



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Don't you DARE let our parks be filled with advertising!

1 message

Maggie Wineland <maggiewineland@kw.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 4:25 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

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

Dear Hardworking Councilmembers and Public Servants,

I heard from our neighborhood group that larger (most) city parks are being considered as a location for private companies to advertise, billboard-size or otherwise.

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

Some of us in Angeleno Heights protest this disgusting idea with our whole hearts. I will try to come Tuesday for the hearing, because in a city like L.A. we get very little visual peace or actual quiet and to the thoughtful or spiritual among us, advertising in our park is like having a commercial for toilet paper playing on a big screen behind the Pastor in church. The park is where we go to see nature, not billboards.

With the price of gas as it is, how many Angelenos can afford to drive an hour to the mountains or beach to get away from city distractions like ads and traffic?

Please, **please don't let this precedent be set.** We don't need the money that badly; we don't need a \$20 million lake-draining in Echo Park. Personally I love the idea of a cleaner Echo Park Lake but if I had to choose I'd rather have a polluted lake than visual and noise pollution in the one peaceful, unpolluted place left to us, our parks. This is a major quality of life issue for our citizens and anyone who approved such an idea would look like Big Business's own sweetheart.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Maggie Wineland,

Keller Williams Los Feliz

DRE # 01858119

(323) 286-2798

Will you please call me if you know anyone who'd like to buy or sell real estate? Thanks!



WESTSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

P.O. Box 64370 Los Angeles, CA 90064

www.wncla.org (310) 474-2326

August 9, 2011



OFFICERS

Terri Tippit, Chair
Steve Spector, Vice-Chair
Mary Kusnic and
Melisa Kenady, Recording
Secretary
Letty Bugarin, Corresponding
Secretary
Lisa Morocco, Treasurer

BOARD MEMBERS

Jerry Asher
Barbara Broide
Drew DeAscentis
Bob Guerin
Dick Harmetz
Charles Horwitz
Colleen Mason Heller
Michael McIntyre
Ron Stone
David (Ty) Vahedi

Chairperson Ed Reyes and Members Jose Huizar and Paul Krekorian
LA City Council Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

VIA EMAIL ATTENTION: Michael Espinosa, Legislative Asst. - michael.espinosa@lacity.org
RE: Proposed Sign Ordinance /File No. 08-2020 / PLUM Hearing August 9, 2011 Item (5)

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian:

I am writing on behalf of the Westside Neighborhood Council, representing approximately 80,000 stakeholders in the Cheviot Hills, Rancho Park and Century City area.

While we are pleased to see this important issue come before your committee, we are greatly concerned that significant changes have been incorporated into the draft in current circulation since it was last considered by the CPC. We cannot support the draft in its current form.

We feel there has not been adequate time allowed for community input and discussion on this important policy document. Several months have passed since the CPC meeting where revisions to the ordinance were discussed and are concerned there is a rush to move this document forward. We urge that the PLUM Committee take testimony on August 9th and continue the item until October thus giving the neighborhood councils the minimum 60 days advance notification on issues as promised to us. Policy should be discussed and debated in public – not crafted behind closed doors with input alone from the industry that is to be regulated. We have not been consulted during these months of staff work and assume that neither were other neighborhood councils.

While the latest proposed ordinance to revise and amend the Los Angeles Municipal Code regulating signs contains a number of positive elements including recognition of the distinction between on and off-site signs, substantial fines for non-compliance with signage regulations, the primacy of specific plans, and other effective provisions which we can support, we are concerned there are a number of serious flaws that must be remedied before PLUM adopts a position on any revisions to the ordinance.

Sign Districts. We are strongly opposed to the creation of additional special Sign Districts. These districts run contrary to the over-riding desire of the citizens of this City. The 2002 Sign Ordinance was specifically enacted in order to halt the proliferation of new off-site signage in the City. Sign Districts that have currently been approved should be allowed to continue. Those districts in existence or approved at the time of CPC consideration of the ordinance revisions may be allowed. However, anything introduced since that time should not be “grandfathered” into existence. The intent of the City was clear at the time of the CPC hearings. The communities should not be punished as a result of the time that it took the Dept. to issue the revisions to the ordinance. The “clock” on sign districts ran out many months ago.

