13,608   | +\$52 per Lot   | +\$500 per Unit | no comparison                         | no comparison | +\$173 per Lot | \$ 13,635     |
| 11             | Other Parcel Map Actions - Parcel Map Exemption (Lot Line Adjustment)  |          | \$ 3,507    | no comparison   | \$ 2,500        | 2 lots - \$1,606<br>>3 lots - \$2,638 | \$ 2,500      | \$ 4,290       | no comparison |
| 12             | Other Parcel Map Actions - Parcel Map Waiver   |          | \$ 3,729    | no comparison   | \$ 13,572       | \$ 1,000                              | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison |
| 13             | Certificate or Conditional Certificate of Compliance- Determination  |          | \$ 3,683    | \$ 515          | \$ 672          | \$ 1,755                              | \$ 1,500      | \$ 1,413       | no comparison |
| <b>19.02 C</b> |  |          |             |                 |                 |                                       |               |                |               |
| 1              | Filing - Deemed to be Approved Private Street  |          | \$ 3,787    | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison |
| 2              | Filing - Private Street Map  |          | \$ 15,421   | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison |
| 3              | Filing - Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Private Street Map  |          | \$ 22,415   | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison |
| <b>19.02 D</b> |  |          |             |                 |                 |                                       |               |                |               |
| 1              | Mobile Home Park Impact Report   |          | \$ 13,992   | no comparison   | no comparison   | \$ 6,376                              | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank                  | Glendale               | LA County                           | Long Beach      | Pasadena                       | Santa Clarit        |
|----------------|--|-------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>19.02 E</b> |  |       |             |                          |                        |                                     |                 |                                |                     |
| 1              | Condominium Conversion for Parcel Maps - Residential - 1-4 Units   |       | \$ 8,055    | \$ 1,319                 |                        | no comparison                       |                 |                                | no comparison       |
| 2              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 5-49 Units  |       | \$ 16,109   | \$ 1,319                 | \$10,000 - Conversion; | no comparison                       | \$7,500         | \$3,747                        | no comparison       |
| 3              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 50-99 Units   |       | \$ 19,575   | \$ 1,319                 | +\$291 per Unit        | no comparison                       | + \$125 per lot | + \$150 per lot                | no comparison       |
| 4              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 100 Units or More   |       | \$ 22,161   | \$ 1,319                 |                        | no comparison                       |                 |                                | no comparison       |
| 6              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |       | \$ 13,430   | \$ 1,319                 |                        | no comparison                       |                 |                                | no comparison       |
| 7              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area   |       | \$ 14,309   | \$ 1,319                 | \$10,000 - Conversion; | no comparison                       | \$7,500         | \$3,747                        | no comparison       |
| 8              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |       | \$ 15,187   | \$ 1,319                 | +\$500 per Unit        | no comparison                       | + \$125 per lot | + \$150 per lot                | no comparison       |
| 9              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More   |       | \$ 16,065   | \$ 1,319                 |                        | no comparison                       |                 |                                | no comparison       |
| <b>19.02 F</b> |  |       |             |                          |                        |                                     |                 |                                |                     |
| 2              | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map, Prior to Hearing  |       | \$ 889      | no comparison            | no comparison          | Major - \$5,984                     | no comparison   |                                |                     |
| 3              | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map, After Hearing   |       | \$ 1,374    | no comparison            | no comparison          | Minor - \$4,634                     | no comparison   | Major - 65% of application fee | 30% of original fee |
| 4              | Modification to Approved Tentative/Preliminary Map or Recorded Final Map   |       | \$ 8,052    | no comparison            | no comparison          | Major - \$11,575<br>Minor - \$9,565 | no comparison   | Minor - \$494                  |                     |
| 5              | Reversion to Acreage   |       | \$ 8,876    | \$ 2,005                 | \$ 10,000              | no comparison                       | no comparison   | no comparison                  | no comparison       |
| 6              | Quimby Fee Calculation   |       | \$ 276      | no comparison            | no comparison          | no comparison                       | no comparison   | no comparison                  | no comparison       |
| 8              | Time Extension for Maps  |       | \$ 793      | no comparison            | \$ 3,500               | \$ 307                              | \$ 1,000        | \$ 439                         | \$ 186              |
| 9              | Letter of Clarification or Correction (initiated by Applicant)   |       | \$ 1,331    | no comparison            | no comparison          | no comparison                       | no comparison   | no comparison                  | no comparison       |
| <b>19.03</b>   |  |       |             |                          |                        |                                     |                 |                                |                     |
| 1              | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                                    |       | \$ 23,884   | \$ 3,085                 | \$ 13,572              | \$ 13,355                           | \$ 10,000       | no comparison                  | \$ 29,077           |
| 2              | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use             |       | \$ 32,116   | \$ 3,085                 | \$ 13,572              | \$ 13,355                           | \$ 10,000       | no comparison                  | \$ 29,077           |
| 3              | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                        |       | \$ 46,357   | no comparison            | \$ 5,409               | no comparison                       | no comparison   | no comparison                  | \$ 25,000           |
| 4              | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use |       | \$ 62,566   | no comparison            | \$ 5,409               | no comparison                       | no comparison   | no comparison                  | \$ 25,000           |
| 5              | Street Re-Classification (place holder)  |       | \$ -        | Actual Cost - \$250 min. | \$ 3,017               | no comparison                       | \$ 2,900        | no comparison                  | no comparison       |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee       | Burbank       | Glendale      | LA County     | Long Beach    | Pasadena      | Santa Clarita |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.05 A</b> |   |       |                   |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - Categorical Exemption  |       | \$ 81             | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 400        | \$ 197        | no comparison |
| 2              | Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND or any other State exemptions       |       | \$ 2,280          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,139      | \$ 7,500      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | MND - Expanded / Initial Study  | [15]  | \$ 1,953          | no comparison |
| 4              | Reconsideration of Prior Environmental Determination  |       | \$ 703            | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,753      | no comparison |
| 6              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - Less Than 1 Acres in Area      |       | \$ 7,156          | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| 7              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area |       | \$ 11,520         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| 8              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - 5 Acres or More in Area        |       | \$ 11,696         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| 9              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - Less than 1 Acre in Area                |       | \$ 14,710         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| 10             | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area          |       | \$ 21,448         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| 11             | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - 5 Acres or More in Area                 |       | \$ 32,770         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | At Cost       | \$ 40,280     |
| <b>19.06</b>   |   |       |                   |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Coastal Development Permit - SF and MF residential dwelling   |       | \$ 7,057          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 8,090      | \$ 2,000      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Coastal Development Permit - SF residential dwelling with no exceptions   |       | \$ 3,528          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 8,090      | \$ 2,000      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Coastal Development Permit - Non-residential  |       | \$ 7,798          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 7,680      | \$ 2,000      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4              | Coastal Development Permit - Exemption Determination  |       | \$ 684            | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 200        | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5              | Coastal Development Permit - Approval in Concept  |       | \$ 703            | no comparison |
| 6              | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment  |       | \$ 6,456          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 5,000      | \$ 11,000     | no comparison | no comparison |
| 7              | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment with no exceptions   |       | \$ 3,228          | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 8,966      | \$ 11,000     | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8              | Coastal Development Permit - Mello Compliance Review - City Review  |       | \$ 828            | no comparison |
| 9              | Mello Compliance Review - 3rd Party Consultant  | [6]   | Fee + Actual Cost | no comparison |

| Fee No.      | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Burbank       | Glendale      | LA County     | Long Beach                          | Pasadena      | Santa Clarit  |
|--------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.09</b> |   |       |             |               |               |               |                                     |               |               |
| 1            | Land Development Counseling   |       | \$ 432      | \$ 1,289      | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 750                              | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.1</b>  |   |       |             |               |               |               |                                     |               |               |
| 1            | Request for a pre-development agreement consulting session with DCP staff |       | \$ 798      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                       | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2            | Initial Development Agreement Application                                 |       | \$ 29,690   | no comparison | \$ 2,803      | \$ 3,000      | \$18,000 Initial Deposit + \$310/hr | \$ 14,165     | \$ 22,000     |
| <b>19.11</b> |   |       |             |               |               |               |                                     |               |               |
| 1            | Annual Inspection of Compliance   |       | \$ 300      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 320                              | no comparison | no comparison |

