

Communication from Public

Name: Ziggy Kruse Blue

Date Submitted: 03/12/2026 07:47 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: This upload is a PDF of an email from me to the City Clerk, Et al. titled "2026-03-12_Email to City Clerk regarding Clarification on Conflicting Records and Procedural Integrity (CF 25-1518).pdf"

RE: Barry Building Demolition Project ... IMPORTANT and TIME SENSITIVE ... I am seeking clarification on Conflicting Records and Procedural Integrity (CF 25-1518) ... Please see email for details ...

From Ziggy Kruse <ziggykruse2005@yahoo.com>

Date Thu 3/12/2026 4:53 PM

To cityclerk@lacity.org <cityclerk@lacity.org>; Candy Rosales <candy.rosales@lacity.org>; kenneth.fong@lacity.org <kenneth.fong@lacity.org>; ken.bernstein@lacity.org <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>; kathryn.phelan@lacity.org <kathryn.phelan@lacity.org>; Milena Zasadzien <milena.zasadzien@lacity.org>; Jason McCrea <jason.mccrea@lacity.org>; marqueece.harris-dawson@lacity.org <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>

Cc Bob Blue <bob.blue@live.com>; Ziggy Kruse <ziggykruse2005@yahoo.com>

Dear Ms. Wolcott, et al:

I am writing to request immediate clarification regarding significant discrepancies in the administrative record for Council File 25-1518 (11973-11975 West San Vicente Blvd / Barry Building).

The LACityClerk Connect "File Activities" log currently lists the status for 03/10/2026 as "Council action **final**". However, the official "Council Action" document linked to that entry states that on March 6, 2026, the Council's official action was to:

"ADOPTED TO REFER ITEM TO PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE"

This creates a serious procedural contradiction. If the Council voted to refer the matter back to the PLUM Committee on March 6, the file should not be marked as "final" on March 10.

Furthermore, I am requesting information regarding any time extensions that may have been agreed to, either openly or behind the scenes, by the applicant for this project. Please clarify if the applicant has granted the City an extension of time to act on this appeal, and if so, what the new expiration date is for Council action.

As this matter involves a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) appeal, I am requesting formal clarification on the following:

- 1. Current Status:** Is the matter currently referred back to the PLUM Committee, or has a final Council determination been made?

2. **Record Correction:** If the "Council action final" status is an administrative error, when will the record be corrected to reflect the referral?
3. **Time Extensions:** Has the applicant provided a written time extension for this file? If so, please provide the date and a copy of that agreement.
4. **File Continuity:** Will this referral back to the PLUM Committee initiate a new Council File, or will the current file (25-1518) remain intact and serve as the complete administrative record?
5. **Basis for Referral:** If the matter was indeed referred back to PLUM after the committee's initial denial on February 24, what was the legal and procedural basis for this second referral?

Because the CEQA statutory clock is continuously running, any delay in clarifying the official status of this case directly impacts the ability of the public and interested parties to determine the window for filing potential legal actions. To ensure that no party is procedurally disadvantaged, we request a formal response to these inquiries by the close of business tomorrow, Friday, March 13, 2026.

Sincerely,
Ziggy Kruse Blue