



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Sign Ordinance

1 message

Michael Fishbein <fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 8:12 AM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

You've heard "No New Taxes!" Well, how about "No New Signs"?

Seriously, the proposed ordinance is so flawed that it should not be approved.

Michael Fishbein
1638 Granville Ave., Apt. 6
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1829



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

NO SIGNS IN PARKS - CF# 11-0724 Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks and CF#08-2020

1 message

Bike Fan <bikefanyay@yahoo.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 7:58 AM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

I am flawed to hear that big business is proposing to 'buy' our parks for advertizing. This is not acceptable in any way, nor is it acceptable for our city council to allow this to happen. Sneaking in silent changes to the law like this is inherently wrong. Our parks are not yours to sell.

I want to make my opposition to these changes heard now, I am unable to attend the upcoming City Hall meeting. This is disgraceful.

CF# 11-0724 Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks and CF#08-2020



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

#08-2020 Signs in Parks

1 message

Jack Fenn <jackfenn@pacbell.net>
To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jack Fenn <jackfenn@pacbell.net>
Date: August 5, 2011 1:54:44 PM PDT
To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org
Subject: ad signs in parks

Please let Councilmen Reyes, Huizar, and Krekorian know that ALL unnecessary signs in parks contribute to blight. Parks are sanctuaries, and advertising in them is a noxious invasion.

Respectfully,
Jack Fenn
Montecito Heights



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Opposition to new sign ordinance

1 message

Gailee33 <gailee33@aol.com>

Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 5:07 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org

To: Michael Espinosa, Legislative Assistant of Planning and Land Use Management Committee

Please distribute this letter to the members of the committee which will be meeting on Tuesday, August 9, 2:30 at City Hall

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers:

I am opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance. The Venice Neighborhood Council has unanimously voted on three different occasions since 2009 opposing CBS Outdoors and its proliferation of signage in its "Street Furniture" program and also opposing the Department of Rec and Parks plan to put up "For Profit" signage in all city parks, recreation centers and the Ocean Front Walk here in Venice. Official letters were sent after all three votes to the Mayor's office, City Attorney, City Council members, Dept. of Rec and Parks and Coastal Commission.

New sign ordinance, old sign ordinance – it's the same old stuff. The lobbyists for the sign companies seem to come out in full force for these hearings. I remember being at a meeting of the Public Works Committee back in June 2010 when CBS Outdoors wanted to place about 100 new "Street Furniture" with its "For Profit Signage" along the coastline from the Palisades to San Pedro and Councilmembers Richard Alarcon and Jose Huizar were literally scratching their heads in wonderment at such bravado. Apparently, the company did not want these structures to be considered as "development," thereby circumventing having to go to the Coastal Commission for approval. The City Attorney was given 60 days to prepare a report as to whether this constituted development or not. That was two years ago and we have not heard anything. The point is that these companies are relentless.

It is time to listen to the Neighborhood Councils and their stakeholders. Here in Venice – home owners, renters, people without homes -- we all stand united against this visual blight.

We take our Neighborhood Councils very seriously and the City needs to listen to us.

Respectfully submitted,
Gail Rogers
33 Park Avenue
Venice, CA 90291
email: gailee33@aol.com



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Proposed new sign ordinance

1 message

Martin Cox <photos@martincox.com>

Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 1:10 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: jose.gardea@lacity.org, Ed Reyes <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>

Dear Mr Espinosa:

Please consider that Los Angeles City parks are not and should never be open to advertising or super graphics or digital signage.

Enough is enough, all our lives are already dominated by TV, and internet advertising, our mail boxes are stuffed daily with the visual pollution of ads.

Parks should be inviolate, a break, a respite, for recreation not sales and promotions. Children need a place to be free of the giddy monster corporations spreading their endless dreck on an exhausted and over stimulated populace.

Have you seen the film Blade Runner? This is where we are headed. A ruined Los Angeles filled with bad air and ads everywhere.

PLEASE PLEASE consider our parks to be a place for trees, grass, recreation, and respite, for games, picnics, for people who do not need to be sold anyway.

cc: my Councilman Ed Reyes.
Jose Gardea

Best regards,

Martin Cox
1030 Laguna Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90026



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

CF#11-0724

1 message

Tomi Bowling <tomi@tomirealty.com>

Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 1:07 PM

To: Paul Krekorian <paul.krekorian@lacity.org>, ed.reyes@lacity.org, jose.huizar@lacity.org,
michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: carmen.trutanich@lacity.org

Dear Honorable Council,

It is my understanding that on August 9th the Planning & Land Use Management Committee of the City Council will hear a proposed new sign ordinance containing a provision for "comprehensive sign programs" that could permit off-site signage (including digital signs) in city parks.