## **APPENDIX C**

---

### ***National Comparative Fee Survey***

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas   | Denver  | Oakland                            | Portland      | San Jose                   | San Francisco                | Seattle                               |
|----------------|--|-------|-------------|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>19.01 A</b> |  | [1.5] |             |  |   |                                    |               |                            |                              |                                       |
| 1              | Zone Change - SF and MF dwelling up to 49 Units  |       | \$ 11,734   | U-1 acre - \$1,050<br>1-5 acres - \$2,610                                  |   | \$ 4,621                           | no comparison |                            | \$ 7,932                     | \$ 5,000                              |
| 2              | Zone Change - SF and MF dwelling - additional fee for each 50 units over 49  |       | \$ 5,747    | 5-15 acres - \$5,820   | <1 acre - \$1,000<br>>1 acre - \$1,000 + \$500/acre<br>Max \$50,000 | \$ 4,621                           | no comparison | \$5,175 + \$1,200 per acre | \$ 7,932                     | \$ 5,000                              |
| 3              | Zone Change - Non-residential less than and including 49,999 sq ft   |       | \$ 11,737   | 15-20 acres - \$9,315<br>>20 acres - \$9,315 + \$113/acre,<br>MAX \$37,500 |   | \$ 4,621                           | no comparison |                            | \$ 7,932                     | \$ 5,000                              |
| 4              | Zone Change - Non-residential 50,000 sq ft and greater   |       | \$ 16,440   |  |   | \$ 4,621                           | no comparison |                            | \$ 7,932                     | \$ 5,000                              |
| 5              | Clarification of Q Classifications or D Limitations  |       | \$ 4,428    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 6              | Land Use Determinations by CPC   |       | \$ 11,060   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | \$ 5,645                   | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 7              | Amendment of Council's Instructions involving (T) Tentative Classifications  |       | \$ 4,264    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 8              | Height District Change   |       | \$ 11,123   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 9              | Supplemental Use District: Change or Removal   |       | \$ 67,915   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 10             | Supplemental Use District: Establishment   |       | \$ 134,608  | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 11             | Conditions of Approval for Oil Drilling  |       | \$ 7,650    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 12             | Zone Boundary Line Adjustment  |       | \$ 5,473    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | \$ 2,727      | \$ 7,395                   | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 13             | Building Line - Establishment, Change or Removal   |       | \$ 8,833    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 14             | Surface Mining Permits   |       | \$ 2,640    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| <b>19.01 B</b> |  | [2]   |             |  |   |                                    |               |                            |                              |                                       |
| 1              | Appeal Fee - Applicant (first level appeal)  |       | \$ 13,277   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | \$ 2,232                   | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 2              | Appeal Fee - Applicant (add level appeal)  |       | \$ 11,211   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | \$ 2,232                   | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 3              | Person other than the applicant  |       | \$ 89       | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | \$ 100                     | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| <b>19.01 C</b> |  |       |             |  |   |                                    |               |                            |                              |                                       |
| 1              | Conditional Use by APC or CPC  |       | \$ 13,224   | no comparison  | \$ 100  | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | \$ 5,000                              |
| 2              | Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project)   |       | \$ 338      | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | Land use hourly X2                    |
| 3              | Public Benefits Alternative Compliance Proposal  |       | \$ 16,938   | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 4              | Modification of Existing CUP by APC or CPC   |       | \$ 8,878    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 5              | Letters of Correction, Modification or Clarification of a determination by a ZA or the Director initiated by Applicant |       | \$ 1,331    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | \$ 645                       | \$ 345                                |
| <b>19.01 D</b> |  |       |             |  |   |                                    |               |                            |                              |                                       |
| 1              | Variance   |       | \$ 6,448    | SF - \$600<br>MF/NonRes - \$900 + \$25/acre                                | no comparison   | Major - \$2,935<br>Minor - \$1,450 | no comparison | \$ 1,580                   | Depends on Construction Cost | \$1,620 + \$250/hr after first 20 hrs |
| 2              | Adjustment by ZA except SF dwelling  |       | \$ 5,370    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 3              | Adjustment by ZA for SF dwelling   |       | \$ 2,685    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 4              | Slight Modification by ZA  |       | \$ 3,941    | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 5              | Reasonable Accommodation Determination   | [3]   | No Fee      | no comparison  | no comparison   | no comparison                      | no comparison | \$ 695                     | no comparison                | no comparison                         |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland       | Portland                                 | San Jose                              | San Francisco                | Seattle                               |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>19.01 E</b> |   |       |             |               |               |               |  |                                       |                              |                                       |
| 1              | ZA Interpretation of Yard or Use Regulations  |       | \$ 5,831    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 2              | Conditional Use by ZA - Alcohol and Entertainment   |       | \$ 6,459    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | 50% of base fee & per category sq.ft. | no comparison                | \$ 5,000                              |
| 3              | Conditional Use by ZA - all other uses  |       | \$ 5,358    | no comparison | \$ 100        | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | \$ 5,000                              |
| 4              | Modification or Review by ZA  |       | \$ 5,754    | no comparison | \$ 100        | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 5              | Relief from Fence Height Limitation   |       | \$ 4,525    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 6              | Child Care less than or equal to 50 children in the R-3 zone or Large Family Daycare  |       | \$ 4,601    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | \$1,620 + \$250/hr after first 20 hrs |
| 7              | Certified Farmers' Market   |       | \$ 2,641    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 8              | Service of Alcohol in a small restaurant less than or equal to 50 seats   |       | \$ 6,040    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | \$ 3,280                              | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 9              | Approval to Erect Amateur Radio Antenna   |       | \$ 2,592    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | Type II - \$7,609<br>Type III - \$18,109 | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 10             | ZA Determination under Section 12.24 X unless listed separately   |       | \$ 6,093    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 11             | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA  |       | \$ 1,722    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 12             | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA SF dwellings with no exceptions  |       | \$ 861      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| <b>19.01 F</b> |   | [7]   |             |               |               |               |  |                                       |                              |                                       |
| 1              | HPOZ: Establishment, Change or Removal  |       | \$ 138,017  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 2              | HPOZ Preservation Plan  |       | \$ 30,998   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 3              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness: not involving new construction or additions  |       | \$ 473      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 4              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, up to 750 sq ft                                   |       | \$ 708      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 5              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, greater than 750 sq ft, or second story additions |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 6              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 1 to 4 units  |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | Depends on construction cost | no comparison                         |
| 7              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 5 units or more   |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | <\$999 - \$371               | no comparison                         |
| 8              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, up to 5,000 s.f.                             |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | \$1,000 to \$19,999-\$1,405  | no comparison                         |
| 9              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, greater than 5,000 s.f.                      |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | >\$20,000-\$6,409            | no comparison                         |
| 10             | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new accessory building construction   |       | \$ 1,706    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | no comparison                         | no comparison                | no comparison                         |
| 11             | Historic Resources Building Permit Clearance (Larger Project)   |       | \$ 783      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                            | \$ 325                                | \$ 294                       | no comparison                         |
| 12             | APC/DEM (Historic) demolition of main structure   |       | \$ 4,317    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 8,869                                 | no comparison                         | no comparison                | 1.5 X Base Fee                        |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee               | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland       | Portland      | San Jose      | San Francisco | Seattle                                   |
|----------------|--|-------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| 14             | Mills Act Application (Single Family Residential)  |       | \$ 250                    | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 524        | no comparison | \$ 1,850      | \$ 2,695      | no comparison                             |
| 15             | Mills Act Application (MF/Commercial/Industrial)   |       | \$ 1,142                  | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 524        | no comparison | \$ 3,120      | \$ 5,390      | no comparison                             |
| 16             | Mills Act Application (Valuation Exemption)  |       | \$ 473                    | no comparison                             |
| 17             | Mills Act Application (Appeal to Cultural Heritage Commission)                                     |       | \$ 473                    | no comparison                             |
| 18             | Mills Act Contract Execution (Single Family Dwelling)  |       | \$1 per \$1,000 valuation | no comparison                             |
| 19             | Mills Act Contract Execution (MF/Commercial/Industrial)  |       | \$ 1,886                  | no comparison                             |
| 20             | Mills Act Inspection (once every 5 years)  |       | \$ -                      | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 245        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                             |
| 21             | Technical Corrections to previously certified Historic Resource (Applicant Initiated)              | [7]   | \$ -                      | no comparison | \$ 1,178      | no comparison                             |
| 22             | Historic Resources - Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND |       | \$ -                      | no comparison                             |
| 23             | Historic Resources - Environmental Impact Report Review - (hourly)                                 |       | \$ -                      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 250        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                             |
| 24             | Major Conforming Work on Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements                                |       | \$ 352                    | no comparison                             |
| 25             | Modification of a Certificate Determination  |       | \$ 440                    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 945        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                             |
| 26             | Preliminary Evaluation of Demolition or Relocation without Permit                                  |       | \$ 2,112                  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 8,869      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                             |
| <b>19.01 G</b> |  |       |                           |               |               |               |               |               |               |   |
| 1              | Sign Modification by ZA  |       | \$ 6,448                  | no comparison | \$ 25         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,688      | no comparison                             |
| 2              | Comprehensive Sign Program   | [4]   | \$ 11,738                 | no comparison                             |
| 3              | Amendment of Comprehensive Sign Program  | [4]   | \$ 5,748                  | no comparison                             |
| <b>19.01 H</b> |  |       |                           |               |               |               |               |               |               |   |
| 1              | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (First Sign)                 |       | \$ 1,052                  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 748        | \$ 1,376      | \$126 for first 100 sq ft of display area |
| 2              | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (Each Additional Sign)       |       | \$ 383                    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 38         | \$ 1,376      | +\$20.45 for each additional 10 sq ft     |
| <b>19.01 I</b> |  |       |                           |               |               |               |               |               |               |   |
| 1              | Miscellaneous Clearance - Director   |       | \$ 745                    | no comparison                             |
| 2              | Landscape Plan Approval as part of a Discretionary Approval  |       | \$ 647                    | no comparison                             |
| 3              | Building Permit Sign-off for minor Projects  |       | \$ 199                    | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 72         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison                             |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland        | Portland      | San Jose      | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.01 J</b> |   | [8]   |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Minor                               |       | \$ 1,477    | no comparison | \$ 75         | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard                            |       | \$ 3,244    | no comparison | \$ 75         | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard (SF)                       |       | \$ 1,622    | no comparison | \$ 75         | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major                               |       | \$ 4,787    | no comparison | \$ 75         | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5              | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major (SF)                          |       | \$ 2,393    | no comparison | \$ 75         | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 6              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor  |       | \$ 2,496    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 7              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor (SF)   |       | \$ 1,248    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard   |       | \$ 4,167    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 9              | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard (SF)  |       | \$ 2,083    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 10             | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major  |       | \$ 5,628    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 11             | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major (SF)   |       | \$ 2,814    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 12             | DRB - Preliminary   |       | \$ 3,044    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 13             | DRB - Preliminary for SF residential dwelling   |       | \$ 1,522    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 14             | Project Permit Modification   |       | \$ 3,308    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | \$ 945        | \$ 310        | no comparison | no comparison |
| 15             | Project Permit Adjustment   |       | \$ 4,901    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | \$ 2,632      | \$ 740        | no comparison | no comparison |
| 16             | Specific Plan Exception   |       | \$ 14,932   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 1,580      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 17             | Specific Plan Amendment   |       | \$ 40,560   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 4,775      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 18             | Specific Plan Interpretation  |       | \$ 2,994    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 19             | CPIO Fees (place holder)  |       | \$ -        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 L</b> |   |       |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - less than and including 49,999 sq ft                                    |       | \$ 16,292   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - 50,000 sq ft and greater  |       | \$ 16,292   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 M</b> |   |       |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Time Extension for other than Maps  |       | \$ 708      | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 314         | no comparison | 10% of fee    | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 N</b> |   |       |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Adult Entertainment Business Exception within 500 ft of another Adult Entertainment Establishment                 |       | \$ 5,317    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 O</b> |   |       |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for one or more Incentives included in the Menu of Incentives |       | \$ 7,115    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 7,360      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for an Incentive not included in the Menu of Incentives       |       | \$ 23,287   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | \$ 7,360      | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Application for a Density Bonus in excess of that permitted by Section 12.22 A.26                                 |       | \$ 20,718   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 P</b> |   |       |             |               |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Imposition of Conditions (City Initiated)   |       | \$ 26,880   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Reconsideration (Applicant Initiated)   |       | \$ 29,866   | no comparison | no comparison | 50% of Request | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Plan Approval for Revocation Case (Deposit)   |       | \$ 5,000    | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes    | Current Fee | Dallas        | Denver   | Oakland                      | Portland      | San Jose   | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|----------------|---|----------|-------------|---------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.01 S</b> |   |          |             |               |  |                              |               |  |               |               |
| 1              | Site Plan Review Application for Residential Project of 50 or more dwelling units |          | \$ 7,806    | no comparison | <1 acre - \$500<br>>1 acre - \$2,500<br>+ \$500/acre<br>Max \$50,000 | \$658 + Parking<br>Surcharge | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | For Non-Residential or Mixed Use Building Site Plan Review Application            |          | \$ 7,925    | no comparison |  |                              | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 U</b> |   |          |             |               |  |                              |               |  |               |               |
| 1              | Hillside Permit Filing Fee  |          | \$ 6,094    | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison                | no comparison | \$ 9,130   | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 W</b> |   |          |             |               |  |                              |               |  |               |               |
|                | Expedited Permit Filing Deposit   |          | \$ 5,000    | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison                | no comparison | \$ 704   | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.01 X</b> |   |          |             |               |  |                              |               |  |               |               |
| 1              | Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application                                     |          | \$ 6,369    | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison                | no comparison | No Fee   | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.02 A</b> |   | [10, 11] |             |               |  |                              |               |  |               |               |
| 1              | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                     |          | \$ 11,219   |               | no comparison  | \$ 6,500                     | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                    |          | \$ 12,662   |               | no comparison  | \$ 6,500                     | no comparison | \$4,470 + \$58<br>per lot for first<br>100 lots plus \$19<br>per lot after | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots     |          | \$ 3,867    |               | no comparison  | \$ 6,500                     | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No. | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas  | Denver        | Oakland  | Portland      | San Jose   | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|---------|---|-------|-------------|---|---------------|----------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|
| 4       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots                 |       | \$ 10,165   | 1-20 lots<br>\$1,548 + \$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots                |       | \$ 11,257   | 20+ lots<br>\$2,193 + \$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre  | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison | \$4,470 + \$58<br>per lot for first<br>100 lots plus \$19<br>per lot after | no comparison | no comparison |
| 6       | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots |       | \$ 3,073    |   | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 7       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 5-49 Units                                   |       | \$ 10,416   | 1-20 lots<br>\$1,548 + \$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 50-99 Units                                  |       | \$ 13,856   | 20+ lots<br>\$2,193 + \$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre  | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison | \$4,470 + \$58<br>per lot for first<br>100 lots plus \$19<br>per lot after | no comparison | no comparison |
| 9       | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 100 Units or More                            |       | \$ 17,611   |   | no comparison | \$ 6,500 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee                | Dallas   | Denver        | Oakland         | Portland      | San Jose   | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|---------|--|-------|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|
| 10      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area |       | \$ 12,552                  | 1-20 lots<br>\$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison |                 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 11      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 50,000-99,999 sq ft of Floor Area    |       | \$ 14,309                  | 20+ lots<br>\$2,193 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre  | no comparison | \$6,500 + \$177 | no comparison | \$4,470 + \$58<br>per lot for first<br>100 lots plus \$19<br>per lot after | no comparison | no comparison |
| 12      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 100,000-249,999 sq ft of Floor Area  |       | \$ 16,065                  |  | no comparison |                 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 13      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More  |       | \$ 17,822                  |  | no comparison |                 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 14      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - Less than 1 Acre                    |       | \$ 11,498                  | 1-20 lots<br>\$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison |                 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 15      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 1 to Less than 5 Acres              |       | \$ 12,552                  | 20+ lots<br>\$2,193 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre  | no comparison | \$6,500 + \$177 | no comparison | \$4,470 + \$58<br>per lot for first<br>100 lots plus \$19<br>per lot after | no comparison | no comparison |
| 16      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 5 Acres or More                     |       | \$ 13,608                  |  | no comparison |                 | no comparison |  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 17      | Phasing of Map   |       | \$ 545                     |  | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 18      | Final Map - fewer than 20 Lots   | (14)  | \$ 8,000                   | 1-20 lots<br>\$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | \$ 310   | no comparison | no comparison |
| 19      | Final Map - more than 20 Lots  | (14)  | Actual Cost<br>and Deposit | 20+ lots<br>\$2,193 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre  | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | \$ 310   | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Notes    | Current Fee | Dallas  | Denver        | Oakland       | Portland      | San Jose      | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|----------------|--|----------|-------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.02 B</b> |  | [10, 11] |             |   |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE40 or More Restrictive Zones                            |          | \$ 9,989    | 1-20 lots   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones                            |          | \$ 8,935    | \$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - Multi-Family  |          | \$ 10,416   |   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |          | \$ 12,552   | 1-20 lots   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |          | \$ 14,309   | \$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 6              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |          | \$ 16,065   |   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 7              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |          | \$ 17,822   |   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 1 Acre in Area                       |          | \$ 11,498   | 1-20 lots   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 9              | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area                 |          | \$ 12,552   | \$1,548 +\$17/lot<br>if no lot exceeds<br>3 acres, if >3<br>acres + \$70/acre | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 10             | Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 5 Acres or More in Area                        |          | \$ 13,608   |   | no comparison | \$ 2,914      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 11             | Other Parcel Map Actions - Parcel Map Exemption (Lot Line Adjustment)  |          | \$ 3,507    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 12             | Other Parcel Map Actions - Parcel Map Waiver   |          | \$ 3,729    | no comparison   | no comparison | \$ 1,056      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 13             | Certificate or Conditional Certificate of Compliance- Determination  |          | \$ 3,683    | no comparison   | \$ 50         | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 2,465      | no comparison | no comparison |
| <b>19.02 C</b> |  |          |             |   |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| 1              | Filing - Deemed to be Approved Private Street  |          | \$ 3,787    | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 2              | Filing - Private Street Map  |          | \$ 15,421   | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3              | Filing - Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Private Street Map  |          | \$ 22,415   | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland       | Portland      | San Jose         | San Francisco | Seattle          |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| <b>19.02 D</b> |   |       |             |               |               |               |               |                  |               |                  |
| 1              | Mobile Home Park Impact Report  |       | \$ 13,992   | no comparison    | no comparison | no comparison    |
| <b>19.02 E</b> |   |       |             |               |               |               |               |                  |               |                  |
| 1              | Condominium Conversion for Parcel Maps - Residential - 1-4 Units  |       | \$ 8,055    | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison |                  | no comparison |                  |
| 2              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 5-49 Units   |       | \$ 16,109   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison | \$10,210 + \$203 | no comparison | 2.5 X base fee + |
| 3              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 50-99 Units  |       | \$ 19,575   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison | per unit         | no comparison | .75 X each unit  |
| 4              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 100 Units or More  |       | \$ 22,161   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison |                  | no comparison |                  |
| 6              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |       | \$ 13,430   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison |                  | no comparison |                  |
| 7              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |       | \$ 14,309   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison | \$10,210 + \$203 | no comparison | 2.5 X base fee + |
| 8              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |       | \$ 15,187   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison | per unit         | no comparison | .75 X each unit  |
| 9              | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |       | \$ 16,065   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 3,451      | no comparison |                  | no comparison |                  |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas  | Denver  | Oakland                               | Portland      | San Jose  | San Francisco | Seattle       |
|---------|--|-------|-------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|
| 19.02 F |  |       |             |   |   |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 2       | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map, Prior to Hearing  |       | \$ 869      | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$ 770  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 3       | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map, After Hearing   |       | \$ 1,374    | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$ 1,080  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4       | Modification to Approved Tentative/Preliminary Map or Recorded Final Map   |       | \$ 8,052    | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5       | Reversion to Acreage   |       | \$ 8,876    | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$ 615  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 6       | Quimby Fee Calculation   |       | \$ 276      | no comparison   | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison |
| 8       | Time Extension for Maps  |       | \$ 793      | no comparison   | no comparison   | \$ 314                                | no comparison | \$ 1,000  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 9       | Letter of Clarification or Correction (initiated by Applicant)   |       | \$ 1,331    | \$ 323  | no comparison   | no comparison                         | no comparison | \$ 655  | no comparison | no comparison |
| 19.03   |  |       |             |   |   |                                       |               |   |               |               |
| 1       | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                                    |       | \$ 23,884   | 0-1 acre - \$1,050<br>1-5 acres - \$2,610<br>5-15 acres - \$5,820       | <1 acre - \$1,000<br>>1 acre - \$1,000 + \$500/acre<br>Max \$50,000 | \$ 4,621                              | \$ 19,067     | no comparison   | \$ 7,932      | \$ 5,000      |
| 2       | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use             |       | \$ 32,116   | 15-20 acres - \$9,315<br>>20 acres - \$9,315 + \$113/acre, MAX \$37,500 |   | \$ 4,621                              | \$ 30,173     | no comparison   | \$ 7,923      | \$ 5,000      |
| 3       | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                        |       | \$ 46,357   | no comparison   | Minor - \$100   | <5 acres \$1,062<br>>5 acres \$25,448 | no comparison | <1 acre-\$4,710<br>1-2 - \$8,090<br>2-3 - \$10,130<br>3-5 - \$12,170<br>>5 - \$13,945 | no comparison | no comparison |
| 4       | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use |       | \$ 62,566   | no comparison   |   |                                       | no comparison |   | no comparison | no comparison |
| 5       | Street Re-Classification (place holder)  |       | \$ -        | no comparison   | no comparison   | \$ 4,980                              | \$ 100        | <5 - \$655<br>>5 - \$1,400 + \$19 per non-applicant property on street                | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee       | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland       | Portland      | San Jose      | San Francisco              | Seattle       |               |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>19.05 A</b> |   |       |                   |               |               |               |               |               |                            |               |               |
| 1              | Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - Categorical Exemption  |       | \$ 81             | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 187        | \$ 321                     | no comparison |               |
| 2              | Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND or any other State exemptions       |       | \$ 2,280          | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,366      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 3              | MND - Expanded / Initial Study  | [15]  | \$ 1,953          | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 748        | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 4              | Reconsideration of Prior Environmental Determination  |       | \$ 703            | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 664        | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 6              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - Less Than 1 Acres in Area      |       | \$ 7,156          | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 7              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area |       | \$ 11,520         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 8              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - Non-Very High Fire Hazard Area - 5 Acres or More in Area        |       | \$ 11,696         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 9              | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - Less than 1 Acre in Area                |       | \$ 14,710         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 10             | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area          |       | \$ 21,448         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| 11             | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposits) - High Fire Hazard Area - 5 Acres or More in Area                 |       | \$ 32,770         | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 4,806      | \$ 3,070      | no comparison              | no comparison |               |
| <b>19.06</b>   |   |       |                   |               |               |               |               |               |                            |               |               |
| 1              | Coastal Development Permit - SF and MF residential dwelling   |       | \$ 7,057          | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 2              | Coastal Development Permit - SF residential dwelling with no exceptions   |       | \$ 3,528          | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 3              | Coastal Development Permit - Non-residential  |       | \$ 7,798          | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 4              | Coastal Development Permit - Exemption Determination  |       | \$ 684            | no comparison | Based on project valuation | no comparison |               |
| 5              | Coastal Development Permit - Approval in Concept  |       | \$ 703            | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 6              | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment  |       | \$ 6,456          | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 7              | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment with no exceptions   |       | \$ 3,228          | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 8              | Coastal Development Permit - Mello Compliance Review - City Review  |       | \$ 828            | no comparison |                            | no comparison |               |
| 9              | Mello Compliance Review - 3rd Party Consultant  | [6]   | Fee + Actual Cost | no comparison |                            | no comparison | no comparison |

