

Communication from Public

Name: Bob Blue

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 07:31 AM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached titled: "2026-03-04_Barry Building Demolition Opposition" which address a recent submittal by the applicant's representative. This is in support of the Appeal for Agenda Item 8 for the March 4, 2026 meeting of the City Council. It is being submitted prior to the start of the meeting.

To: Members of the Los Angeles City Council

Date: March 4, 2026

Subject: Council File No. 25-1518, Proposed Demolition of the Barry Building (HCM #887)

Submission Time: Submitted prior to the start of the March 4, 2026, regular City Council meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL: Applicant's Evidence of Self-Imposed Hardship and Failure of Stewardship

This submittal is provided to the record to address critical admissions made by the Applicant regarding the management and security of the Barry Building (HCM #887). The evidence demonstrates that the "economic and safety" justifications used by the Applicant to seek demolition are the direct result of a decade of intentional mismanagement and a **contrived safety crisis**.

1. Absence of Active Security and Surveillance

The Applicant's recent communications confirm a shift from proactive preservation to a passive model that relies on the "inadvertent discovery" of site breaches.

- **Security Systems Removed:** While the Applicant previously displayed signage indicating exterior camera monitoring, these systems are no longer in place.
- **Lack of Security Patrols:** No active security patrols are employed to protect the site. Relying on chance discovery of break-ins is a gross abdication of the legal requirements tied to a designated Historic-Cultural Monument.

2. Physical Evidence of Systemic Neglect

The building's current state is not the result of "unavoidable" deterioration, but rather a failure to maintain the building's envelope:

- **Transom Windows:** As documented by Bob Blue, transom windows were left open for a period exceeding two years. (See

attached photo)

- **Intentional Exposure:** By allowing the interior to remain open to inclement weather, the Applicant facilitated the growth of mold and structural decay. This neglect created the very "financial infeasibility" the Applicant now uses to justify demolition.

3. The Self-Imposed Hardship Doctrine

The City cannot legally grant a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) based on conditions the Applicant themselves created.

- **Eviction of Revenue:** The Applicant voluntarily evicted rent-paying tenants in 2016-2017, choosing to forgo nearly a decade of revenue that could have funded maintenance.
- **Property Management Observations:** We have observed and spoke with property manager Robert Harden in the past. He has provided access to gardeners to all properties owned by 11973 San Vicente, LLC and 11991 San Vicente, LLC. He also mentioned talking to Hal (William H. Borthwick). This confirms central control of all parcels owned by the two LLCs.

The Applicant's letter serves not as a defense, but as a confirmation of the Appellants' allegations. The current "safety crisis" at the Barry Building is a contrived and curated outcome of the owner's 10-year strategy. We urge the City Council to deny the demolition permit and uphold the protections of the City's Historic-Cultural Monument ordinance.

Submitted by,

Bob Blue