The proposed ordinance specifies that an area qualifying for a "comprehensive sign program" must be a minimum of 5 acres. This includes all but the smallest city parks. It also states that only 10% of the signage in a "comprehensive sign program" can be off-site. Should an entire park be designated for a "comprehensive sign program," the area of all of its existing facility and informational signage could be totaled -- and 10% of that area sold for billboards and signs. The ordinance states also that this off-site signage cannot be visible from the public right-of-way or adjacent property, but that leaves abundant places for signs in parks.

The Planning Commission previously approved a version of this new ordinance that did not contain language allowing off-site or digital signs in "comprehensive sign programs," nor did it mention city parks and recreation facilities. The version to be discussed on August 9 does both -- and it has never been presented for public input and debate AND IT MUST!!!

Parks are not advertising venues. Nor are our kids marketing targets.

This is infuriating. Why would you even consider this? This is simply absurd.

You, as an elected official, are supposed to represent the interests of the citizens of LA. Destroying the few parks that are here by allowing blight in them is the opposite of why you were elected.

Sincerely,

Tomi Lyn Bowling

Tomi Lyn Bowling
8545 Tujunga Valley Street
Sunland CA 91040
818-353-9143

20 years sales experience
Certified Short Sale
& Foreclosure Resource Specialist
www.TomiRealty.com
818-353-9143
Lic.#01145550

Aug. 7, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

The Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight is a registered non-profit organization representing individuals, homeowner's associations, and civic groups throughout the city of Los Angeles. We supported the citywide sign ordinance approved by the City Planning Commission in March, 2009, because it was a reasonable compromise between the desires of developers and business interests and the concerns of community groups and individuals about digital, supergraphic, and other forms of off-site signage. Of particular significance, that ordinance allowed sign districts, but limited them geographically and required billboard takedown in the surrounding communities, an important and quantifiable benefit. The ordinance also prohibited digital signage outside sign districts, an important protection for people concerned about issues of energy use, light trespass onto residential properties, traffic safety, and the potential change in community character. And comprehensive sign programs were included for large scale developments like shopping centers, while allowing only on-site signage.

Unfortunately, the latest version of the ordinance as made public by the city planning department on July 22 seriously undermines those protections and community benefits by making the following changes.

- -Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing. This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and supergraphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.
- Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations that, at a minimum, should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval.
- Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for both private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

We urge you to reject this version of the ordinance and restore the important protections and benefits for communities and neighborhoods across the city.

Sincerely,

Dennis Hathaway, President
Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Billboards in City Parks

1 message

gerryjim <gerryjim@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 10:21 AM

To: councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, michael.espinosa@lacity.org

City Parks are no place for unsightly billboards. People go to parks to get a break from city life --- a refreshing breather. I especially don't want to see them in Griffith Park. Although I live in Pasadena, where we have great parks, I do visit Griffith Park and am a member of GLAZA.

Gerald Orcholski
Pasadena, California



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

ads in parks

1 message

Jayson Matthews <lettherebejayson@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 6, 2011 at 7:03 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Mr. Espinosa,

It has come to my attention that there is currently an attempt to use supergraphic billboards to promote movies in three Los Angeles city parks. I cannot believe that this is even being considered. Parks are not meant to be used for ad space, they are meant to be respite from urban life and are often the only connection with nature children and adults can consistently have in a major city. Please do not allow this to happen. We already have enough advertising blanketing the airwaves, streets, and sky. We don't need it in the tree too.

Sincerely,

Jayson Matthews
Los Angeles, CA



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

NO Advertising in Our Parks!

1 message

Debbie Spinelli <debbiespinelli@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 6, 2011 at 3:46 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Council Member,

I am writing to express my opposition to the legalization of commercial advertising in our public parks.

The Parks are NOT venues for marketing, in fact they provide a refuge from the omni-present advertising that blights our city.

Please do not allow the natural beauty of our parks to be destroyed.

Vote NO on CF# 11-0724 Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks

Sincerely,
debbie spinelli

West of Westwood
Homeowners Association

August 6, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I am writing on behalf of the West of Westwood HOA representing approximately 1200 households in Rancho Park.

We are opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. This ordinance neither stops the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising nor begins a serious reduction in the number of billboards that blight our neighborhoods. In specific, the following provisions badly undermine the purpose of the ordinance, which is to make our city a more attractive and livable place by reducing visual blight and the other negative effects of outdoor advertising.

-Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing. This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and supergraphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

-Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential for driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval.