| Fee No.      | Fee Description   | Notes | Current Fee | Dallas        | Denver        | Oakland  | Portland      | San Jose  | San Francisco | Seattle            |
|--------------|---|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|---|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>19.09</b> |   |       |             |               |               |  |               |   |               |                    |
| 1            | Land Development Counseling   |       | \$ 432      | no comparison | no comparison | Regular working hours - \$250/hr<br>Outside regular hours - \$375/hr | no comparison | Existing SF house - \$77<br>Review (2hr min) - \$310<br>Enhanced Review - \$620<br>Comprehensive Review (Pre-Application) - \$1,460 | \$ 4,980      | Land Use Hourly X2 |
| <b>19.1</b>  |   |       |             |               |               |  |               |   |               |                    |
| 1            | Request for a pre-development agreement consulting session with DCP staff |       | \$ 798      | no comparison | no comparison | no comparison  | no comparison | no comparison   | no comparison | no comparison      |
| 2            | Initial Development Agreement Application                                 |       | \$ 29,690   | no comparison | no comparison | \$ 12,074  | no comparison | \$ 11,805   | no comparison | Land use hourly X2 |
| <b>19.11</b> |   |       |             |               |               |  |               |   |               |                    |
| 1            | Annual Inspection of Compliance   |       | \$ 300      | no comparison | \$ 225        | \$ 125   | no comparison | \$ 730  | no comparison | no comparison      |

REPORT FROM

## OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

---

Date: July 26, 2017

CAO File No. 0220-04851-0014  
Council File No. 09-0969  
Council District: Citywide

To: The Mayor  
The Council

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

Reference: Department of City Planning Report dated December 29, 2016; additional information received through June 30, 2017.

Subject: **CITY PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE FEE STUDY**

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council, subject to approval by the Mayor:

1. Approve amending the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 19.01 through 19.10 (excluding 19.01 F) to revise fees to reflect the total cost per activity in order to more accurately represent the cost of providing planning and land use services and achieve full-cost recovery, as outlined in the Total Cost per Activity column in the attached City Planning Estimated Cost of Service Fee Schedule (Attachment 1); and,
2. Request the Office of the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance to amend the LAMC Sections 19.01 through 19.10 (excluding 19.01 F) in accordance with the fees listed in the Total Cost per Activity column in the attached City Planning Estimated Cost of Service Fee Schedule (Attachment 1).

### SUMMARY

In December 2016, the Department of City Planning (DCP), through the contracted services of NBS, completed their comprehensive fee study to achieve full cost recovery for planning services. The fee study utilized a cost-based analytical approach in calculating the full cost of providing planning services, which follows best management practices to ensure fees are fair, equitable, and represent the estimated and reasonable costs of services, as required by the Government Code. The methodology employed was a "bottom up" approach to cost analysis, where time spent per unit of fee activity is determined for each position within the DCP. The times are totaled and then used in calculating all applicable City costs, which include: direct salaries and benefits, operating services and supplies, department and divisional overhead, and citywide overhead costs. For the time period reviewed, the cost of case processing related services was approximately \$29.8 million while revenue from these services was \$22.1 million resulting in a General Fund subsidy of \$7.7 million. The Department's report concludes that the City should try to recover as much of the cost of services as is feasible, but recommends that minor and/or single family project permit compliance cases, reasonable accommodation determinations, historic resources cases, and non-applicant appeals receive some level of subsidy.

