



December 26, 2025

To: PPCC Board Members

From: Sue Kohl / President, and Chris Spitz / LUC Chair, At-large rep & EC member

Re: EC letter stating conditional support for a temporary ACE Building Materials yard and point-of-sale center in the Palisades commercial village

### What is this matter all about?

ACE Building Materials (not related to ACE Hardware) — a family-owned business based in Van Nuys — is seeking a “temporary long-term permit,” under LA Municipal Code Sec. 16.01, to establish a **building supplies “support yard” and point-of-sale center** at the former Shell Station site at the Sunset & Via de la Paz corner

At a PPCC working meeting on December 16, 2025, representatives of ACE, of CD 11 and of the Planning Dept. presented extensive information about ACE’s plans, and also explained the “temporary long-term permit” process (relatively new Code provisions that were unknown to most of us). Attending were all PPCC LUC members (including LUC Chair Spitz and Chair Emeritus M. Zar), advisor R. Blumenberg, *ex officio* member S. Kohl, VP Q. Fleming; J. Padden (PRIDE) and K. Bloom (Area 5 rep, location of the proposed site).

As explained at the meeting, the ACE facility will supply *heavy building materials* (basic construction building blocks, *e.g.*, lumber, concrete, rebar, etc.) during the Palisades’ reconstruction – potentially key to reducing the number of truck trips for pickups and delivery and expediting recovery. See slides shown by the ACE reps: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Palisades-Rebuild-Support-Yard.pdf>. See more info. about ACE & the materials it supplies: <https://acebuildingmaterials.com/departments/concrete-cement-masonry/>.

We also learned that LAMC Sec. 16.01 (provision for “long-term temporary permits”) was first used during the COVID emergency; its purpose is to “aid in the immediate restoration of an area adversely impacted by a severe fire, storm, earthquake, similar natural disaster, or a civil or military disturbance, and declared by the Governor as an emergency area.” The proposed use in Pacific Palisades is the first time this Code section has been utilized in an emergency since the COVID years.

Permits under Sec. 16.01 are only valid for one year and ACE must reapply annually. We were told that the Shell station property owner has agreed to the temporary use of the site for this purpose. Those interested may see the ACE application documents on ZIMAS (click on “Initial Submittal Documents” on the right hand side of page): <https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenummer/ZA-2025-6805-TLT>.

The ACE operations will only take place during *day-time hours* (this is stated in the ACE application and was reiterated at the LUC meeting). The ACE reps emphasized their experience with operating these types of yards and handling heavy building materials; they also provided assurances that *no toxic materials* would be present and that care would be taken to maintain a *safe, clean, and orderly environment*. During the meeting we also discussed concerns related to *ingress & egress* and possible *traffic congestion*. The ACE reps were agreeable to the reasonable conditions that LUC members and other attendees suggested were needed for this project to proceed safely, transparently and with sensitivity to neighborhood impacts.

The LUC members then reached unanimous consensus, per the LUC’s regular procedures, on a recommended motion to the Board for *conditional approval* of the requested ACE permit. See the LUC’s initial proposed motion to be presented to the Board for approval (detailing the specific suggested conditions): <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/LUC-Recommendation-re-ACETemporary-Permit.pdf>.

## Why has the EC now taken a position on behalf of PPCC?

In preparing for the January 8<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and researching the ACE permit application on ZIMAS, LUC Chair Spitz learned for the first time on December 21<sup>st</sup> that ACE's application was set for a Planning Dept. hearing on **January 5, 2026** (*i.e.*, before PPCC's next meeting on January 8, 2026). PPCC had not received a prior hearing notice, and we did not know whether neighboring property owners had been sent such notices. President Kohl and Chair Spitz then promptly wrote to the Planning Dept., requesting postponement of the hearing; staffer Kenton Trinh replied on December 22<sup>nd</sup> and advised us that hearing notices had already been sent out as required and the January 5<sup>th</sup> hearing would *not* be postponed (he also emailed to us a copy of the hearing notice: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/ZA-2025-6805-TLT.pdf>).

Because PPCC's bylaws allow the EC to act on behalf of the Board when there is no time for the Board to act, the EC considered the matter and determined to take a position now, reflecting the same position recommended by the LUC (conditional support), so that PPCC's position – stating our conditional approval and **specifying our key proposed conditions** – will be before the Zoning Administrator for consideration *at the time of the hearing*.<sup>1</sup>

The EC and LUC recognize and agree that there is an urgent need for convenient, neighborhood-scale access to building materials as Pacific Palisades enters an active phase of post-Fire rebuilding, and that locating a building supplies yard within the community would meaningfully reduce delivery distances, truck miles traveled, congestion on regional corridors and construction delays for homeowners and contractors. We believe this assessment is shared generally by the wider Palisades community.

*By President Sue Kohl & LUC Chair Chris Spitz*  
[info@pacpalicc.org](mailto:info@pacpalicc.org)  
12/26/25

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that five of the seven EC members (a supermajority) attended the LUC meeting and were already in agreement (as were other Board member attendees). The two EC members who could not attend the LUC meeting, upon learning the facts, also agreed with the LUC-recommended position (conditional support for the ACE permit). It was and is reasonable to assume that other Board members and the community at large would support this position.

Moreover, while the file may be kept open for a week or two after January 5<sup>th</sup> (to allow further comments to be submitted before the ruling becomes final), in the EC's judgment under the circumstances it wasn't necessary to delay communicating this presumably widely-supported position, and that bringing forward the PPCC position now – in time for the Planning hearing and the Z.A.'s initial consideration – would be an important step in moving the process forward toward a positive outcome. The ACE reps may attend PPCC's January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting to answer further questions that Board or community members may have about the proposal. Any additional issues or concerns that may arise at that time could then be communicated to the Zoning Administrator.