Sincerely,

Terri Tippit, President



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

signs

1 message

jack <scene2too@hotmail.com>
Reply-To: jack <scene2too@hotmail.com>
To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Sat, Aug 6, 2011 at 3:25 AM

We don't need, or want, signs in our parks. There is enough advertising to satisfy even the most jaded.

jbaird@lbnc.org



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

CF #11-0724 (Opposed)

1 message

Ruth Doxsee <ruthdoxsee@sbcglobal.net>

Sat, Aug 6, 2011 at 12:10 AM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org, cd1@lacity.org, Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org,
Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org

Cc: attyneighbors@lacity.org, cd6news@lacity.org

To the Honorable Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar, and Krekorian,

As a resident of Los Angeles and Board member on the Lake Balboa Neighborhood Council, I am informing you of my opposition to CF #11-0724. Do not let our parks become littered with advertising: targeting children and littering the views with promotional trash.

Sincerely,
Ruth Doxsee



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Re: No signs in public parks!!

1 message

susan ROCHA <car2532002@yahoo.com>

Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Reply-To: susan ROCHA <car2532002@yahoo.com>

To: Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Can you also put in public records that it is unfair to give special treatment to churches and their noise.

Susan Rocha

From: Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

To: car2532002 <car2532002@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, August 5, 2011 4:55 PM

Subject: Re: No signs in public parks!!

Thank you for your email. Your comments have been attached to the Council file.

Michael Espinosa
Council and Public Services Division
Office of the City Clerk
(213) 978-1074

On Thu, Aug 4, 2011 at 8:22 PM, car2532002 <car2532002@yahoo.com> wrote:

Our parks should be free of ulgy advertising. NO SIGNS IN THE PARKS!

Susan Rocha
Cypress Park



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

1 message

Robert W. Pann <bobpann@earthlink.net>

Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 9:02 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: info@banbillboardblight.org

PLEASE contact your city councilperson and the members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee to tell them you want an ordinance that STOPS the spread of commercial advertising in the city's visual environment, and starts reducing the numbers of billboards that blight many communities throughout the city.

It is EXTREMELY important that people hear from the community, because there has been intense lobbying by sign companies and others who have a vested interest in more and more sales pitches filling our visual landscape. See sample letter below (and consider sending comments in your own words, with added provisions you think should be added, deleted, or otherwise changed)

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Espinosa

I request that my following comments be made available to Councilmembers Rees, Huizar, and Krekorian at the August 9, 2011 meeting.

I am very much opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. This ordinance neither stops the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising nor begins a serious reduction in the number of billboards that blight our neighborhoods. In specific, the following provisions badly undermine the purpose of the ordinance, which is to make our city a more attractive and liveable place by reducing visual blight and the other negative affects of outdoor advertising.

-Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing. This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and supergraphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

-Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential for driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval.

Sincerely,

Writer's direct phone

Writer's e-mail

August 5, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Dear Councilmember Reyes:

Re: Council File 082020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

The proposed ordinance should not be adopted in its present form. As drafted, it does nothing to reduce billboard proliferation and other forms of outdoor advertising. Equally important, it does not address the fact that many neighborhoods of the city are already blighted by an excessive number of billboards, many of which appear to be illegal. If the goal is to make our city a more attractive and livable place, it will not be furthered by the proposed ordinance. These provisions in the draft are particularly antithetical to the forgoing objectives:

-Grandfathering sign district applications without a planning commission hearing will result in hundreds of new billboards, supergraphic signs and electronic signs being approved without complying with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards.


-Allowing commercial advertising on signs simply because they aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could lead to new advertising in public parks and other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval

Sincerely,

T. LARRY WATTS



Writer's direct phone

Writer's e-mail

August 5, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Dear Councilmember Huizar:

Re: Council File 082020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

The proposed ordinance should not be adopted in its present form. As drafted, it does nothing to reduce billboard proliferation and other forms of outdoor advertising. Equally important, it does not address the fact that many neighborhoods of the city are already blighted by an excessive number of billboards, many of which appear to be illegal. If the goal is to make our city a more attractive and livable place, it will not be furthered by the proposed ordinance. These provisions in the draft are particularly antithetical to the forgoing objectives:

-Grandfathering sign district applications without a planning commission hearing will result in hundreds of new billboards, supergraphic signs and electronic signs being approved without complying with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards.

-Allowing commercial advertising on signs simply because they aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could lead to new advertising in public parks and other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval

Sincerely,

T. LARRY WATTS



Writer's direct phone

Writer's e-mail

August 5, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

Re: Council File 082020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

The proposed ordinance should not be adopted in its present form. As drafted, it does nothing to reduce billboard proliferation and other forms of outdoor advertising. Equally important, it does not address the fact that many neighborhoods of the city are already blighted by an excessive number of billboards, many of which appear to be illegal. If the goal is to make our city a more attractive and livable place, it will not be furthered by the proposed ordinance. These provisions in the draft are particularly antithetical to the forgoing objectives:

-Grandfathering sign district applications without a planning commission hearing will result in hundreds of new billboards, supergraphic signs and electronic signs being approved without complying with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards.

