

ORIGINAL EMAIL THREAD: THE BUILDING OFFICIAL RECORD

APRIL 23 - MAY 27, 2026

This packet reproduces the original email chain with City of West Hollywood Building and Safety Division Manager Benjamin Galan. The City officials, dates, questions, and official responses are preserved. Personal identifiers, the exact property address, private contact information, and unrelated medical details are removed.

The original email begins on the following page. Black bars indicate true redactions; the underlying text has been removed.

 282K

 [REDACTED]emental Photographic and Documentary Evidence _ [REDACTED]
compressed.pdf

Be

Thu, Apr 23, 2026 at 3:40 PM

To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Good Afternoon,

The city will review your inquiry and provide you with information on which Division/agency may be able to best assist you.

Thank you.

Benjamin Galan, P.E.

Building and Safety Division Manager

City of West Hollywood

8300 Santa Monica Blvd.

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Office: (323) 848-6512 

Fax: (323) 848-6569 

bgalan@weho.org 

PLEASE NOTE: Projects submitted to the West Hollywood Building & Safety Division on or after January 1, 2026, will be required to comply with the statewide 2025 California Building Codes and 2026 Los Angeles County Amendments, as adopted by West Hollywood.

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Sent:

To:

Cc: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]; Gloria Aviles <GAviles@weho.org>; Jackie Rocco <JR@weho.org>

Subject: Formal [REDACTED] Special- Level Records Based Code Review and Written Determinations: [REDACTED]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION - EXTERNAL SENDER. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

[Quoted text hidden]

E-mail correspondence with the City of West Hollywood (including any attachment) is a public record under the California Public Records Act, which may be subject to public disclosure under the Act.

Sun, May 10, 2026 at 8:46 AM

Dear Mr. Galan,

I am following up on your April 23, 2026 response stating that the City would review my inquiry; more than ten business days have elapsed, and I have not received the requested records, a written determination, or a formal written denial identifying the basis for any withholding.

If additional time is required, please identify the basis for the extension and the date by which I can expect the City's response.

[Quoted text hidden]

Be [REDACTED] |
To: [REDACTED]
Cc [REDACTED] n Galan <bgalan@weho.org>

Mon, May 11, 2026 at 2:53 PM

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

Apologies for the delayed response. I had to take some unexpected time off last week. I went through your items and provided my response in **BOLD** after each item. I have also notified the Code Enforcement Officer assigned to this case of the information I am providing you below. These items are property maintenance items that can be remedied through our Code Enforcement team. In my responses, I also make note of work that would require permits. The Code Officer can verify if one is required through a site visit.

You have also requested copies of permits and other documents in the City's records. Most records can be obtained by submitting a public records request through the City Clerk's Office here: [West Hollywood CA | Public Records Center](#)

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Benjamin Galan, P.E.

Building and Safety Division Manager

City of West Hollywood

8300 Santa Monica Blvd.

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Office: (323) 848-6512 

Fax: (323) 848-6569 

bgalan@weho.org 

PLEASE NOTE: Projects submitted to the [West Hollywood Building & Safety Division](#) on or after January 1, 2026, will be required to comply with the statewide 2025 California Building Codes and 2026 Los Angeles County Amendments, as adopted by West Hollywood.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Ben Galan] A roofing permit was issued, but never finalized by the building inspector. Code Enforcement will be notified regarding this open permit and will follow up with the property owner. The inspector would also not be inspecting the interior of the unit under this re-roof permit and would be unaware of any damage. Mold should be reported to LAC Health Department. The damaged ceiling would require a separate permit.

II. The September 4, 2022 Water Heater Failure & Legal Uninhabitability This event must be reviewed as an owner-documented building-system failure, not routine maintenance. On that date, Mr. McGlynn wrote that there was “a problem with the hot water heater,” that the water heater was “new,” that he had contacted “the plumber that installed it,” that experts told him to “turn it off,” and that he would “have to turn it off before the end of today to avoid more damage.”

By his own admission, Mr. McGlynn’s new water-heater installation created a condition that required shutting down the gas and hot water or allowing the system to continue causing damage. The relevant question is not whether the appliance later produced hot water; it is whether the defective installation and the moisture damage it caused were professionally corrected, inspected, approved, and safe to return to service.

- 5. California Civil Code § 1941.1(a)(3):** Provides that a dwelling is deemed legally untenable if it substantially lacks functioning plumbing or gas facilities.
- 6. EPA Moisture & Mold Guidelines:** EPA guidance states that wet materials should be dried within 24–48 hours to prevent mold growth, and that cleanup is not complete unless the water problem is fixed. The crumbling, taped, and deteriorated wall/utility-room conditions shown in the photographs are material evidence of failure to properly remediate.
- 7. Installation Permitting & Final Approval:** Please identify the specific 2022 plumbing, mechanical, gas, and venting permits for the installation of this new water heater. If no such permits and final inspections exist, the installation is an illegal, unpermitted alteration, and the appliance has been operating unlawfully since 2022.