The Department's last comprehensive fee study was adopted in 2009 and was phased-in over three years to achieve full-cost recovery for most planning services. At the time, the Mayor and Council adopted a fee study which subsidized single family project permit compliance cases, reasonable accommodation determinations, non-applicant appeals and historic resources. In hindsight, the fee study severely underestimated the annual volume of work associated with these cases. The 2009 fee study assumed zero appeals by parties other than the applicant, so the necessary funds to subsidize the appeal fees are not included in the Department's budget. Therefore, General Fund monies that would be utilized to support long-range planning efforts have been diverted to cover staff time spent on non-applicant appeals.

Based on average annual case volume, the full cost to provide anticipated planning services is \$25.23 million and current fees would recover \$16.77 million resulting in a General Fund subsidy of \$8.46 million. The Department's recommended fee increases would recover \$22.27 million resulting in a General Fund subsidy of \$2.96 million. Adoption of the Department's recommended fees would require General Fund subsidies for non-applicant appeals and historic resources totaling approximately \$3 million. To be consistent with the City's Financial Policies, the Mayor and Council would need to appropriate \$2.68 million annually to subsidize non-applicant appeals and \$320,000 annually to subsidize historic resources. The Department's proposed subsidy is approximately the annual cost to fund one geographic community planning team (15 positions).

The General Fund contribution to the expanded Community Planning Program (CPP) was anticipated to be offset by increasing planning fees to full-cost recovery and diverting the existing General Fund subsidy to support long-range planning. The Fiscal Year 2017-18 Adopted Budget increased the CPP to 78 positions which expands the CPP to five geographic teams. Two of the CPP teams are funded by the General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (C.F. 16-0422). The Mayor and Council authorized setting the General Plan Maintenance Surcharge at a level lower than full-cost recovery based on the fact that planning fees would be increasing to full-cost recovery. Therefore, this Office recommends increasing the single family project permit compliance case fees, reasonable accommodation determination fees, and non-applicant appeal fees to full-cost recovery. During budget deliberations on the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the City Attorney to prepare a draft ordinance amending Section 19.04 F of Article 9, Chapter 1 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to increase the Historic Preservation and Mills Act fees to full cost recovery to fund four fee-funded positions (C.F. 17-0600-S100) to support historic resources casework. The recommendations in this report exclude Section 19.04 F because those fees and the policy decision associated with full-cost recovery for historic resources are pending before the Budget and Finance Committee.

Our Office reviewed the fee study and final report which indicates the City would only recover approximately 66 percent of the full cost of providing planning services if fees are not adjusted. Based on average annual case volume, the full cost to provide planning services is \$25.23 million and current fees recover \$16.77 million. Increasing fees to full-cost recovery will decrease the Department's reliance on the General Fund by \$8.46 million annually. The proposed fee structure establishes a nexus between costs of providing services and specific users. Based on the fee study findings, our Office recommends revising Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 19.01 through 19.10 (excluding 19.01 F) to more accurately represent the cost of providing planning and land use services and achieve full-cost recovery.

## **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Consistent with the City's Financial Policies, our Office recommends amending the fees in Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 19.01 through 19.10 (excluding 19.01 F) to achieve full cost recovery. The revised fees will provide a more reliable funding source for the Department of City Planning's special fund programs and decrease the Department's reliance on the General Fund by \$8.46 million annually. The recommendations in this report comply with the City's Financial Policies in that fees for service are set at full cost recovery to generate revenues sufficient to fully offset associated expenditures.

If the Mayor and Council authorize setting planning service fees at a level lower than full cost recovery, then General Fund monies will need to be appropriated to subsidize the associated planning service fees.

*RHL:YC:ACA:JLK:02170172C*

**ATTACHMENT**

| Fee No.   | Fee Description  | Article           | Notes | Cost Recovery Analysis                            |                         |                              |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---|--|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|   |  |                   |       | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| <b>19.01 FILING FEES FOR APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS</b> |  |                   |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.01 A</b>  | <b>Establishment or Change of Zones, Height Districts or Supplemental Use Districts and Other Related Actions.</b><br><i>The following fees shall be charged for a zone change, height district or supplemental use district when that action is consistent with the General Plan. (See Section 19.03 for zone change requests that are not consistent with the General Plan.)</i> |                   | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Zone Change - No New Construction  | 12.32             | [1]   | 60.00   | \$ 11,609               | \$ 11,734                    | \$ 11,609                       | 100%                        | 31                                       | \$ 357,887                               | \$ 354,076  | \$ 354,076                                   |
| 2   | Zone Change - With New Construction  | 12.32             |       | 120.00  | \$ 20,229               | \$ 5,747                     | \$ 20,229                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Clarification of Q Classifications or D Limitations  | 12.32 H           |       | 21.71   | \$ 4,158                | \$ 4,428                     | \$ 4,158                        | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 36,531                                | \$ 34,301   | \$ 34,301                                    |
| 4   | Land Use Determinations by CPC   | 12.24.1           |       | 7.76  | \$ 1,485                | \$ 11,060                    | \$ 1,485                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 11,060                                | \$ 1,485  | \$ 1,485                                     |
| 5   | Amendment of Council's Instructions involving (T) Tentative Classifications  | 12.32             |       | 24.21   | \$ 4,637                | \$ 4,264                     | \$ 4,637                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 2,132                                 | \$ 2,318  | \$ 2,318                                     |
| 6   | Height District Change   | 12.32             |       | 100.60  | \$ 19,270               | \$ 11,123                    | \$ 19,270                       | 100%                        | 9  | \$ 84,546                                | \$ 163,797  | \$ 163,797                                   |
| 7   | Supplemental Use District: Change or Removal   | 12.32 S           |       | 342.88  | \$ 65,680               | \$ 67,915                    | \$ 65,680                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 8   | Supplemental Use District: Establishment   | 12.32 S           |       | 882.38  | \$ 130,708              | \$ 134,608                   | \$ 130,708                      | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 289,216                               | \$ 281,418  | \$ 261,416                                   |
| 9   | Conditions of Approval for Oil Drilling  | 13.01 H           |       | 46.00   | \$ 8,811                | \$ 7,650                     | \$ 8,811                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 10  | Zone Boundary Line Adjustment  | 12.36 H           |       | 27.94   | \$ 5,352                | \$ 5,473                     | \$ 5,352                        | 100%                        | 5  | \$ 25,997                                | \$ 25,422   | \$ 25,422                                    |
| 11  | Building Line - Establishment, Change or Removal   | 12.32             |       | 37.40   | \$ 7,164                | \$ 8,833                     | \$ 7,164                        | 100%                        | 6  | \$ 48,582                                | \$ 39,402   | \$ 39,402                                    |
| 12  | Surface Mining Permits   | 13.03             |       | 12.98   | \$ 2,410                | \$ 2,640                     | \$ 2,410                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 B</b>  | <b>Appeal Fees</b>   |                   | [2]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Appeal Fee - Applicant (first level appeal)  |                   |       | 70.68   | \$ 13,538               | \$ 13,277                    | \$ 13,538                       | 100%                        | 24                                       | \$ 321,987                               | \$ 328,296  | \$ 328,296                                   |
| 2   | Appeal Fee - Applicant (add'l level appeal)  |                   |       | 53.48   | \$ 10,243               | \$ 11,211                    | \$ 10,243                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Person other than the applicant  |                   |       | 70.68   | \$ 13,538               | \$ 89                        | \$ 271                          | 2%                          | 188                                      | \$ 17,822                                | \$ 2,680,620  | \$ 53,610                                    |
| <b>19.01 C</b>  | <b>Commission Conditional Uses and Other Similar Quasi-Judicial Approvals and Public Benefit Approvals</b>   |                   | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Conditional Use by APC or CPC<br><i>Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project) - Moved to 19.04</i>  | 12.24U and 12.24V |       | 65.95   | \$ 12,633               | \$ 13,224                    | \$ 12,633                       | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 102,488                               | \$ 97,905   | \$ 97,905                                    |
| 2   | Public Benefits Alternative Compliance Proposal  | 14.00B            |       | 68.20   | \$ 13,064               | \$ 16,938                    | \$ 13,064                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Modification of Existing CUP by APC or CPC   | 12.24B            |       | 67.07   | \$ 12,846               | \$ 8,878                     | \$ 12,846                       | 100%                        | 5  | \$ 44,380                                | \$ 64,232   | \$ 64,232                                    |
| 4   | Letters of Correction, Modification or Clarification of a determination by a ZA or the Director initiated by Applicant   |                   |       | 7.76  | \$ 1,486                | \$ 1,331                     | \$ 1,486                        | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 10,648                                | \$ 11,882   | \$ 11,882                                    |
| <b>19.01 D</b>  | <b>Variances, Adjustments or Modifications from the Regulations and Requirements of the Zoning Ordinances</b>  |                   |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Variance   | 12.24Y and 12.27  |       | 29.02   | \$ 5,558                | \$ 6,448                     | \$ 5,558                        | 100%                        | 120                                      | \$ 773,760                               | \$ 686,948  | \$ 686,948                                   |
| 2   | Adjustment by ZA except SF dwelling  | 12.28A            |       | 26.87   | \$ 5,146                | \$ 5,370                     | \$ 5,146                        | 100%                        | 35                                       | \$ 186,808                               | \$ 178,826  | \$ 178,826                                   |
| 3   | Adjustment by ZA for SF dwelling   | 12.28A            |       | 22.57   | \$ 4,322                | \$ 2,685                     | \$ 4,322                        | 100%                        | 69                                       | \$ 184,594                               | \$ 297,164  | \$ 297,164                                   |
| 4   | Slight Modification by ZA  | 12.28B.2          |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 3,941                     | \$ 5,517                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 1,971                                 | \$ 2,758  | \$ 2,758                                     |
| 5   | Reasonable Accommodation Determination   | 12.22A.27         | [3]   | 11.80   | \$ 2,222                | \$ -                         | \$ -                            | 0%                          | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 E</b>  | <b>Zoning Administrator Conditional Uses, Interpretations and Various Quasi-Judicial Approvals</b>   |                   | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article                        | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |  |
|---------|--|--------------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
|         |  |                                |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |  |
| E.1     | <i>The following fees shall be charged pursuant to Section 12.24 of this Code to applicants seeking certain permits, interpretations or approvals</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 1       | ZA Interpretation of Yard or Use Regulations   | 12.21A.2                       |       | 29.19   | \$ 5,591                | \$ 5,831                     | \$ 5,591                        | 100%                        | 3  | \$ 14,578                                | \$ 13,979   | \$ 13,970                                    |  |
| 2       | Conditional Use by ZA - Alcohol and Entertainment  | 12.24W.1 and 12.24W.18         |       | 33.47   | \$ 6,412                | \$ 6,459                     | \$ 6,412                        | 100%                        | 254                                      | \$ 1,640,588                             | \$ 1,628,539  | \$ 1,628,539                                 |  |
| 3       | Conditional Use by ZA - all other uses   | 12.24W                         |       | 29.55   | \$ 5,860                | \$ 5,358                     | \$ 5,680                        | 100%                        | 167                                      | \$ 894,786                               | \$ 945,283  | \$ 945,283                                   |  |
| 4       | Modification or Review by ZA   | 12.24J, 12.24L, and 12.24M     |       | 29.85   | \$ 5,718                | \$ 5,754                     | \$ 5,718                        | 100%                        | 174                                      | \$ 998,758                               | \$ 993,576  | \$ 993,576                                   |  |
| 5       | Relief from Fence Height Limitation  | 12.24X.7, 12.24X.8, and 12.28  |       | 28.37   | \$ 5,434                | \$ 4,525                     | \$ 5,434                        | 100%                        | 35                                       | \$ 158,375                               | \$ 190,202  | \$ 190,202                                   |  |
| 6       | Child Care less than or equal to 50 children in the R-3 zone or Large Family Daycare   | 12.24X                         |       | 22.35   | \$ 4,281                | \$ 4,601                     | \$ 4,281                        | 100%                        | 3  | \$ 11,503                                | \$ 10,703   | \$ 10,703                                    |  |
| 7       | Certified Farmers' Market  | 12.24X.6                       |       | 13.03   | \$ 2,495                | \$ 2,641                     | \$ 2,495                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 2,641                                 | \$ 2,495  | \$ 2,495                                     |  |
| 8       | Service of Alcohol in a small restaurant less than or equal to 50 seats  | 12.24X.2                       |       | 19.77   | \$ 3,787                | \$ 6,040                     | \$ 3,787                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 6,040                                 | \$ 3,787  | \$ 3,787                                     |  |
| 9       | Approval to Erect Amateur Radio Antenna  | 12.24X.3                       |       | 12.11   | \$ 2,320                | \$ 2,592                     | \$ 2,320                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ 648                                   | \$ 580  | \$ 580                                       |  |
| 10      | ZA Determination under Section 12.24 X unless listed separately  | 12.24X                         |       | 28.59   | \$ 5,476                | \$ 6,093                     | \$ 5,476                        | 100%                        | 56                                       | \$ 341,208                               | \$ 306,630  | \$ 306,630                                   |  |
|         | <i>Items 11 and 12 moved to 19.04</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| E.2     | <i>The following fee shall be charged pursuant to Section 12.24 B.1. of this Code to applicants seeking a conditional use permit that requires a consultation with the Department for preliminary project review:</i>                              |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 1       | Pre-Application Review and Research for Conditional Uses (moved to section 19.09)  | 12.24 F                        |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| E.3     | <i>The following fees shall be charged pursuant to Sections 12.24 F. and 12.24 Z.2. of this Code for costs associated with permit clearance, condition compliance monitoring and inspections conducted by the City, and revocation proceedings</i> |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
|         | <i>Miscellaneous Clearance - Zoning Administrator (moved to 19.04)</i>   |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
|         | <i>Miscellaneous Clearance - Zoning Administrator Single Family Dwellings with No Exceptions (moved to 19.04)</i>  |                                |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 1       | Monitoring of Conditional Use Permits  | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 952                       | \$ 952                          |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 2       | Field Verification Prior to Operations   | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 253                       | \$ 253                          |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 3       | Inspection and Field Compliance Review of Operations   | 12.24F, 12.24M, 12.24W, 12.24X |       |   |                         | \$ 746                       | \$ 746                          |                             |  |  |   |  |  |
| 4       | Revocation, Suspension or Restriction Proceedings for Non-Compliance of Conditions (Deposit)   | 12.24Z                         | [17]  |   |                         | \$ 5,000                     | \$ 5,000                        |                             |  |  |   |  |  |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description   | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |      |
|----------------|---|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|------|
|                |   |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |      |
| <b>19.01 F</b> | <b>Fees for Historic Related Applications</b>   |         | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |      |
| 1              | HPOZ: Establishment, Change or Removal  | 12.20.3 | [7]   | 664.00  | \$ 127,191              | \$ 138,017                   | \$ 127,191                      | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 2              | HPOZ Preservation Plan  |         |       | 165.00  | \$ 31,606               | \$ 30,998                    | \$ 31,606                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 3              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness: not involving new construction or additions  | 12.20.3 |       | 22.25   | \$ 4,262                | \$ 473                       | \$ 1,279                        | 30%                         | 4  | \$ 1,692                                 | \$ 17,048   | \$ 5,114                                     | \$ - |
| 4              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, up to 750 sq ft                                   | 0       |       | 23.25   | \$ 4,454                | \$ 708                       | \$ 1,336                        | 30%                         | 23                                       | \$ 15,930                                | \$ 100,209  | \$ 30,062                                    | \$ - |
| 5              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for additions to existing square footage, greater than 750 sq ft, or second story additions | 12.20   |       | 29.75   | \$ 5,699                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 1,710                        | 30%                         | 27                                       | \$ 45,647                                | \$ 152,440  | \$ 45,732                                    | \$ - |
| 6              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 1 to 4 units  | 12.20   |       | 38.25   | \$ 7,327                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 2,198                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 7              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new residential construction, 5 units or more   | 12.20   |       | 45.25   | \$ 8,668                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 2,600                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 8              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, up to 5,000 s.f.                             | 12.20   |       | 38.25   | \$ 7,327                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 2,198                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 9              | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new commercial and mixed use construction, greater than 5,000 s.f.                      | 12.20   |       | 45.25   | \$ 8,668                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 2,600                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 10             | HPOZ Certificate of Appropriateness or Compatibility: for new accessory building construction   | 12.20   |       | 23.25   | \$ 4,454                | \$ 1,706                     | \$ 1,336                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 11             | Historic Resources Building Permit Clearance (Larger Project)   | 12.20   |       | 18.75   | \$ 3,592                | \$ 783                       | \$ 1,077                        | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 12             | APC/DEM (Historic) demolition of main structure   | 0       |       | 43.75   | \$ 8,380                | \$ 4,317                     | \$ 8,380                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 13             | Mills Act Application - Part 1 - City Application Processing Fee  | 19.144  | [19]  | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 250                       | \$ 650                          | 85%                         | 53                                       | \$ 13,250                                | \$ 40,609   | \$ 34,450                                    | \$ - |
| 14             | Mills Act Application - Part 2 - City Contract Execution Processing Fee   | 19.144  | [19]  |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |      |
|                | City Administrative Fee   |         |       | 7.00  | \$ 1,341                | \$ 1,142                     | \$ 1,142                        | 85%                         | 18                                       | \$ 20,556                                | \$ 24,136   | \$ 20,556                                    | \$ - |
|                | Mills Act Contract - Inspection - Contract Services Provider (Charged at actual cost)   | 19.144  | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,654                | \$ -                         | \$ 1,654                        | 100%                        | 71                                       | \$ -                                     | \$ 117,440  | \$ 117,440                                   | \$ - |
| 15             | Mills Act Application (Valuation Exemption)   | 19.144  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |      |
|                | City Administrative Fee   |         |       | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 473                       | \$ 766                          | 100%                        | 7  | \$ 3,311                                 | \$ 5,363  | \$ 5,363                                     | \$ - |
|                | Contract Services Provider (Charged at Actual Cost)   |         | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,500                | \$ -                         | \$ 1,500                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 16             | Mills Act Application (Appeal to Cultural Heritage Commission)  | 19.144  |       | 8.00  | \$ 1,532                | \$ 473                       | \$ 1,532                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 17             | Mills Act Inspection (once every 5 years)   |         | [19]  |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |      |
|                | City Administrative Fee   |         |       | 3.00  | \$ 575                  | \$ 1,142                     | \$ 575                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
|                | Mills Act Contract - Inspection - Contract Services Provider (Charged at actual cost)   | 19.144  | [19]  | n/a   | \$ 1,500                | \$ -                         | \$ 1,500                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 18             | Technical Corrections to previously certified Historic Resource (Applicant Initiated)   | 0       | [7]   | 13.00   | \$ 2,490                | \$ -                         | \$ 2,490                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 19             | Historic Resources - Environmental Clearance Except EIRs - EAF Initial Study leading to ND or MND   | 0       |       | 0.00  | \$ -                    | \$ -                         | \$ -                            | n/a                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 20             | Historic Resources - Environmental Impact Report Review - (hourly)  | 0       |       | 1.00  | \$ 192                  | \$ -                         | \$ 192                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 21             | Major Conforming Work on Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements   | 0       |       | 8.00  | \$ 1,532                | \$ -                         | \$ 460                          | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 22             | Modification of a Certificate Determination   | 0       |       | 10.00   | \$ 1,916                | \$ -                         | \$ 575                          | 30%                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| 23             | Preliminary Evaluation of Demolition or Relocation without Permit   | 12.20.0 | [18]  | 48.00   | \$ 9,195                | \$ -                         | \$ 9,195                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   | \$ - |
| <b>19.01 G</b> | <b>Sign Application</b>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |      |