Comprehensive Sign Program. There can be no justification for exceptions for larger developments. Larger developments would have, almost without exception, longer street footages and thus be allowed larger signs than would be the case for small developments. The blighting and safety issues would remain the same for signs exterior to the developments. The argument for the need for larger signs interior to a larger development makes no sense. In addition, while three acres and/or 50,000 to 100,000 square feet may define an exceptionally large commercial development in cities such as New York or Chicago, it is no larger than the typical “big box” store or strip mall in Los Angeles. Such an exemption would essentially emasculate any sign ordinance and a barrier to the adoption of a coherent ordinance. We urge further discussion of the proposed allowances for internal signage, particularly where such signage includes off-site and digital signage. We have not had adequate time to discuss this issue and have many concerns related to possible park signage, impacts on courtyard

buildings, schools, etc. Commercial signage in parks is a highly emotional issue and one that is of great concern.

Sign Modification. The current proposal refers to variances of up to 20% increases in height and area as “minor”. That is certainly a misnomer and a serious loophole. All modifications that increase the sign height or area should be subjected to the sign variance process.

Right of Private Action. We question the position against legitimate right of private action. The City of Los Angeles has a well documented reluctance to initiate legal action, despite flagrant violation of the municipal code. Budget constraints may exacerbate the City’s failure to act. “Frivolous” lawsuits seem rather unlikely given the cost of filing and the lack of potential monetary gain to the civic minded groups likely to file such an action. Delay in action until all courses of remedy are exhausted equates to a free ride for years for the offending parties. The past history of the City and its commitment to enforcement are evidence enough to justify right of private action.

Digital Signs. The Planning Department and CPC decision to delay consideration of any restrictions to the conversion of existing signs to digital or erection of new digital signs is truly unfortunate. These signs are a substantial safety hazard, a distraction to drivers and pedestrians in the area, a light invasion of adjacent homes, and an unconscionable waste of electric energy. There are needs to establish new regulations on brightness, message, and duration for existing digital signs (after those that should never have been erected are removed), to acknowledge and address the real problems created by the signs. We propose a moratorium on any new digital signage or conversion until a comprehensive set of regulations is provided and subjected to public scrutiny. We have long advocated for a halt to any new digital signage pending the completion of federal traffic safety studies. We believe this to be the prudent course for the city.

Removal of Existing Unlawful Signs. We do not see language that addresses the elimination of existing unlawful signs. That is, signs erected without a permit or which violate the terms of the permit issued. The current proposal covers existing signs that are lawful under current regulations, but does not address unlawful signage. We strongly support provisions that will lead to the speedy elimination of all signage that is unlawful under the current code (or that was not granted a permit under prior regulations).

We urge the PLUM and later the City Council to: eliminate the Comprehensive Sign Program and any additional special sign districts, foster wide community discourse on elements of a new sign ordinance, and, of paramount importance, vigorously enforce the provisions of the law once it is in place.

Sincerely,

Terri Tippit, Chair

cc: info@banbillboardblight.org



PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL

August 8, 2011

Via Email & PLUM Hearing Hand Delivery

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian
c/o Michael Espinosa – Legislative Assistant / Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org
The Los Angeles City Council; Planning & Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: PPCC Opposes “Sign Ordinance”¹ /File No. 08-2020 / PLUM Hearing August 9, 2011 Item (5)

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian:

Pacific Palisades Community Council (“PPCC” opposes the Sign Ordinance as presently drafted. The Executive Committee of PPCC voted on this proposed ordinance, as the full Board is on summer schedule. PPCC’s opposition is based on the following key points:

1. **Community Groups Have Insufficient Notice.** Rather than the customary sixty (60) days notice, we received twenty-one (21) days to review, vet language, adopt positions and present a voice on the Sign Ordinance. The PPCC, other groups and affected persons have not had a chance to adequately evaluate and react to the substantial zoning code changes now proposed to take effect.

2. **The “Internal Sign Exception” (proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec. 14.4.3(A)) Must Be Changed.** The intent of this exception is to accommodate signs in large, enclosed spaces like malls and stadiums through sign districts, a comprehensive sign program or during temporary construction. Planning has indicated that it would consider a revision(s) to the current wording because it is a total exception to the City’s sign regulations (i.e., no site characteristics are considered). *Without change, the PPCC believes that both our specific plan and non-specific plan areas may become subject to unregulated interior signs (including on-site digital signs) because we have small commercial atrium office buildings, enclosed retail plazas, schools with courtyard areas, and walled baseball fields at our recreation center.* PPCC has suggested to Planning, in order of preference, the following options: (a) delete proposed change and leave the existing LAMC which regulates interior signs, (b) have the interior sign exception not apply to off-site signs and digital signs, or (c) cross-reference Sec. 91.6216.4.3 (Sign Districts) and LAMC 14.4.24 (Comprehensive Sign Program) to ensure that the interior sign exception applies only to larger projects.²

¹ The “Sign Ordinance” is that report from the Department of City Planning relative to a proposed ordinance amending Sections 11.5.7, 12.05, 12.21, 12.22, 12.23, 13.11 and Article 4.4 of Chapter 1 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to enact a new criteria for the establishment of sign districts; create new relief provisions for certain deviations from the sign regulations; establish administrative civil penalties for violations of the sign regulations; and enact related technical corrections and other measures to control the potential impacts of signs on traffic safety and the visual environment.

