

RECEIVED

DEC 12 2016

APPEAL OF DECISIONS-JACOB PATTERSON  
CITY CLERK  
CITY OF CLAREMONT  
08:37 AM  
\$105.00



APPEAL OF DECISIONS

CITY OF CLAREMONT  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
207 HARVARD AVENUE, P. O. BOX 880  
CLAREMONT, CA 91711-0880  
(909) 399-5470

APPELLANT INFORMATION

Name of Appellant: JACOB PATTERSON  
Address: PO BOX 1624, CLAREMONT, CA 91711  
Phone Number: (310) 948-1305 Date: DECEMBER 12, 2016

APPEAL INFORMATION

Application Number: 16-A11 Appeal of:  Staff Decision  
 Planning Commission  
 Architectural Commission  
Decision Date: NOVEMBER 30, 2016

Please describe the specific decision being appealed and state the reasons for this appeal. Appeals shall set forth alleged inconsistency or non-conformity with procedures or criteria set forth in City codes. If additional sheets are necessary, please attach them to this form.

APPEAL OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF RENWICK HOUSE RELOCATION SITE PLAN.  
SEE ATTACHED.

Appellant's Signature

FEES

- Project Proponent
  - Fixed Fee Projects 1/2 of the application fee
  - Hourly Fee Projects Continuation of hourly fee (appeal deposit required)
- Other Interested Persons \$105.00

Received By: Jamie Costanza Date: December 12, 2016  
Fixed Fee: \$105.- Hourly Deposit: \_\_\_\_\_

The City's procedural shortcomings for the Renwick House Site Plan review are similar to the procedural defects for the design review for the new art museum (see appeal for PCMoA design review):

- The improper participation of the same City Attorney who is also actively engaged in adversarial proceedings concerning the underlying subject matter (the PCMP).
- The improper segmentation of the environmental review of a single project into component parts.
- Unequal access to relevant information because the makeup of the commission changed between the 11/9/16 and 11/30/16 meetings and both approvals are properly considered part of the same project.

In addition to these ongoing procedural objections, the conditional approval at the 11/30/16 meeting purported to create a commission subcommittee who would then make the final adjustments to the site plan. This is entirely improper and violates several applicable fair and open meeting laws because it removes the decision-making process from a duly-noticed public meeting where the interested public has the opportunity to evaluate the details of what is being considered and comment on them during the meeting before the decision has been made. If a subcommittee was necessary to work out the details in order to grant an approval of the application, then the subcommittee should meet and then present the amended proposal to the entire commission for final approval in a later public meeting. That way, the entire commission and all members of the public would have equal access to information. Removing the full deliberative process from the public forum and delegating the decision-making authority of the commission to a subset of the commission is improper, particularly for quasi-adjudicative matters.

For the forgoing reasons, I object to the conditional approval of the site plan for the Renwick House relocation.