| Fee No.                | Fee Description   | Article                   | Notes | Cost Recovery Analysis                            |                         |                              |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                        |   |                           |       | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| <i>section deleted</i> |   |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.01 H                | Temporary Subdivision Direction Signs<br><i>moved to 19.04</i>                              |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.01 I                | Fees for Plan Approvals<br><i>moved to 19.04</i>  |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.01 J                | Commission or Director Approvals  |                           | [B.9] |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1                      | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Minor         | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 16.91   | \$ 3,239                | \$ 1,477                     | \$ 1,619                        | 50%                         | 89                                       | \$ 131,453                               | \$ 288,234  | \$ 144,117                                   |
| 2                      | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard      | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 22.58   | \$ 4,326                | \$ 3,244                     | \$ 4,326                        | 100%                        | 30                                       | \$ 97,320                                | \$ 129,775  | \$ 129,775                                   |
| 3                      | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Standard (SF) | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 19.75   | \$ 3,782                | \$ 1,622                     | \$ 3,782                        | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 3,244                                 | \$ 7,584  | \$ 7,584                                     |
| 4                      | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major         | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 4,787                     | \$ 6,500                        | 100%                        | 57                                       | \$ 271,662                               | \$ 368,894  | \$ 368,894                                   |
| 5                      | Project Permit Compliance, Design Overlay Plan Approvals or other DIR cases - Major (SF)    | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 2,393                     | \$ 6,500                        | 100%                        | 92                                       | \$ 218,960                               | \$ 594,781  | \$ 594,781                                   |
| 6                      | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Minor  | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 29.68   | \$ 5,685                | \$ 2,496                     | \$ 2,842                        | 50%                         | 17                                       | \$ 42,432                                | \$ 96,643   | \$ 48,322                                    |
| 7                      | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard   | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 4,167                     | \$ 6,500                        | 100%                        | 23                                       | \$ 93,758                                | \$ 146,258  | \$ 146,258                                   |
| 8                      | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Standard (SF)  | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 33.94   | \$ 6,500                | \$ 2,083                     | \$ 3,250                        | 50%                         | 1  | \$ 2,083                                 | \$ 6,500  | \$ 3,250                                     |
| 9                      | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major  | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 43.87   | \$ 8,403                | \$ 5,628                     | \$ 8,403                        | 100%                        | 13                                       | \$ 73,164                                | \$ 109,239  | \$ 109,239                                   |
| 10                     | Project Permit Compliance with DRB - Major (SF)   | 11.5.7 and Article 3 Ch 1 |       | 41.03   | \$ 7,859                | \$ 2,814                     | \$ 7,859                        | 100%                        | 59                                       | \$ 166,028                               | \$ 483,705  | \$ 483,705                                   |
| 11                     | DRB - Preliminary   | 16.50E.3                  |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 3,044                     | \$ 4,482                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 3,044                                 | \$ 4,482  | \$ 4,482                                     |
| 12                     | DRB - Preliminary for SF residential dwelling   | 16.50E.3                  |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 1,522                     | \$ 2,241                        | 50%                         | 8  | \$ 12,176                                | \$ 35,859   | \$ 17,929                                    |
| 13                     | Project Permit Modification   | 11.5.7D                   |       | 23.40   | \$ 4,482                | \$ 3,308                     | \$ 4,482                        | 100%                        | 7  | \$ 23,158                                | \$ 31,376   | \$ 31,376                                    |
| 14                     | Project Permit Adjustment   | 11.5.7E                   |       | 25.53   | \$ 4,890                | \$ 4,901                     | \$ 4,890                        | 100%                        | 15                                       | \$ 72,260                                | \$ 72,128   | \$ 72,128                                    |
| 15                     | Specific Plan Exception   | 11.5.7F                   |       | 74.92   | \$ 14,350               | \$ 14,932                    | \$ 14,350                       | 100%                        | 10                                       | \$ 149,320                               | \$ 143,502  | \$ 143,502                                   |
| 16                     | Specific Plan Amendment   | 11.5.7                    |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 40,560                    | \$ 21,227                       | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 40,560                                | \$ 21,227   | \$ 21,227                                    |
| 17                     | Specific Plan Interpretation  | 11.5.7                    |       | 30.50   | \$ 5,841                | \$ 2,994                     | \$ 2,921                        | 50%                         | 3  | \$ 9,731                                 | \$ 18,085   | \$ 9,492                                     |
| 18                     | CPIO Fees (place holder)  |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.01 K                | Fees - Exceptions<br><i>Placeholder - see existing fee ordinance</i>                        |                           |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.01 L                | Transfer Plan   |                           | [9]   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1                      | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - less than and including 49,999 sq ft              | Article 4.5               |       | 84.00   | \$ 16,090               | \$ 16,292                    | \$ 16,090                       | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 122,190                               | \$ 120,678  | \$ 120,678                                   |

