

Google Groups

Letter to City Clerks Office re: appeal - complaint

Robin Rudisill <willdrudi@icloud.com>

Jun 10, 2020 6:22 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Re. Council File 20-0680
1309-1333 Pacific, San Pedro

City Clerk's office,

We would like to make a formal complaint regarding the Planning Department, as they are prejudicing the above-mentioned appeal (Council File 20-0680) to the City Council/PLUM. See email correspondence attached.

The Planner completely omitted the exhibits to our appeal in their transmittal to the Council File, and now they say (below) that they are going to transmit the exhibits as an independent submission. It is essential that our appeal application and justification be provided to the decision makers together with the exhibits and CPC determination, as the justification cannot stand alone without the exhibits.

To present this appeal as two completely separate documents makes the Appeal impotent. I have explained this a number of times, below, and the Planning department well knows this.

All that the Planner handling this needs to do to correct their error is to scan the entire appeal submission as one document and re-submit it to the Council File. Then delete the earlier incomplete, erroneous transmittal so that there is no confusion as to which one is the one to read.

However, apparently Planning refuses to do this. Instead they intend to forward you the exhibits separately from the rest of the appeal, as an independent submission.

One can only wonder why the Appeal is being intentionally defused.

There has already been egregious mishandling of this case by the Planning Department and it must be stopped.

Can you please direct them to correct their error and submit a corrected appeal document, with all of the documents included in the proper order? And then we ask that they please notify us when they have made the correction, with an active link to the council file.

If Planning continues to refuse to correct this serious error that prejudices our appeal and makes it ineffective to the decision makers, can you please instruct us on the details of how to file a formal complaint to both the City Council and the Ethics Commission?

***For the Love of Los Angeles
and our precious Coast,
Robin Rudisill
(310) 721-2343***

Begin forwarded message:

From: Robin Rudisill <willdrudi@icloud.com>
Subject: Re: appeal to City Council of 1309-1333 Pacific, San Pedro CPC decision
Date: June 9, 2020 at 2:12:58 PM PDT
To: Cecilia Lamas <cecilia.lamas@lacity.org>
Cc: Connie Chauv <connie.chauv@lacity.org>

Hi Cecilia,

But that is exactly how I asked that this correction not be done as this will also prejudice our case.

I said over and over that it is critical that the entire appeal be resent, with the exhibits, because the appeal must be immediately followed by the exhibits in order to understand all of the appeal justification points, which ALL reference the exhibits.

Again, to have the appeal justification in one place, represented as the official appeal, and then the exhibits in another place, does not satisfy the issue.

Can you please please please be sure that the entire appeal document be retransmitted all together as a CORRECTED version of the appeal?

Thank you for correcting the appellants' representative.

*For the Love of Los Angeles
and our precious Coast,*
Robin Rudisill
(310) 721-2343

On Jun 9, 2020, at 2:08 PM, Cecilia Lamas <cecilia.lamas@lacity.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Ms. Rudisill,

Please note a supplemental transmittal was submitted to include missing exhibits (59 Pages) and we corrected the representative to reflect Mr. Noel Gould. I am sure the City Clerk will update the Council File as soon as they review the transmittal. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns, I am here to assist.

Thank you,



Cecilia Lamas
Commission Executive Assistant
Los Angeles City Planning
200 N. Spring St., Room 272
Los Angeles, CA. 90012
Planning4LA.org
T: (213) 978-1299 | (213) 978-1300



On Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 10:48 AM Robin Rudisill <wildrudi@icloud.com> wrote:

Hi Cecilia,

Thank you for your follow up!

I did notice the pages with redactions, which was fine. That is not the issue.

I think that the problem is that Planning did not send the City Clerk the complete appeal.

You can see from the pdf I sent you last night that we successfully submitted five files to Planning's appeal portal. The fourth file is the exhibits (see page one in the pdf below).