-Allowing commercial advertising on signs simply because they aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could lead to new advertising in public parks and other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval

Sincerely,

T. LARRY WATTS





Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Signs at City Parks

1 message

Mario Milch <tangoklutz@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 3:11 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org, "councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org" <councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org>

To: Councilmembers Ed Reyes (Chair), Jose Huizar, Paul Krekorian
L.A. City Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee
Re: CF#11-0724 Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks

Gentlemen:

City parks constitute a refuge for many people; a way to relax, exercise, entertain kids and walk dogs. For me, hiking in Griffith Park is a great way to accomplish all those tasks (except my kids are grown). To have great views and natural (or semi-natural) vistas broken up by garish advertising signs is antithetical to any common sense. While Los Angeles is thirsty for new revenue, parks as that refuge I mention above must be maintained.

Please consider this a plea and a request that no ordinance be enacted that allows advertising signs at city parks.

Thank you for your kind attention

Mario Milch, MD
4118 Los Nietos Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027
323 819-5154
tangoklutz@gmail.com



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Billboard Ordinance

1 message

Michael Conway <ConwayM@unitedtalent.com>

Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 2:43 PM

To: "michael.espinosa@lacity.org" <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Cc: "info@banbillboardblight.org" <info@banbillboardblight.org>, Michael Conway <ConwayM@unitedtalent.com>

August 5, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilman Paul Koretz

I am opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. This ordinance neither stops the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising nor begins a serious reduction in the number of billboards that blight our neighborhoods. In specific, the following provisions badly undermine the purpose of the ordinance, which is to make our city a more attractive and livable place by reducing visual blight and the other negative effects of outdoor advertising.

-Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing. This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and super graphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

-Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential for driver distraction on busy streets. I am still angry about the flashing digital sign that was constructed at the end of my street that negatively impacts my home value.

Sincerely,

Michael Conway

6630 Maryland Dr.

Los Angeles, CA 90048

310-721-5908



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

advertising in public parks

1 message

Gabriel Liebeskind <glovechild@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 2:03 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Sir,

As a parent, park user and member of the community please weigh in however possible to prevent advertising in our public parks. We're inundated with advertising in this city as it is, causing a blight in an otherwise wonderful city. Wherever we can eliminate advertising would go a long way toward beautifying this city. Thank you.

Gabriel Liebeskind



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Don't put adds in our parks

1 message

Yamit Shimonovitz <4yamit@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 4, 2011 at 9:43 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Please keep the parks add free for our children so they will experience nature without thinking about the next block buster or fatty foods....

Thanks

--

Yamit Shimonovitz

www.Yamit.biz

From: Bernadette Soter <bsoter@earthlink.net>
Date: Sun, Aug 7, 2011 at 11:02 AM
Subject: Council File# 08-2020 Signs in Parks and City Owned Facilities
To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian,

I am adamantly opposed to the new ordinance you are considering whose language will allow the introduction of paid advertising in our city parks and other city-owned spaces. If passed, the losers will be us, the owners of our parks, who have faithfully supported our municipal park system for over 120 years through our taxes and consistent passage of bond measures. The winners will be the powerful media companies who will offer be able, for the first time, to offer advertisers unprecedented access to children in what they call a "target rich environment."

The ordinance under consideration is distressing for this reason, but also because it represents a broken promise. Over the past several years, as each new "comprehensive sign district" has been designated exempting it from our off-site sign laws, we have been told that this is being permitted under the theory that by concentrating advertising in heavily urbanized places, the rest of our metropolis will be free from its blight. Now the very definition of a "comprehensive sign district" has morphed to include the least urbanized areas of our city.

Even in the depths of the Great Depression, Los Angeles did not resort to commercializing its parks and exploiting its children for financial gain. I understand that the sign lobby in our city is very powerful, but please stand up to them and let our parks remain refuges from commerce and exploitation.

Respectfully,

Bernadette Soter
2640 N. Commonwealth Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90027



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

PLUM Committee Tuesday meeting, File # 08-2020

1 message

Gerry Hans <gerry@friendsofgriffithpark.org>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 9:21 AM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

To: Members of Planning and Land Use Management Committee
From: Friends of Griffith Park

Friends of Griffith Park has opposed commercial advertising in CITY PARKS in all manners, including on trash cans, since we learned of the The Department of Recreation and Parks Commission approval of a plan for the LA Parks Foundation to sell to Warner Bros Yogi Bear advertising space earlier this year. We stand firm in our belief that City Parks should remain free of all commercial signage, no matter what. Therefore we oppose the passage of a "comprehensive sign program" for public or private property, which would play right into the hands of advertising enterprises, open up the door to signs in our parks, and weaken the Billboard Ordinance.