| Fee No.        | Fee Description  | Article          | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Cost Recovery Analysis  |                              |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|----------------|--|------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                |  |                  |       |   | Total Cost per Activity | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| 2              | Approval of Transfer of Floor Area Plan - 60,000 sq ft and greater   | Article 4.5      |       | 99.75   | \$ 19,107               | \$ 16,292                    | \$ 19,107                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 M</b> | <b>Extension of Time or Suspension of Time Limits for Planning and Zoning Matters</b>  |                  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Time Extension for other than Maps   |                  |       | 1.76  | \$ 336                  | \$ 708                       | \$ 336                          | 100%                        | 25                                       | \$ 17,700                                | \$ 8,404  | \$ 8,404                                     |
| <b>19.01 N</b> | <b>Adult Entertainment Business Exception</b>  |                  | (9)   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Adult Entertainment Business Exception within 500 ft of another Adult Entertainment Establishment  | 12.22A.20        |       | 38.15   | \$ 7,308                | \$ 5,317                     | \$ 7,308                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 O</b> | <b>Density Increase</b>  |                  | (9)   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for one or more Incentives included in the Menu of Incentives  | 12.22A.25 (g)(2) |       | 38.02   | \$ 7,282                | \$ 7,115                     | \$ 7,282                        | 100%                        | 110                                      | \$ 780,871                               | \$ 799,186  | \$ 799,188                                   |
| 2              | Application for a Density Bonus including a request for an Incentive not included in the Menu of Incentives  | 12.22A.25 (g)(3) |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 23,287                    | \$ 21,227                       | 100%                        | 14                                       | \$ 326,018                               | \$ 297,177  | \$ 297,177                                   |
| 3              | Application for a Density Bonus in excess of that permitted by Section 12.22 A.26  | 12.24U.26        |       | 110.82  | \$ 21,227               | \$ 20,718                    | \$ 21,227                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 P</b> | <b>Modifications or Discontinuance of Use Pursuant to Nuisance Abatement Proceedings</b>   |                  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Imposition of Conditions (City Initiated)  | 12.27.1          |       | 304.64  | \$ 58,354               | \$ 26,680                    | \$ 58,354                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 2              | Reconsideration (Applicant Initiated)  | 12.27.1          |       | 251.54  | \$ 48,182               | \$ 29,866                    | \$ 48,182                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3              | Plan Approval for Revocation Case  | 12.27.1          |       | 251.54  | \$ 48,182               | \$ 5,000                     | \$ 48,182                       | 100%                        | 5  | \$ 25,000                                | \$ 240,911  | \$ 240,911                                   |
| <b>19.01 S</b> | <b>Site Plan Review</b>  |                  | (9)   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Site Plan Review Application for Residential Project of 50 or more dwelling units  | 16.05            |       | 47.08   | \$ 9,014                | \$ 7,806                     | \$ 9,014                        | 100%                        | 26                                       | \$ 201,005                               | \$ 232,098  | \$ 232,098                                   |
| 2              | For Non-Residential or Mixed Use Building Site Plan Review Application   | 16.05            |       | 47.08   | \$ 9,014                | \$ 7,925                     | \$ 9,014                        | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 63,400                                | \$ 72,108   | \$ 72,108                                    |
| <b>19.01 U</b> | <b>Hillside</b>  |                  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1              | Hillside Permit Filing Fee   | 12.24X2          |       | 29.55   | \$ 5,660                | \$ 6,094                     | \$ 5,660                        | 100%                        | 15                                       | \$ 88,363                                | \$ 82,076   | \$ 82,076                                    |
| <b>19.01 V</b> | <b>Multiple or Combination Applications</b>  |                  | (9)   |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|                | <i>If more than one application is filed at the same time for the same project and the fee for each separate application is set forth in sections 19.01, 19.03, 19.08 or 19.10, then the charges will be as follows: 100% for the highest application fee, 50% for the second application (second highest fee), and 25% for each additional application fee.</i> |                  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.01 W</b> | <b>Expedited Permit Fee</b>  |                  |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description  | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---|--|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|   |  |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
|   | <i>At the request of the applicant, the Department may, at its discretion, charge a fee to offset expenses for additional human and physical resources necessary to expedite the permit process for development projects upon application by an applicant. An initial amount of \$5,000, in addition to fees charged elsewhere in this code, by the Director of Planning, including any additional costs to the City that exceed the fees collected by the Planning Department for this service, shall be collected at the time of the request. The Department shall cause all money collected pursuant to this section to be deposited into the Planning Case Processing Fund described in Chapter 6, Section 5.121.9.2 of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code for purposes of disbursement as permitted therein.</i> |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   | Expedited Review Services (hourly)   |         |       | 1.00  | \$ 219                  | varies                       | \$ 219                          | 100%                        | n/a                                      | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.01 X</b>  | <b>Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application</b>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Eldercare Facility Unified Permit Application  | 14.3.1  |       | 38.85   | \$ 7,442                | \$ 6,369                     | \$ 7,442                        | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 9,554                                 | \$ 11,163   | \$ 11,163                                    |
| <b>19.02 FILING FEES - DIVISION OF LAND AND PRIVATE STREET MAPS AND APPEALS</b> |  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.02 A</b>  | <b>Subdivision Maps</b>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   | <b>1. Tentative Map</b>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots  |         |       | 51.05   | \$ 9,779                | \$ 11,219                    | \$ 9,779                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 2   | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots   |         |       | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,662                    | \$ 11,097                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Tentative Map - SF RE40 or More Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots  |         |       | 20.95   | \$ 4,013                | \$ 3,867                     | \$ 4,013                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 4   | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 5-10 Lots  |         |       | 45.89   | \$ 8,790                | \$ 10,165                    | \$ 8,790                        | 100%                        | 7  | \$ 71,155                                | \$ 61,532   | \$ 61,532                                    |
| 5   | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - 11-49 Lots   |         |       | 51.05   | \$ 9,779                | \$ 11,257                    | \$ 9,779                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 6   | Tentative Map - SF RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones - Each 50 Lots over 49 Lots  |         |       | 17.51   | \$ 3,354                | \$ 3,073                     | \$ 3,354                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 7   | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 5-49 Units  |         |       | 50.75   | \$ 9,721                | \$ 10,416                    | \$ 9,721                        | 100%                        | 113                                      | \$ 1,177,008                             | \$ 1,098,506  | \$ 1,098,506                                 |
| 8   | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 50-99 Units   |         |       | 68.09   | \$ 13,043               | \$ 13,856                    | \$ 13,043                       | 100%                        | 8  | \$ 110,848                               | \$ 104,343  | \$ 104,343                                   |
| 9   | Tentative Map - MF Residential - 100 Units or More   |         |       | 86.15   | \$ 16,502               | \$ 17,611                    | \$ 16,502                       | 100%                        | 11                                       | \$ 193,721                               | \$ 181,525  | \$ 181,525                                   |
| 10  | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area   |         |       | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,552                    | \$ 11,097                       | 100%                        | 3  | \$ 37,656                                | \$ 33,290   | \$ 33,290                                    |
| 11  | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 50,000-99,999 sq ft of Floor Area  |         |       | 66.53   | \$ 12,744               | \$ 14,309                    | \$ 12,744                       | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 14,309                                | \$ 12,744   | \$ 12,744                                    |
| 12  | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 100,000-249,999 sq ft of Floor Area  |         |       | 75.13   | \$ 14,391               | \$ 16,065                    | \$ 14,391                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 32,130                                | \$ 28,783   | \$ 28,783                                    |
| 13  | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/ Building - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More  |         |       | 83.73   | \$ 16,039               | \$ 17,822                    | \$ 16,039                       | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 17,822                                | \$ 16,039   | \$ 16,039                                    |
| 14  | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - Less than 1 Acre  |         |       | 52.77   | \$ 10,108               | \$ 11,498                    | \$ 10,108                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article       | Notes        | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---------|--|---------------|--------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|         |  |               |              |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| 15      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 1 to Less than 5 Acres  |               |              | 57.93   | \$ 11,097               | \$ 12,552                    | \$ 11,097                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 25,104                                | \$ 22,193   | \$ 22,193                                    |
| 16      | Tentative Map - Commercial/Industrial w/o Building - 5 Acres or More   |               |              | 63.09   | \$ 12,085               | \$ 13,608                    | \$ 12,085                       | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 13,608                                | \$ 12,085   | \$ 12,085                                    |
| 17      | Phasing of Map<br>Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone  | 17.07         | [10]         | 36.43   | \$ 6,978                | \$ 545                       | \$ 6,978                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 18      | Mixed Use Projects   |               | [11]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19      | BOE Fees - Tentative Maps  |               | [14]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 2. BOE Fees - Final Maps   |               | [14]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 3. BOE Fees - Improvement Plans  |               | [14]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 4. Appeals - reference 19.01 B   |               |              |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 5. Modifications - reference 19.02 F   |               |              |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 19.02 B | Parcel Maps  |               | [10]<br>[11] |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 1. Preliminary Parcel Map  |               |              |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE40 or More Restrictive Zones                            |               |              | 66.36   | \$ 13,095               | \$ 9,989                     | \$ 13,095                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 19,978                                | \$ 26,189   | \$ 26,189                                    |
| 2       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - SF, RE20 or Less Restrictive Zones                            |               |              | 58.90   | \$ 11,282               | \$ 8,935                     | \$ 11,282                       | 100%                        | 20                                       | \$ 178,700                               | \$ 225,649  | \$ 225,649                                   |
| 3       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Residential Dwellings, up to 4 Lots - Multi Family  |               |              | 75.80   | \$ 14,520               | \$ 10,416                    | \$ 14,520                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 20,832                                | \$ 29,039   | \$ 29,039                                    |
| 4       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |               |              | 57.18   | \$ 10,953               | \$ 12,552                    | \$ 10,953                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 5       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |               |              | 65.78   | \$ 12,600               | \$ 14,309                    | \$ 12,600                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 6       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |               |              | 76.10   | \$ 14,577               | \$ 16,065                    | \$ 14,577                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 7       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/Building), up to 4 Lots - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |               |              | 82.98   | \$ 15,895               | \$ 17,822                    | \$ 15,895                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 8       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - Less than 1 Acre in Area                       |               |              | 52.02   | \$ 9,965                | \$ 11,498                    | \$ 9,965                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 9       | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 1 to Less Than 5 Acres in Area                 |               |              | 57.18   | \$ 10,953               | \$ 12,552                    | \$ 10,953                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 10      | Preliminary Parcel Map - Commercial/Industrial (w/o Building), up to 4 Lots - 5 Acres or More in Area                        |               |              | 62.34   | \$ 11,941               | \$ 13,608                    | \$ 11,941                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 11      | Other Preliminary Parcel Map Actions - Preliminary Parcel Map Exemption (Lot Line Adjustment)                                | 17.50 B.3     |              | 18.14   | \$ 3,474                | \$ 3,507                     | \$ 3,474                        | 100%                        | 63                                       | \$ 220,941                               | \$ 218,852  | \$ 218,852                                   |
| 12      | Other Preliminary Parcel Map Actions - Preliminary Parcel Map Waiver   | 17.50 B.3 (d) |              | 18.14   | \$ 3,474                | \$ 3,729                     | \$ 3,474                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 13      | Mixed Use Projects   |               | [11]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 14      | BOE Fees - Parcel Maps   |               | [14]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|         | 2. Certificate or Conditional Certificate of Compliance-Determination  | 66499.35      |              | 17.82   | \$ 3,375                | \$ 3,693                     | \$ 3,375                        | 100%                        | 30                                       | \$ 110,490                               | \$ 101,255  | \$ 101,255                                   |
|         | 2. BOE Fees - Final Parcel Maps  |               | [14]         |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description   | Article      | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Cost Recovery Analysis  |                              |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---|---|--------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|   |   |              |       |   | Total Cost per Activity | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| <b>4. Appeals - reference 19.01 B</b>                                 |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>5. Modifications - reference 19.02 F</b>                           |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.02 C Private Street Map</b>                                     |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Filing - Deemed to be Approved Private Street   | 18.00C       |       | 18.78   | \$ 3,210                | \$ 3,787                     | \$ 3,210                        | 100%                        | 5  | \$ 16,835                                | \$ 16,052   | \$ 16,052                                    |
| 2   | Filing - Private Street Map   |              |       | 70.94   | \$ 13,589               | \$ 15,421                    | \$ 13,589                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Filing - Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Private Street Map   |              |       | 104.48  | \$ 20,013               | \$ 22,415                    | \$ 20,013                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 44,830                                | \$ 40,027   | \$ 40,027                                    |
| 4   | BOE Fees - Private Street Maps  |              | [14]  |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.02 D Mobile Home Park Impact Reports</b>                        |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Mobile Home Park Impact Report  | 17.04        |       | 62.23   | \$ 11,920               | \$ 13,992                    | \$ 11,920                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.02 E Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps</b> |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>1. Residential</b>   |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Condominium Conversion for Parcel Maps - Residential - 1-4 Units  |              |       | 70.94   | \$ 13,589               | \$ 8,055                     | \$ 13,589                       | 100%                        | 3  | \$ 24,165                                | \$ 40,768   | \$ 40,766                                    |
| 2   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 5-49 Units   |              |       | 84.53   | \$ 18,192               | \$ 16,109                    | \$ 16,192                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 50-99 Units  |              |       | 103.10  | \$ 19,750               | \$ 19,575                    | \$ 19,750                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 4   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision - Residential - 100 Units or More  |              |       | 118.52  | \$ 22,320               | \$ 22,161                    | \$ 22,320                       | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 22,161                                | \$ 22,320   | \$ 22,320                                    |
| <b>2. Commercial / Industrial</b>                                     |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 5   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - Less than 50,000 sq ft of Floor Area             |              |       | 61.48   | \$ 11,777               | \$ 13,430                    | \$ 11,777                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 6   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 50,000 to Less than 100,000 sq ft of Floor Area  |              |       | 65.78   | \$ 12,600               | \$ 14,309                    | \$ 12,600                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 7   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 100,000 to Less than 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area |              |       | 70.08   | \$ 13,424               | \$ 15,187                    | \$ 13,424                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 8   | Condominium Conversion for Subdivision and Parcel Maps - Commercial/Industrial - 250,000 sq ft of Floor Area or More              |              |       | 74.38   | \$ 14,248               | \$ 16,065                    | \$ 14,248                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>3. Mixed Use</b>   |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   |   |              | [11]  |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.02 F Map Related Fees</b>                                       |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Review or Revision of Tentative/Preliminary Map   |              |       | 13.28   | \$ 2,543                | \$ 889                       | \$ 2,543                        | 100%                        | 1  | \$ 889                                   | \$ 2,543  | \$ 2,543                                     |
| 2   | Modification to Approved Tentative/Preliminary Map or Recorded Final Map  | 17.14, 17.59 |       | 38.24   | \$ 7,324                | \$ 8,052                     | \$ 7,324                        | 100%                        | 16                                       | \$ 128,832                               | \$ 117,184  | \$ 117,184                                   |
| 3   | Reversion to Acreage  | 17.10        |       | 39.96   | \$ 7,853                | \$ 8,878                     | \$ 7,853                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 4   | Quilby Fee Calculation  |              |       | 2.12  | \$ 405                  | \$ 276                       | \$ 405                          | 100%                        | 16                                       | \$ 4,416                                 | \$ 6,482  | \$ 6,482                                     |
| 5   | Time Extension for Maps   |              |       | 5.58  | \$ 1,064                | \$ 793                       | \$ 1,064                        | 100%                        | 36                                       | \$ 28,548                                | \$ 38,307   | \$ 38,307                                    |
| 6   | Letter of Clarification or Correction (initiated by Applicant)  |              |       | 15.02   | \$ 2,878                | \$ 1,331                     | \$ 2,878                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.03 FEES FOR GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY</b>                        |   |              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