But the exhibits file was not included in the appeal document that planning sent to the City Clerk. The 72 page document that Planning sent to the City Clerk does not include the exhibits. The exhibits add another 59 pages. The document that Planning should have sent to the City Clerk would be 131 pages.

Here is the 59 page file with the Exhibits that Planning did not send to the City Clerk with the appeal:

When this error is corrected, I request that Planning resubmits the entire appeal as one, including the exhibits just following the justification. That is because the exhibits are absolutely necessary to have just following the justification as it is necessary to reference them at the same time as reading the justification.

Without the exhibits just following the justification the appeal justification is incomplete and not understandable and would not correctly inform the reader/decision makers.

If Planning does not correct this error by resubmitting the appeal to the City Clerk with the exhibits included just after the appeal justification our appeal will be prejudiced as it will not be understandable/complete. Just sending the exhibits separately would not correct this.

Can you also have Planning correct the Appellants' representative to Noel Gould at the same time and resubmit the entire transmittal correctly to the City Clerk?

Would it make sense to put me in touch with the Planner handling this so that I can explain this to them directly?

Thank you for your help in correcting these significant errors as these are extremely important corrections that must be made asap.

*For the Love of Los Angeles
and our precious Coast,*
Robin Rudisill
(310) 721-2343

On Jun 8, 2020, at 10:20 AM, Cecilia Lamas
<cecilia.lamas@lacity.org> wrote:

Good morning Ms. Rudisill,

I reached out to the City Clerk's office and this is their response/direction:

They did not remove any pages, but rather only redacted sensitive personal information, as this is their policy. Any updates regarding the appellant's representative should be submitted by email to clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org.

Please contact the City Clerk and they will assist you. Thank you.

Cecilia Lamas
Commission Executive Assistant
Los Angeles City Planning



200 N. Spring St., Room 272
 Los Angeles, CA. 90012
 Planning4LA.org
 T: (213) 978-1299 | (213) 978-1300



On Sun, Jun 7, 2020 at 11:35 PM Robin Rudisill
 <wildrudi@icloud.com> wrote:

Thank you so much Cecilia,

Just in case it's useful, here is documentation of our filing. I've marked the file that contains the exhibits, which is 59 pages. That is in addition to the other 72 pages.

*For the Love of Los Angeles
 and our precious Coast,*
 Robin Rudisill
 (310) 721-2343

On Jun 7, 2020, at 10:26 PM, Cecilia Lamas
 <cecilia.lamas@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello Ms. Rudisill,

I will look into this. I was provided a 72 page attachment of your appeal from the planner. I verified the transmittal and that is what we transmitted. I will definitely connect with the City Clerk and verify the issue. I will also ensure all documents are posted accurately.

I will send you a follow up email once this issue has been resolved. Thank you in advance.



Cecilia Lamas
 Commission Executive Assistant
Los Angeles City Planning
 200 N. Spring St., Room 272
 Los Angeles, CA. 90012
 Planning4LA.org
 T: (213) 978-1299 | (213) 978-1300



On Sun, Jun 7, 2020 at 8:55 PM Robin Rudisill
 <wildrudi@icloud.com> wrote:
 Hi Cecelia and Connie,

We've reviewed the Council file for the appeal and found that there is a significant omission—the appeal exhibits are not included. The exhibits are integral to the points we make in our appeal justification document.

Can you please have someone correct this right away? Please let me know how I can help.

Also, and just as important, we noticed that on the Planning Department Transmittal the Appellants' representative is indicated as Alfredo Ramirez. That is not correct. He is not the Appellants' representative and no where does it say that. The Appellants' representative is Noel Gould and his mailing address, email address and phone number are on the front page of the signed appeal form:

<Screen Shot 2020-06-07 at 7.43.39 PM.png>

Can you please make that modification so that all communications get to the correct representative?

Please confirm you got this email and that the two corrections will be made.

Thank you both very much!

*For the Love of Los Angeles
and our precious Coast,*
Robin Rudisill
(310) 721-2343