Thank you for your consideration.
Gerry Hans
President
Friends of Griffith Park

(Please confirm receipt)



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Oppose the Sign Ordinance

1 message

Al Moggia <almog@dslextre.me.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 10:35 AM

To: Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>, Eric Garcetti <councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org>

To: Planning and Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re:Council File 08-2020

Honorable Councilmembers:

I oppose the city sign ordinance presented by the planning department on July 22, 2011.

The most troubling element of the ordinance is the one that would allow commercial billboards and signs into our city parks. Parks have always been intended to be places where the surrounding of the natural landscape and views give people respite from the problems and hurried pace of daily life. I find it difficult to understand how the planning department could lose sight of this fundamental principle of public parks. On second thought I do understand, it is due to effecting lobbying of billboard/ sign lobby and the city current effort in pushing its departments to increase revenue.

Other elements of the sign ordinance that I take issue with are: allowing digital billboards, grandfathering signs that have not been through the plan department process.

The result of a misguided sign ordinance will be to reduce the quality of life in Los Angeles and make Los Angeles less attractive place for visitors.

Al Moggia
Los Angeles 90026

August 3, 2011

Councilmember Tom LaBonge
Los Angeles City Hall Office
200 N. Spring St. #480
Los Angeles CA 90012

Re: Commercial ads in City Parks, Council File Number: 11-0724

Councilmember Tom LaBonge,

Recently we have learned that there are discussions and actual attempts to facilitate the selling of advertising space in our city parks. There is no room for any such precedent because it will only weaken our City Billboard Ordinance. More importantly, we join many communities throughout the city to say that advertising in parks is not wanted, under any circumstances.

Children need this last remaining public space unmarked by commercialism to remain as such. Parks should be a place for children to enjoy the outdoors and unleash their creative talents within themselves, rather than be exploited by messages to which they are inevitably vulnerable.

Advertising in parks is not what our residents want, not even ads on garbage cans. Nor is it even a viable plan to attract any more than "chunk change" for the City. Energy is better spent on legitimate, clearly legal, and smart ways of fixing the City's budget problems. Donors to our parks should be thanked in a manner similar to museums and libraries, that is, through a well-located, non-commercial donor wall.

Sincerely,

Caroline Schweich
President

Cc: Councilmember Jon Kirk Mukri, Barry Sanders, Carmen Trutanich



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Proposal to allow commercial signs in parks

1 message

Ron Wilkniss <rwilkniss@att.net>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 11:09 AM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

It is my understanding that the issue of potentially allowing commercial signs in city parks is now being considered.

I am a resident of the Hollywood Hills - on the edge of Griffith Park. I am aware of the city's current budget problems but I am simply incredulous that "selling" our parks should be considered as one means to alleviate those problems.

As a related matter, although I am pleased to (finally) see significant redevelopment in Hollywood, I am very unhappy about the "supergraphic" signs that seem to accompany that redevelopment - for example, the supergraphic signs on the "W" Hotel.

I would like to go on record as being firmly opposed to the proliferation of commercial signs - and to the potential of having commercial signs in our parks, in particular.

Sincerely,

Ronald Wilkniss



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Sign ordinance in city parks

1 message

Carol Brusha <ron.carol.brusha@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 11:38 AM

To: Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>, "Hon. Tom LaBonge" <councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>, "Hon. Ed P. Reyes" <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, "Hon. Jose Huizar" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "Hon. Paul Krikorian" <councilmember.krikorian@lacity.org>

To: Hon. Ed P. Reyes

To: Hon. Jose Huizar

To: Hon. Paul Krikorian

Members - Los Angeles City Council Planning and Land Use Committee.

Re: Council File 0802020

City sign ordinance

Gentlemen:

My husband and I oppose the proposed city sign ordinance that would allow our city parks to become magnets for commercial advertisements.

I began hiking in Griffith Park at age 7 with my parents and met my husband, Ronald F. Brusha, there. This park, therefore, holds a special place for me.

All city parks are peaceful havens for its users and should not be cluttered with distractions. They are special places.

I doubt very much that there will be an abundant increase in revenue for the city. It may sound good on paper but the reality will be far different.

Before forging ahead with the plan, there should be an EIR to determine the impact as well as public hearings.

Also, remember the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, passed by both houses of Congress and signed by Pres. Lyndon Johnson? It was designed to control outdoor advertising on our interstates and federal highways. As someone who takes many road trips throughout the United States, I can now enjoy unblemished scenery.