² Planning has represented that the interior sign exception was never intended to allow unregulated signs in specific plan areas and is “aware of the ambiguity” in LAMC Sec. 14.4.3(A) as presently drafted.

3. **The New “Donor Sign” Definition (proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec. 14.4.2) Should be Deleted.**

This definition should be deleted because it arguably regulates content. Second, it does not specify whether donor signs are recognized as off-site or on-site signs. *Therefore, the definition may provide a loophole for a proliferation of unregulated on-site and off-site “donor” signs throughout the Pacific Palisades (note: our specific plan bans only “off-site commercial” signs).*

4. **The Off-Site Sign Definition (proposed LAMC Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.2) Should be Clarified.**

Planning agreed to consider PPCC’s recommendation that the word "exclusively" be inserted before "used to advertise" in this definition – to be consistent with the definition of “on-site” signs and encompass all forms of commercial advertising.

5. **The Impact of the Sign Ordinance on Public and Charter School Campuses In Areas Not Covered by Specific Plans is Unclear.**

When Palisades Charter High School erected a digital sign, homeowners experienced light spillover from flashing, rolling, scrolling 24/7 messages that also created a substantial distraction to drivers along Temescal Canyon Road and Sunset Boulevard (the sign is one long block from Sunset Blvd.). The PPCC quite simply has not had time to research the impact of the proposed ordinance, if any, on these government-owned properties in the Palisades.

6. **The "Three Tiered Approach to Deviations" (proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec.’s 14.4.4(B), 14.4.4(C), 14.4.4(D), 14.4.22, 14.4.23, 14.4.24) is Not Acceptable as Written.**

The PPCC is gravely concerned about Planning’s May 11, 2011 letter to the Budget and Finance Committee which states that the Comprehensive Sign Program “might apply to the Department of Recreation and Parks . . . [as] a new discretionary procedure that would enable the City to approve otherwise prohibited signs (including digital off-site signs) in certain locations . . .” *PPCC objects to the “three tiered approach” as drafted because the Sign Ordinance allows otherwise prohibited on-site signs in our parks and may allow otherwise prohibited off-site and temporary signs on other properties where the city may apply for a comprehensive sign program.* Finally, the PPCC objects to the application of the “three tiered approach” without time to evaluate how adjustments of 20% will affect on-site signs in our commercial areas.

7. **Regulation of Digital Displays (proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec. 14.4.19) is Insufficient.**

The Sign Ordinance contains bare minimum standards. *Based on our experience with Palisades Charter High School (ref. Paragraph 5 above), the PPCC is most concerned that spillover light is not regulated³ – along with regulation of size, spacing, and the number of signs which are critical factors to driver safety and contributors to visual blight.*

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Janet Turner, Chair
310-573-0382

CC’s: CD 11: Councilmember Rosendahl, Norm Kulla, Whitney Blumenfeld, Paul Backstrom, Joaquin Macias / City Planning Department: Michael LoGrande, Alan Bell, Daisy Mo

³ The candelas standard involves pointing a light at the source to determine what is too bright only and does not address spillover impacts. Proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec. 14.4.4(F) (Sign Illumination Limitations) limits light intensity from a single sign and not an aggregate affect of multiple signs on nearby residentially zoned properties. It is also unclear whether the “not visible” language proposed in the interior sign exception (Sec. 14.4.3(A)) means “not visible” or includes the allowance of light intensity limited by Sec. 14.4.4(F).



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

CF 08-2020 / PLUM Meeting Aug. 9, 2011 / WSSM letter of opposition attached

1 message

Barbara Broide <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Tue, Aug 9, 2011 at 6:38 AM

To: "Michael Espinosa (Council File postings)" <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>, Councilmember Ed Reyes <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, Councilmember Paul Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, "Councilmember Jose Huizar" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>

Cc: "Alan Bell - Planning Dept." <alan.bell@lacity.org>, daisy.mo@lacity.org, Paul Koretz <paulkoretz@hotmail.com>, Christopher Koontz <chris.koontz@lacity.org>

Please accept the attached comment letter on behalf of Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association (WSSM) representing over 3,800 households in the Westwood/West Los Angeles area.