8. Remediation & Repair Permitting: Please identify the inspection records proving that the system failure and resulting water damage admitted to by the owner were lawfully corrected. If no such records exist, the unit has legally remained in an unpermitted, uninhabitable state since September 2022—a fact physically evidenced today by the metallic foil tape illegally holding the exhaust vent together.

[Ben Galan] The replacement of a water heater would require a plumbing permit. I did not find one on file. Code Enforcement will follow up to identify any violations.

III. Severe Weatherproofing & Security Failures at the Main Entry The front entrance to this unit features a Dutch door. Because it lacks proper weatherstripping, seals, and structural integrity, there is a gaping hole that exposes the interior of my home directly to the outside elements. Furthermore, the upper and lower halves do not properly secure together with a deadbolt.

9. California Civil Code § 1941.1(a)(1): Mandates effective waterproofing and weather protection of roof and exterior walls, including unbroken windows and doors.

10. California Civil Code § 1941.3(a)(1): Landlords are legally mandated to install and maintain operable deadbolt locks on main entry swinging doors. A Dutch door that cannot be fully secured as a single, deadbolted unit is a direct violation of this basic security mandate.

[Ben Galan] This repair would not require a building permit and falls under the property maintenance category. Code Enforcement can follow up on this to determine whether any violations exist.

IV. Exterior Sanitation Failures and Aerosolized Biohazards I have provided video and photographic evidence documenting dogs roaming and defecating on my exclusive-use patio and egress pathway. Mr. McGlynn routinely abandoned this biohazard on the premises for days. Due to this accumulation, it was impossible for the weekly gardener to perform routine groundskeeping without aerosolizing the dried waste. Furthermore, video evidence documents Mr. McGlynn himself operating a gas-powered blower directly adjacent to my unit. Because my front door and windows lack effective weatherproofing, this aerosolized fecal matter and debris were blown directly into my living space.

11. WHMC § 9.48.010 (Adopting LACC Title 10 - Animals): Requires pet owners to remove and dispose of pet waste. The property owner cannot legally outsource immediate sanitary removal to a weekly gardener.

12. Los Angeles County Code (LACC) §§ 11.16.050 & 11.16.090: Defines the "accumulation of animal excrement" on the premises as a direct health code violation.

13. WHMC § 9.08.050 (Leaf Blowers): Prohibits allowing the operation of portable combustion/gasoline-powered machines used to blow leaves, dirt, and debris.

[Ben Galan] This falls under the property maintenance category. Code Enforcement can follow up with this to identify if any violations exist.

V. The Utility Room & Unpermitted Appliances The laundry room contains the electrical breaker panel alongside multiple gas appliances cramped into a confined space. Mr. McGlynn executed the DIY installation of two HVAC systems, a washer/dryer, a water heater, three refrigerators, two stoves, and a dishwasher. Furthermore, he abandoned a refrigerator directly in front of the kitchen window, blocking natural ventilation.

14. Unpermitted Appliances & Alterations (West Hollywood Building Code § 106.1): Please identify the specific permits and final approvals on record for the installation of the aforementioned HVAC systems and appliances. Absent these records or a documented statutory exemption, these are illegal installations that must be formally cited.

15. Electrical Fire & Electrocution Hazard (CEC Article 110.26 & 110.27): The electrical breaker panel lacks a legally required, non-combustible safety cover to contain arc flashes. Instead, as shown in the photographs, the high-voltage panel is dangerously covered with combustible paper held together by blue painter's tape. Furthermore, CEC Article 110.26 requires strict, clear working space around all electrical equipment. The obstructed panel and the use of combustible paper and tape directly adjacent to a gas appliance constitute a severe, immediate fire hazard.

16. California Mechanical Code (CMC) § 504.4 & 504.4.2 (Clothes Dryer Exhaust): State law strictly mandates that clothes dryer exhaust ducts must **terminate permanently on the building's exterior (venting directly to the outdoors) and be constructed of smooth, rigid metal. Venting into an attached utility room does not satisfy this legal mandate, regardless of whether an exterior barn door is left open. A lawful mechanical exhaust requires a permanent exterior termination fitting. Furthermore, the photographs show that the cheap, unpermitted corrugated ducting is physically broken and discharging highly flammable lint directly into the enclosed space, just inches from the combustion air intake and burner of the gas water heater. This creates a catastrophic and immediate fire hazard.**

17. Carbon Monoxide & Venting Hazard (CMC § 802.10.6 & § 802.10.4): The photographs document a heavily modified, crushed water heater exhaust vent connector with severe, restrictive bends (elbows), held together by unpermitted metallic foil tape. The California Mechanical Code requires gas vent connectors to be routed as short and straight as possible, maintain a continuous upward slope without dips or sags, and be mechanically fastened with sheet metal screws. This taped, structurally crushed configuration restricts the draft, creating a severe and immediate risk of deadly carbon monoxide spillage into the enclosed space.

18. HSC § 17920.3(a)(8) & LACC § 11.20.160: Legally defines a building as substandard if there is a "lack of minimum amounts of natural light and ventilation."

[Ben Galan] No permits found for any recent work. Code Enforcement will be notified to investigate any code violations.

VI. Egress, Fire Safety, Failure to Maintain Security, & Combustible Hoarding I have discussed the egress gate at length with the City Prosecutor, who confirmed via real-time GPS that the gate is my only egress route.