I want to continue enjoying the scenery in our parks.

Carol Brusha



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

1 message

Mary Button <marybutton59@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 11:23 AM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

To Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the passage of the new sign ordinance which was initially made public by the Planning Department on July 22nd.

It is very disturbing this ordinance does not stop the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising. In fact, the ordinance would encourage the presence of billboards in our city parks. Los Angeles is strapped for cash, and is seeking Public Private Partnerships as a solution. It is shameful to allow these partnerships to control and change the nature of our city parks. I am especially concerned the nature of Griffith Park remain what it is: "Nature." I oppose *any* commercial signs, billboards and banners in the parks.

Our city parks are one of the last remaining places of refuge, free of commercial signs. It is our duty to ensure they remain that way, not only for ourselves but for the generations to come. Our children should have to bear the brunt and pay the consequences of a diminished "true" park experience, just because the city is trying to find funds.

Thank you for your serious consideration. I am confident you will make the correct decision and allow our Parks to remain the wonderful, much-needed commercial-free refuge!

Sincerely,
Mary J Button
Los Angeles CA
25 Year Resident of Los Angeles, and frequent user of City Parks



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

New Sign Ordinance

1 message

Nancy Rae Stone <nancyraestone@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 1:52 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: info@banbillboardblight.org

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Espinosa:

I am opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. This ordinance neither stops the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising nor begins a serious reduction in the number of billboards that blight our neighborhoods. In specific, the following provisions badly undermine the purpose of the ordinance, which is to make our city a more attractive and livable place by reducing visual blight and the other negative affects of outdoor advertising.

-Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing.

This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and supergraphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

-Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

-Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential for driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval.



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

NO to Signage at City-Owned Facilities and Parks

1 message

Patricia Gallery <patricia.a.gallery@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 1:52 PM

To: paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org, Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

To:

paul.koretz@lacity.org

councilmember.reyes@lacity.org

councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org

councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org

tom.labonge@lacity.org

Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Say NO to advertising in our city parks. Do not permit the passage of a new sign ordinance containing a provision for "comprehensive sign programs" that could permit off-site signage in our LA city parks. Our parks should be off limits to ANY commercial signage whatsoever. Griffith Park is a prime example of a city gem at risk.

Griffith Park is one of the last respits in this city that provides an escape to the natural world free from advertising and urban marketing sprawl. We hike all of the Griffith Park trails on a weekly basis. It must be treated as a precious protected area, not as a revenue generating facility.

We must find other ways to fund our parks - not through advertising revenue.

Patricia Gallery
1946 Micheltorena St.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
[\(323\) 665-0298](tel:(323)665-0298)
patricia.a.gallery@gmail.com



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

CF #08-2020 Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks - NO to Commercial Signage in our Parks

1 message

Patricia Gallery <patricia.a.gallery@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 1:00 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org, tom.labonge@lacity.org

To:

Councilmembers Ed Reyes (Chair), Jose Huizar, Paul Krekorian
L.A. City Council Planning & Land Use Management Committee
Tom LaBonge, Councilmember, 4th District
CarmenTrutanich, City Attorney

We say NO to advertising in our city parks. Do not permit the passage of a new sign ordinance containing a provision for "comprehensive sign programs" that could permit off-site signage in our LA city parks. Our parks should be off limits to ANY commercial signage whatsoever.

Griffith Park is one of the last respits in this city that provides an escape to the natural world free from advertising and urban marketing sprawl. We hike all of the Griffith Park trails of the park on a weekly basis. It must be treated as a precious protected area - not as a revenue generating facility.

Patricia Gallery
1946 Micheltorena St.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
(323) 665-0298
patricia.a.gallery@gmail.com



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Re: CF# 11-0724 / "Signs at City-Owned Facilities and Parks"

1 message

Cavers321 <cavers321@ca.rr.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 1:59 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: ROstrow@ggpnc.org, acohen@losfelizledger.com, President@hillsidefederation.org, Carmen.trutanich@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, councilmember.zine@lacity.org, councilmember.labonge@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org, councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org

I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting but I'm writing to express my shock and dismay regarding the proposal that could allow "off-site signage" and commercial advertising inside our city parks, specifically inside Griffith Park.

Griffith Park has stood as a cultural and historical landmark for over 100 years. It is a natural jewel in the crown of Los Angeles. The park is often the only place many people can afford to travel for recreation, relaxation, or just to "get away from it all" for a few hours.

