

Communication from Public

Name: Mike Bravo

Date Submitted: 04/15/2026 10:22 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: When the First Baptist Church of Venice — a multi-generational Black heritage site, a sacred community space — was threatened by developers, Venice organized and fought back. That fight taught us something about how heritage gets treated in Council District 11: if our communities are not watching, they will take it from us. So when a designated Los Angeles landmark in Brentwood is being demolished — not because it's beyond saving, but because a billionaire family let it sit vacant for a decade and then asked the City to put it down — Venice is paying attention. Not because we have a stake in mid-century modern architecture. Because we recognize the playbook. The Barry Building demolition sets a precedent that does not stay in Brentwood. If the City establishes that a property owner can acquire a designated landmark, evict the anchor tenant, abandon maintenance for ten years, and then obtain a demolition permit with no replacement project — simply by pointing to the deterioration they manufactured — then every heritage site in Council District 11 is on the clock. The First Baptist Church of Venice. Community spaces in Oakwood. Any culturally or racially significant site that sits on land someone with deeper pockets wants cleared. This is not a preservation debate. It is a blueprint for demolition by neglect, and it disproportionately threatens Black, Brown, and Indigenous heritage across the district. What makes this worse is how the City has treated the people whose ancestral connection to this land predates every building on it. Brentwood sits on Gabrielino ancestral land. The consulting tribal entity under AB 52 formally raised concerns about tribal cultural resources at this site and requested documentation — specifically, proof that native soils had actually been removed and replaced, as the City's environmental review claimed. That was August 2022. The City's response since then has been silence. Over three and a half years of it. Internal communications about the tribal consultation were shielded behind attorney-client privilege, blocking the public from seeing how and why the City stopped engaging. Meanwhile, the City's own Final Environmental Impact Report claimed excavation would only disturb artificial fill. But the City's own earlier documentation confirms that fill only extends to two feet. The project requires excavation to five feet. That three-foot gap is undisturbed native soil — the exact zone flagged as

high-sensitivity for tribal cultural resources, including potential human remains. The "No Impact" finding is not a conclusion. It is a fabrication. Under AB 52, the burden of meaningful consultation falls on the lead agency. The tribal entity raised concerns. The tribal entity demanded documentation. The City had a legal obligation to respond. It did not. And when the appeal reached PLUM, councilmembers were caught on citizen video having a side conversation on the dais while an Indigenous advocate testified about sacred site protections. They voted to reject the appeal minutes later, deferring to the councilmember whose district this falls in. PLUM denied the appeal a second time on April 14, 2026 — this time with the procedural cosmetics corrected. Same outcome. Same deference. The day before that hearing, the applicant consented to another time-limit extension, which the PLUM Chair approved. This is not a coincidence. The applicant has every incentive to keep consenting to extensions because they want a legally clean approval — and the appellant has argued the City's jurisdiction to act on this appeal expired on March 6 under LAMC. Each new extension is the City and the billionaire property owner cooperating to keep a process alive that should already be over. This is how Indigenous consultation and community heritage get treated in Council District 11 — as boxes to check, and then discard when the answer is inconvenient. That should concern every community in this city that depends on CEQA and AB 52 to protect what matters to them. The full City Council has one last opportunity to break from this pattern. We are asking the Council to reverse the demolition approval, rescind the EIR certification, and deny the demolition permit. Not as a favor to preservationists. As a legal and moral obligation — to the tribal entity whose voice was buried, to the communities across CD11 whose heritage is one negligent property owner away from the same fate, and to every Angeleno who still believes our landmark protections mean something. Venice is watching. We will keep watching. Mike Bravo 5th-Generation Venice Resident Founder, Defend Venice defendvenice.org

Communication from Public

Name: Janice Figman

Date Submitted: 04/15/2026 06:53 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to oppose the proposed demolition of the Barry Building, Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) #887, and ask that you grant Angelenos for Historic Preservation's appeal. If the appeal is denied, this demolition would set a dangerous and harmful precedent for the City's historic preservation program and threaten the future of more than 1,300 designated HCM's. The project before your consideration will demolish a designated HCM solely to clear the property for a vacant dirt lot, with no replacement project proposed. Such action incentivizes property owners of other HCMs to pursue similar outcomes, as well as encouraging and rewarding intentional demolition by neglect of a designated historic place. Should the City of Los Angeles approve the proposed demolition of this HCM without a replacement project, it will severely erode protections upheld by the City's long-held historic preservation program, and result in a clear circumvention and piecemeal approach of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For these reasons, I ask you to: Reverse the demolition approval (LOD). Rescind the certification of the EIR, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program. Deny the demolition permit application.