19. LACC § 11.20.140 / HSC § 17920.3(m) (Fire Safety & Egress): As codified in the LA County Habitability Program Inspection Guide, it is a "Premises Critical" violation if exit doors or gates "do not swing in the direction of exit travel, are not self-closing, or openable from the inside without the use of a key or any special knowledge or effort." The gate to my unit violates all three absolute mandates.

20. CFC § 1032.2 (Reliability & Obstructions): Mandates that required exits shall be continuously maintained free from obstructions. In a text message dated July 30, 2025, Mr. McGlynn explicitly admitted in writing to intentionally barricading this single inward-swinging egress gate with multiple trash bins at 2:30 AM.

21. Failure to Maintain [REDACTED] **1032.2.1:** Mr. McGlynn confirmed his knowledge that the lock is challenging [REDACTED] yet refused to repair it, conceding his solution was to "just leave it unlocked," [REDACTED] te unvetted commercial foot traffic on the property.

22. California Fire Code (CFC) § 304.1 & 304.1.1: The adjacent storage area and pergola (marked "1/2") are filled with accumulated debris, junk, and tarps. Combustible waste material shall not be allowed to accumulate upon premises or kept within 10 feet of a structure.

[Ben Galan] Debris encroaching into an egress path of travel or any other elements hindering it are a property maintenance issue, and Code Enforcement will investigate for potential code violations.

VII. Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) & Unpermitted Commercial Use

23. WHMC § 19.36.140 (Home Occupations): Please provide the legal Home Occupation Business Permit that allows Mr. McGlynn to operate a commercial mental health practice with foot traffic on [REDACTED] property. If approved, please identify whether the approval considered the legal status of [REDACTED] as a dwelling unit, and whether commercial foot traffic aggravated the documented security [REDACTED]

24. WHMC § 17.28.010 (Registration of Rental Units): Mr. McGlynn registered my tenancy with the City for the very first time in January 2026. Please provide a formal determination regarding the penalties for his failure to register this unit for the preceding years of my tenancy.

[Ben Galan] This unpermitted use will need to be addressed by Code Enforcement.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Tue, May 26, 2026 at 10:25 AM

Dear Mr. Galan,

[REDACTED] I also realized that the prior photo
ogle document. I apologize for that. I have
extracted and reattached the specific pages concerning the roof and ceiling collapse for your review.

I am writing to clarify your statement that “the inspector would also not be inspecting the interior of the unit under this re-roof permit and would be unaware of any damage.”

The only reason I requested City involvement was because the roof and ceiling collapsed into my bedroom. The inspector came because of that roof and ceiling failure, entered the unit, observed the interior damage, assessed the scope of repair, and determined that the roof needed to be replaced. The City cannot now treat the matter as though the inspector would have been unaware of interior damage when the City’s involvement began with interior damage caused by roof failure.

The attached photographs do not show a routine roof covering condition. They show collapsed ceiling and roof materials directly over the bed, exposed framing and wood members, delaminated ceiling and roof substrate, dark staining, moisture damaged materials, insulation hanging into the living space, and heavy debris that fell directly where I sleep.

Previously sent photographs also show that the exterior roof work remains visibly unfinished more than one year later, including unpainted and unsealed exposed wood open to the elements.

As the City’s top building safety official, did the documented roof and ceiling collapse, including interior collapse known to the inspector, exposed framing, moisture damaged materials, ceiling failure, and visibly unfinished exterior weatherproofing, fall within the lawful scope of a re-roof permit alone?

This determination is necessary because the documented conditions support a substandard building condition under California Health and Safety Code § 17920.3, including defective or deteriorated ceiling supports, defective or deteriorated roof supports, dampness, and weatherproofing failure. A routine Code Enforcement referral does not answer the permit scope question.

Please provide the City’s written determination and identify the permit and inspection requirements that applied to this work.

[Quoted text hidden]

 **Roof Pictures from Supplemental Paperwork.pdf**
6541K

Be [REDACTED] |
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Tue, May 26, 2026 at 10:33 AM

Good Morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for the clarification. Can you tell me the name of the Building Inspector who inspected the ceiling failure?

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] Tue, May 26, 2026 at 10:33 PM

Eric Barrera.

[Quoted text hidden]

Be [REDACTED] |
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Cc

Wed, May 27, 2026 at 2:26 PM

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Officer Barela is with our Code Enforcement team and not with the Building and , and he indicated that Code Enforcement has been in communication with the landlord on a few of the issues you brought up. The reroof permit would not trigger an interior inspection by our building inspectors.

I am including Officer Barela on this message so he can follow up on any additional questions you have.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] Wed, May 27, 2026 at 8:09 PM

Cc: Eric Barela <EBarela@weho.org>

So, I want to confirm that as the top building and safety official in the City, you believe that that catastrophic structural failure warranted only a re-roof permit? That is my only question. I am contacting you, bc I am already aware that officer Barela has failed to account on several positions you have already disagreed on. So, my only question is do YOU believe that something as severe as what happened with the roof warranted only a reroof permit, that is, the roof could be repaired with external shingles only?