The average person is already exposed to over 200 ads per day. Thousands of companies already bombard nearly every moment of our lives with advertising:

during television shows, before movies, during movies (product placement), on the radio, on DVDs, in newspapers, at sporting events, in email, during the evening news, in shopping malls, in grocery stores, on food packaging, on billboards while driving, in magazines, on street corners, on city buses, in our mailbox, on buildings, on bus benches, in the sky (skywriting), and even in our children's schools.

Can we please have one last sanctuary free from the never-ending reach of money-first corporations? One last place for our children to play untainted by branding? One last place for the average family to escape for a while?

Remember, Colonel Griffith J. Griffith left the land of Griffith Park as a gift to the people of Los Angeles. Please don't tarnish that gift.

Thank You,

Dirk VanFleet



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

1 message

Deborah Lashever <bohemianexchange@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 2:33 PM

To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Cc: info@banbillboardblight.org

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee and Councilmembers,

I am opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. This ordinance neither stops the proliferation of billboards and other forms of outdoor advertising nor begins a serious reduction in the number of billboards that blight our neighborhoods. In specific, the following provisions badly undermine the purpose of the ordinance, which is to make our city a more attractive and liveable place by reducing visual blight and the other negative affects of outdoor advertising.

- Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing. This means those sign districts could put up hundreds of new billboards and supergraphic and electronic signs without having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

- Allowing comprehensive sign programs to be established for private and public property, where commercial advertising would be allowed on signs that aren't visible from the public-right-of-way. This could result in extensive advertising in large parks like Griffith Park and others, and open the door for advertising on other city properties.

- Allowing digital on-site signage without any study and development of regulations regarding light trespass on residential properties, energy use, and potential for driver distraction on busy streets.

At a minimum, the regulations should include limits on size, height, spacing, hours of operation, and provisions for community review and approval.

One of the worst problems America faces today is corporate take over. The proposed signage contributes to this, which is proving to be the downfall of the American ideal and way of life in general. By bowing to corporations you are promoting the downfall of Los Angeles, of Venice and of American society in general. Do not become pawns of corporations! The public hates this proposal! And it is we who will be effected everyday.

LISTEN TO YOUR CONSTITUENTS!!!!!!

WE DO NOT WANT MORE ADVERTISING IN OUR PUBLIC PLACES!! PERIOD.

(Michael, please distribute my comments to the members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee. Thank you.)

Sincerely,
Deborah Lashever

--

Deborah LaShever
BOHEMIAN EXCHANGE
1358 Abbot Kinney Blvd.
Venice, CA 90291
310.396.3044
bohemianexchange@gmail.com

"Be the change you wish to see in the world." ---Mahatma Gandhi

"Wherever you stand be the soul of that place." ---Rumi

August 8, 2011

Honorable Ed Reyes, Chair
PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL
Office of the City Clerk
200 North Spring Street, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Proposed Ordinance Revising the Citywide Sign Regulations
Council File No. 08-2020; 08-3386-S1
PLUM Committee Hearing Date: August 9, 2011

Dear Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Ordinance Revising the Citywide Sign Regulations, dated July 22, 2011 ("Draft Sign Ordinance"). We are the owners of **Bank of America Plaza** (located at 333 S. Hope Street), **Figueroa at Wilshire** (601 S. Figueroa Street), **Ernst & Young Plaza** (located at 725 S. Figueroa Street), and the recently renamed **FIGat7th** shopping center (735 S. Figueroa Street), all located in Downtown Los Angeles. FIGat7th is currently being renovated, and upon reopening will house a variety of new retail, restaurant, and commercial tenants, including cityTarget. Tenant signage plays a crucial role in attracting quality retail tenants to Downtown Los Angeles.

We have reviewed the Draft Sign Ordinance and have several concerns about the recommendations as currently drafted. As an operator of one of the few retail shopping centers in Downtown LA, we are most concerned with the recommended revisions that will affect tenant or on-site signage opportunities, as well as the minimal allowance of off-site signage allowed under Comprehensive Sign Programs.

We have the following comments for your consideration as you review the Draft Sign Ordinance and make recommendations to Department of City Planning Staff and the City Council:

1. Comprehensive Sign Programs (see §14.4.24)
 - a. The "Eligibility" section (see §14.4.24 B.) should clarify whether two or more property owners or development sites can be combined to be eligible for one Comprehensive Sign Program. It is not uncommon for major tenants to own parcels within a larger development project, or for a project to have multiple parcels owned by affiliates or parties obligated to each other under reciprocal easement agreements or as a common interest development. We request that this section allow for combining parcels under a single Comprehensive Sign Program.
 - b. Per the Draft Ordinance, the sign regulations of Comprehensive Sign Programs may vary from specified provisions of the sign code. The excepted provisions should include §14.4.5, Freeway Exposure. First, the limitation that signs only be incidentally visible within 2,000 feet (nearly ½ mile) of a main roadway is too restrictive – particularly for a major development qualifying for this program that is going to be convenient to transportation corridors. Second, restricting the area permitted for on-site wall signs makes no sense considering that no such restriction is placed on other types of signs. The intent of a Comprehensive Sign Program to provide flexibility in signage for major projects. Requiring a developer of a major project to

opt for what may be a less attractive sign (a pole sign, for example) to avoid this limitation is counter to the intent of the Program.