| Fee No.  | Fee Description  | Article                      | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Cost Recovery Analysis  |                              |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |                              |       |   | Total Cost per Activity | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| <i>The following fees shall be charged when a zone change is requested by an applicant that necessitates the initiation of a General Plan Amendment to achieve consistency between the requested zone change and the General Plan:</i> |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                                    | 11.5.6                       | [9]   | 130.54  | \$ 25,004               | \$ 23,884                    | \$ 25,004                       | 100%                        | 14                                       | \$ 334,376                               | \$ 350,080  | \$ 350,060                                   |
| 2  | Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use             | 11.5.6                       |       | 147.74  | \$ 28,289               | \$ 32,116                    | \$ 28,299                       | 100%                        | 2  | \$ 64,232                                | \$ 58,596   | \$ 58,598                                    |
| 3  | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for less than 400 dwelling units, 500,000 sq ft for C/I, or 250,000 for mixed use                        | 11.5.6                       |       | 438.20  | \$ 83,936               | \$ 46,357                    | \$ 83,936                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 4  | Annexation, Zone Change and Associated costs for a General Plan Amendment for 400 dwelling units or greater, 500,000 sq ft or greater for C/I, or 250,000 or greater for mixed use | 11.5.6                       |       | 448.20  | \$ 85,471               | \$ 62,566                    | \$ 85,471                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 5  | Street Re-Classification   |                              |       | 67.26   | \$ 12,884               | \$ -                         | \$ 12,884                       | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.04 FEES FOR SIGN OFF REQUESTS</b>  |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Public Benefit Project (sign off for by-right project)   |                              |       | 7.50  | \$ 1,437                | \$ 338                       | \$ 1,437                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 2  | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA   | 12.24 and all other projects |       | 11.25   | \$ 2,155                | \$ 1,722                     | \$ 2,155                        | 100%                        | 170                                      | \$ 292,740                               | \$ 366,344  | \$ 366,344                                   |
| 3  | Miscellaneous Clearance - ZA SF dwellings with no exceptions   | 12.24 and all other projects |       | 11.25   | \$ 2,155                | \$ 861                       | \$ 2,155                        | 100%                        | 24                                       | \$ 20,664                                | \$ 51,719   | \$ 51,719                                    |
| 4  | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (First Sign)   |                              |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 1,052                     | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 5  | Request for Approval to Erect Temporary Subdivision Directional Signs (Each Additional Sign)   |                              |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 383                       | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 6  | Miscellaneous Clearance - Director   | [9]                          |       | 11.75   | \$ 2,251                | \$ 746                       | \$ 2,251                        | 100%                        | 184                                      | \$ 137,080                               | \$ 414,137  | \$ 414,137                                   |
| 7  | Miscellaneous Clearance - Commission   | [9]                          |       | 6.50  | \$ 1,245                | \$ 647                       | \$ 1,245                        | 100%                        | 48                                       | \$ 31,056                                | \$ 59,764   | \$ 59,764                                    |
| 8  | Landscape Plan Approval as part of a Discretionary Approval  | [9]                          |       | 4.00  | \$ 766                  | \$ 647                       | \$ 766                          | 100%                        | 48                                       | \$ 31,056                                | \$ 36,778   | \$ 36,778                                    |
| 9  | Landscape per tract  | [9]                          |       | 4.50  | \$ 862                  | \$ 199                       | \$ 862                          | 100%                        | 154                                      | \$ 30,646                                | \$ 132,746  | \$ 132,746                                   |
| 10   | Building Permit Sign-off for minor Projects  | [9]                          |       | 1.25  | \$ 238                  | \$ 199                       | \$ 238                          | 100%                        | 154                                      | \$ 30,646                                | \$ 38,726   | \$ 38,726                                    |
| <b>19.05 FILING FEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCES</b>  |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.05 A Fees</b>  |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>1. Environmental Clearances Except EIRs</b>   |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Categorical Exemption  |                              |       | 1.95  | \$ 373                  | \$ 81                        | \$ 373                          | 100%                        | 1,033                                    | \$ 83,673                                | \$ 384,865  | \$ 384,865                                   |
| 2  | EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND or any other State exemptions   |                              |       | 30.15   | \$ 5,774                | \$ 2,280                     | \$ 5,774                        | 100%                        | 701                                      | \$ 1,598,280                             | \$ 4,047,822  | \$ 4,047,822                                 |
| 3  | MND - Expanded / Initial Study   | [15]                         |       | 58.13   | \$ 11,134               | \$ 1,953                     | \$ 11,134                       | 100%                        | 6  | \$ 11,718                                | \$ 66,804   | \$ 66,804                                    |
| 4  | Reconsideration-Addendum or Supplemental to Prior Environmental Determination  |                              |       | 9.97  | \$ 1,909                | \$ 703                       | \$ 1,909                        | 100%                        | 62                                       | \$ 43,586                                | \$ 118,347  | \$ 118,347                                   |
| 5  | Publication Fee for ND or MND (pass through of publishing costs)   |                              |       | n/a   | \$ 676                  | \$ 946                       | \$ 676                          | 100%                        | 756                                      | \$ 715,176                               | \$ 511,317  | \$ 511,317                                   |
| <b>2. Environmental Impact Reports</b>   |  |                              |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|  |  | [13]                         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