- c. Off-Site Signs are prohibited under Comprehensive Sign Programs if visible from any public right of way or adjacent property. The adjacent property limitation is too onerous in an urban high-rise setting where it is virtually impossible for exterior signs not to be visible to someone looking down from the many nearby high-rise buildings – even if those signs are located in a subterranean location such we have at FIGat7th.
 - d. Off-Site Signs are limited to a maximum of 10% of the total sign area permitted under a Comprehensive Sign Program. Because these signs may not be visible from any public right of way, there should be no such limitation.
2. Architectural Lighting. The Draft Ordinance should provide a clear definition of what is considered architectural lighting of surfaces, as opposed to "Sign Area." New lighting technologies provide exciting opportunities for incorporating lighting into project design, and it is necessary for architects and designers to know exactly when they will cross the line between architectural lighting and signs, causing an entire building surface to be counted as sign area (see §14.4.2, Definitions, Sign Area.)
 3. Murals and Other Art. We understand the Draft Ordinance does not attempt to solve the complex issues surrounding the regulation of murals, and that the Department of City Planning is drafting a separate Ordinance to address murals. We encourage the Department of City Planning to draft the separate Ordinance as soon as possible and to clearly define murals as public works of art, and not signage. Murals and similar works of art that are essentially part of a building, whether existing or proposed, should neither have any bearing on proposed sign programs, nor be calculated as signage.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. If you have any questions, or would like to further discuss any of our concerns, please contact me at (213) 330-8033 or mark.phillips@brookfield.com.

Sincerely,

BROOKFIELD OFFICE PROPERTIES



Mark C. Phillips
Vice President, Regional Counsel

cc: Honorable Jose Huizar, Council District 14
Honorable Paul Krekorian, Council District 2
Marie Rumsey, Council District 9
Michael Espinosa, Office of the City Clerk
Alan Bell, Department of City Planning
Daisy Mo, Department of City Planning

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL OFFICERS

PATTI BERMAN, PRESIDENT

RUSSELL CHAN, VP OF ADMINISTRATION

JAY KIM, VP OF OUTREACH & COMMUNICATION

SCOTT BYTOF, TREASURER

SHIRA BLATT, SECRETARY

DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

P.O. Box 13096
Los Angeles, CA 90013-0096

TELEPHONE: (678) 65-DLANC
www.dlanc.com

August 9, 2011

To:
Councilmember Perry
Councilmember Huizar
City Attorney Carmen Trutanich

Dear Councilmembers Perry and Huizar and Mr. Trutanich,

The Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council (DLANC) believes that City parks and recreation centers are no place for commercial advertising and objects to the L.A. Park Foundation's plan to permit for-profit signage in them in return for donations to the Foundation.

The purported reason for this initiative is to raise funds to support the parks, but the net gained will not begin to address the park budget's multi-million dollar shortfall, nor will it resolve the maintenance, staffing and security losses faced by the system.

Its real beneficiaries will be advertisers who will be permitted to blanket parks with signage for extremely low rates; the minor sums gained in this process will be reduced even further by the minimum 20% administrative fees deducted by the Foundation.

The plan:

- o Violates the letter and spirit of the City's signage and billboard ordinances;
- o Circumvents longstanding concession contracting and RFP processes that afford transparency in the permitting of for-profit activities in our parks;
- o Exploits children by subjecting them to the kind of advertising to which they are particularly vulnerable;
- o Deprives park users of all ages of the escape from commercial intrusions afforded by parks;
- o Repositions parks as canvases for promotional messaging, thereby inviting copycat poster and graffiti blight.

Although the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council believes that subtle donor and sponsor recognition should be allowed, to encourage and celebrate private donations to improve and sustain our public open spaces and facilities, allowance of commercial advertising with no obvious or direct relation or benefit to our parks is not appropriate.

The City Attorney has already found that commercial signing in parks is illegal. For this reason as well as those cited above, we are asking you to direct the L.A. Parks Foundation to abide by this finding and end this initiative.

Sincerely,

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – 2011-08-09

Patricia Berman, President
Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council

Cc:
Jon Kirk Mukri, General Manager, Department of Recreation and Parks
Recreation and Parks Commissioners, City of Los Angeles