| Fee No.  | Fee Description   | Article                   | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis           |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|--|---|---------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|  |   |                           |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount     | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| 6  | Environmental Impact Reports (Initial Deposit)                          |                           |       | 0.00  | varies                  | Average Initial Deposit \$15,125 | Initial Deposit - \$11,000      | n/a                         | 19                                       | \$ 287,375                               | n/a   | n/a  |
| 7  | Environmental Impact Report Review Services (hourly)                    |                           |       | 1.00  | \$ 192                  | varies                           | \$ 192                          | 100%                        | n/a                                      |  |   |  |
| <b>19.06 FILING FEES FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMITS</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Coastal Development Permit - SF and MF residential dwelling             | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 7,057                         | \$ 13,753                       | 100%                        | 23                                       | \$ 162,311                               | \$ 316,330  | \$ 316,330                                   |
| 2  | Coastal Development Permit - SF residential dwelling with no exceptions | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 3,528                         | \$ 13,753                       | 100%                        | 71                                       | \$ 249,806                               | \$ 973,059  | \$ 973,059                                   |
| 3  | Coastal Development Permit - Non-residential                            | 12.20.2                   |       | 71.80   | \$ 13,753               | \$ 7,798                         | \$ 13,753                       | 100%                        | 13                                       | \$ 97,475                                | \$ 171,918  | \$ 171,918                                   |
| 4  | Coastal Development Permit - Exemption Determination                    | 12.20.2.1                 |       | 7.50  | \$ 1,437                | \$ 684                           | \$ 1,437                        | 100%                        | 273                                      | \$ 186,732                               | \$ 392,204  | \$ 392,204                                   |
| 5  | Coastal Development Permit - Approval in Concept                        | 12.20.2                   |       | 3.00  | \$ 575                  | \$ 703                           | \$ 575                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 6  | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment                                  | 12.20.2.1Q and 12.20.2O   |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 6,456                         | \$ 5,517                        | 100%                        | 7  | \$ 41,984                                | \$ 35,858   | \$ 35,858                                    |
| 7  | Coastal Development Permit - Amendment with no exceptions               | 12.20.2.1Q and 12.20.2O   |       | 28.80   | \$ 5,517                | \$ 3,228                         | \$ 5,517                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ 807                                   | \$ 1,378  | \$ 1,378                                     |
| 8  | Coastal Development Permit - Mello Compliance Review - City Review      | 12.20.2                   | [9]   | 34.18   | \$ 6,547                | \$ 628                           | \$ 6,547                        | 100%                        | 13                                       | \$ 10,971                                | \$ 86,751   | \$ 86,751                                    |
| 9  | Mello Compliance Review - 3rd Party Consultant                          |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | Fee + Actual Cost                | Fee + Actual Cost               | n/a                         | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.07 FEES FOR FLOOD HAZARD REPORTS AND COMPLIANCE CHECKS</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <i>Section Deleted</i>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.08 SURCHARGE FOR ONE-STOP PERMIT CENTER</b>  |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <i>There shall be added to each fee imposed for any permit, license or application provided for in this article a surcharge in an amount equal to the greater of two percent of the fee or \$1.00.</i> |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.09 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND COUNSELING SERVICES</b>   |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Pre-Application Review and Research                                     | 12.24 and all other appl. |       | 2.00  | \$ 383                  | \$ 293                           | \$ 383                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 2  | Zoning Pre-Check (per project, per request)                             |                           |       | 6.00  | \$ 1,149                | \$ 432                           | \$ 1,149                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 3  | Pre-development Meeting   |                           |       | 9.00  | \$ 1,724                | \$ 432                           | \$ 1,724                        | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
|  | Per meeting   |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                           | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
|  | Additional assistance as required, per hour                             |                           |       | 4.50  | \$ 862                  | \$ 432                           | \$ 862                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| 4  | Project Navigation Services (deposit required, per hour)                |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                           | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
|  | Project not requiring EIR   |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                           | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
|  | Project including EIR   |                           |       | 1.50  | \$ 287                  | \$ 432                           | \$ 287                          | 100%                        | 0  | \$ -                                     | \$ -  | \$ -   |
| <b>19.10 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FEES</b>  |   |                           |       |   |                         |                                  |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1  | Initial Development Agreement Application (Deposit)                     | 12.32                     |       | 0.00  | varies                  | \$29,690 Initial Deposit         | \$29,690 Initial Deposit        | n/a                         | 3  | \$ 89,070                                | \$ -  | \$ 89,070                                    |

| Fee No.   | Fee Description                 | Article                     | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis             |                                    |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|   |                                 |                             |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount       | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit    | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| <b>19.11. ANNUAL INSPECTION OF COMPLIANCE WITH FLOOR AREA RATIO AVERAGING AND RESIDENTIAL DENSITY TRANSFER COVENANTS.</b> |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Annual Inspection of Compliance | 12.24 B.25. and 12.24 C.58. | [14]  |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.12. [DEVIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 16.03 E.]</b><br><i>Section Deleted</i>   |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.13 SURCHARGE FOR AUTOMATED SYSTEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING</b>  |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 1   | Operating Surcharge             |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 7% of the fee or \$1.00 | Greater of 7% of the fee or \$1.00 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| 2   | Development Surcharge           |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 6% of the fee or \$1.00 | Greater of 6% of the fee or \$1.00 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.14 FEES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF HOUSING COVENANTS</b><br>NONE LISTED   |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.15 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRAFFIC STUDY REVIEW, CONDITION CLEARANCE AND PERMIT ISSUANCE FEES.</b>             |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   |                                 |                             | [14]  |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
| <b>19.16 GENERAL PLAN MAINTENANCE SURCHARGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING</b>                                       |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   |                                 |                             |       |   |                         | Greater of 5% of the fee or \$1.00 | Greater of 5% of the fee or \$1.00 |                             |  |  |   |  |
|   |                                 |                             |       |   |                         |                                    |                                    |                             |  | \$ 16,773,498                            | \$ 25,233,969                                       | \$ 22,274,494                                |

**Notes**

- [1] A filing fee of \$149.00 shall accompany each application for a credit pursuant to Section 12.33 B. A fee equal to 85% of the filing fee shall accompany each appeal of a determination of credit made pursuant to Section 12.33 B.
- [2] (a) A fee equal to 85% of the underlying application of the set fee will be charged, which ever is lower. An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.2. of this Code, shall be accompanied by a filing fee as specified in Table 4-A of Section 98.0403 2 of the Code, to be collected by the Department. (b) An appeal filed pursuant to Section 12.26 K.6. of this Code shall be charged a fee in accordance with Subdivision 1., above.
- [3] City can not charge a fee
- [4] See Section 19.01 A (Sign Districts)
- [5] See Section 19.01 G (Comprehensive Sign Program)
- [6] Fee is for City administration and Consultant fees will be added to City fee
- [7] HPOZ fees are not to be charged for technical corrections to a previously certified Historic Resource Survey.
- [8] Minor cases are defined as three signs or less or a change of use. Standard cases are defined as more than three signs, wireless cases, or projects with additions of less than 200 square feet. Major cases are all other projects not falling into the categories of Minor or Standard projects.

| Fee No. | Fee Description  | Article | Notes | Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours) | Total Cost per Activity | Cost Recovery Analysis       |                                 |                             | Annual Revenue Analysis                  |  |   |  |
|---------|--|---------|-------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|         |  |         |       |   |                         | Current Cost Recovery Amount | Recommended Fee Level / Deposit | Recomm. Fee Cost Recovery % | Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed) | Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee | Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee |
| [8]     | <p><i>Multiple or Combination Applications. If more than one application is filed at the same time for the same project and the fee for each separate application is set forth in sections 19.01, 19.03, 19.06 or 19.10, then the charges will be as follows: 100% for the highest application fee, 50% for the second application (second highest fee), and 25% for each additional application fee.</i></p>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [10]    | <p><i>Subdivision Maps: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. For tentative maps within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, as described in Section 57.4908 of this Code, a surcharge of one-half the sum of the fees paid pursuant to paragraphs (a) through (c) shall be paid.</i></p> <p><i>Parcel Maps: For preliminary parcel maps within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, as described in Section 57.4908 of this Code, a surcharge of one-third the sum of the fees paid pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) shall be paid.</i></p>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [11]    | <p><i>Subdivision Maps - Mixed Use. Where the project involves a combination of Single-Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee, including modifications to the base fee, shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the surcharge required by paragraph (a) of this subdivision.</i></p> <p><i>Parcel Maps - Mixed Use. Where the project involves a combination of Single-Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee, including modifications to the base fee, shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the surcharge required by paragraph (d) of this subdivision.</i></p> <p><i>Condominium Conversions - Mixed Use: Where the project involves a combination of Residential, Commercial, and/or Industrial uses, the highest fee shall be charged at 100 percent (100%), the second highest at fifty percent (50%), and the third and subsequent fee at twenty-five percent (25%). This fee discounting shall not apply to the fee required by paragraph (b) of subdivision 1. of subsection E. of this Section 19.02 of this Code, above.</i></p> |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [12]    | <p><i>The Planning Department shall calculate the actual costs and resultant fee, in accordance with Chapter 35, Section 5.403(b)(3) of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code and shall maintain appropriate accounting records of the actual costs. The Director of Planning shall resolve any disputes related to the fee. The Director shall exclude from consideration any cost incurred or attributed to the processing of appeals.</i></p>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [13]    | <p><i>Fee collected by the BOE, DBS, or DOT</i></p>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [14]    | <p><i>Fee is applied in addition to Environmental Clearances Except EIRs - EAF/Initial Study leading to ND or MND</i></p>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [15]    | <p><i>NBS did not evaluate; fees were adopted per ordinance specific to CGU</i></p>  |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [16]    | <p><i>The Planning Department shall calculate actual costs and the resultant fee in accordance with Chapter 6, Section 5.121.9.2 of Division 5 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, and shall maintain appropriate accounting records of the actual costs. The Director of Planning shall resolve any dispute related to the fee. The Director shall exclude from consideration any cost incurred or attributed to the processing of appeals.</i></p>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [17]    | <p><i>NBS did not evaluate - fee set per City Policy</i></p>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [18]    | <p><i>Fees reflect pass through of average contractor costs.</i></p>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |
| [19]    | <p><i>Fees reflect pass through of average contractor costs.</i></p>   |         |       |   |                         |                              |                                 |                             |  |  |   |  |

**EXHIBIT E**

## West Hollywood, California Municipal Code

### Title 19 Zoning Ordinance

### Article 19-5 Zoning Ordinance Administration

### Chapter 19.76 Appeals

## 19.76.030 Filing and Processing of Appeals.

#### A. *Timing and Form of Appeal.*

1. Appeals, other than Planning Commission or Council review, shall be submitted in writing and filed with the Planning and Development Services Department or City Clerk, as applicable, on a city application form, within 10 days after the date the decision is rendered by the Planning and Development Services Director or Planning Commission, or within 10 days after a 72-hour period after the Director has taken a decision under advisement, in compliance with Section 19.62.020 (Effective date of permits).

2. Reviews by the Planning Commission or Council shall be considered at a hearing scheduled following its affirmative vote to review the decision in compliance with Section 19.76.020(B).

B. *Filing.* Appeals shall be filed with the City Clerk, and shall be accompanied by the filing fee set by the city's Fee Resolution.

C. *Effect of Filing.* The filing of an appeal in compliance with this chapter shall have the effect of suspending the effective date of the decision being appealed, and no further actions or proceedings shall occur in reliance on the decision being appealed except as allowed by the outcome of the appeal.

D. *Filing Fees Waived.* The filing fee shall be waived for appeals accompanied by original petitions, signed by a minimum of 50 residents or property or business owners within West Hollywood.

#### E. *Required Statement and Evidence.*

1. Applications for appeals shall include a general statement specifying the basis for the appeal and the specific aspect of the decision being appealed.

2. Appeals shall be based upon an error in fact, dispute of findings or inadequacy of conditions to mitigate potential project impacts, imposition of conditions not necessary to mitigate potential project impacts, or availability of alternatives that could reasonably mitigate potential project impacts or specific conditions.

3. Appeals shall be accompanied by supporting evidence substantiating the basis for the appeal.

4. Staff shall return the appeal if it:

a. Fails to specify a basis for the appeal; or

b. Fails to comply with subsection (E)(2).

F. *Notice to Applicant.* If the appellant is not the applicant, a copy of the appeal shall be sent to the applicant, via certified mail, return receipt requested, to the address listed on the application within seven days of its filing.

G. *Report and Scheduling of Hearing.* When an appeal has been filed, the Planning and Development Services Director shall prepare a report on the matter, and schedule the matter for consideration by the appropriate appeal body identified in Section 19.76.020(A), with notice provided in compliance with subsection (H). All appeals shall be considered in public hearings. The City may consolidate hearings on all timely filed appeal applications for the same project.

H. *Notice Requirements.*

1. Public notice for the hearing on appeal shall be provided in the same manner as required for the decision being appealed; except that, if posted notice was required for the hearing from which the appeal is taken, the minimum number of days required for posting notice of the appeal hearing shall be 10 days before the date of the hearing and notice shall be mailed to all persons who provide written or oral testimony at the public hearing and provide the city with their mailing address.

2. The content of the notice shall comply with Chapter 19.74 (Public Hearings and Notice).

I. *Withdrawal of Appeal.* Once filed, an appeal may only be withdrawn by a written request submitted to the Planning and Development Services Director, with the signatures of all persons who filed the appeal.

(Ord. 19-1058 §§ 247 – 249, 2019; Ord. 04-683 § 5, 2004; Ord. 02-643 § 64, 2003; Ord. 01-594 § 2, 2001)

## Contact:

City Clerk: 323-848-6400

Published by [Quality Code Publishing, Seattle, WA](#). By using this site, you agree to the [terms of use](#).