We sincerely hope that additional time for community input will be allowed before PLUM schedules a vote on this measure.

Please enter this letter in the council file records for CF 08-2020 and inform us of future meetings and hearings pertaining to its consideration.

Thank you,

Barbara Broide
President



WSSM PLUM Letter for 8-9-11 CF 08-2020.doc

49K

Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd
Homeowner's Association
Incorporated November 8, 1971
P. O. Box 64213
Los Angeles, CA 90064-0213

August 8, 2011

Chairperson Ed Reyes and Committee Members Jose Huizar and Paul Krekorian
c/o Michael Espinosa, Legislative Assistant – Via email: michael.espinosa@lacity.org
LA City Council Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: WSSM Opposes Sign Ordinance Revisions /File No. 08-2020
PLUM Hearing - August 9, 2011, Item 5

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian:

Our community has a strong interest in reducing the negative impacts of commercial signage on our local area and on the quality of life in the City as a whole. Because of our community's location and the ability of advertisers to command high prices for advertisements placed in our vicinity, Council District 5 (and CD 11) have been the targets for many (and we would say a disproportionate number of) outdoor advertisement placements. We were therefore pleased to learn that the Planning Department was readying amendments and updates to the current sign ordinance. We participated in the earlier hearings held by the City Planning Commission which gave us hope that the City might adopt measures that would "make real" the 2002 off-site sign ordinance ban that was adopted by the Council nearly a decade ago. However, we cannot support the current ordinance under your consideration as written. We have many concerns.

Adequate notice in advance of the August 9 hearing has not been allowed. While posting requirements for the City have been met, the short time frame between the release of the draft and the PLUM meeting does not allow for meaningful discussion and evaluation of the proposed ordinance. WSSM has not been able to complete our analysis in the allotted time. We urge a continuation of the consideration for a minimum of 60 days to allow for our group, the neighborhood councils and others to be involved.

Proliferation of signage is possible under the proposed ordinance. The current sign code prohibits all new off-site signs (billboard ads) except in special sign districts and specific plans. By contrast, the proposed sign code will allow new off-site signs anywhere not visible from the street, in places such as outdoor shopping malls, school campuses, and parks.

Creation of new Sign Districts is unacceptable. We are strongly opposed to the creation of additional special Sign Districts. These districts fly contrary to the over-riding desire of the citizens of this City. The 2002 Sign Ordinance was specifically enacted in order to halt the proliferation of new off-site signage in the City. Sign Districts that have currently been approved should be allowed to continue. However, the long delay in bringing the ordinance for review at PLUM was not intended to be an open window for others to begin the process of seeking sign district status and/or of creating eligibility to be considered for being "grandfathered" into existence. Review of proposed districts that had not already been in review at the time of the CPC hearing should be discontinued. No additional districts should be considered. This is a serious flaw in the current ordinance draft.

Comprehensive Sign Program. We are concerned about provisions related to the creation of a Comprehensive Sign Program. We have problems with and oppose the “Three Tiered Approach to Deviations.” Should the Comprehensive Sign Program be used to allow signage that would otherwise not be allowed, it would create a major loophole in the ordinance. Signage in parks is a particularly troublesome proposition; allowing otherwise prohibited signs (including digital and off-site signage) in parks (and elsewhere) is objectionable. The “three tiered approach” may allow otherwise prohibited off-site and temporary signs on other properties where the city may apply for a comprehensive sign program. We have not yet been able to evaluate how adjustments of 20% will affect on-site signs in our commercial areas.

The current proposal which refers to variances of up to 20 percent increases in height and area as “minor” is problematic and could be viewed as another potential loophole for circumventing the intent of the 2002 sign ordinance. Ordinance revisions should seek to reduce opportunities for exceptions. Any modifications that might be considered should be subjected to the sign variance process and carry with them significant community betterments, both financial and aesthetic.

Exceptions granted for larger developments are problematic. We are concerned about the impacts of allowances given should there be allowances to allow for larger signs interior to a larger development.

Sign Modification. The current proposal refers to variances of up to 20% increases in height and area as “minor”. That is certainly a misnomer and a serious loophole. All modifications that increase the sign height or area should be subjected to the sign variance process.

Right of Private Action. We strongly support the inclusion of language that would provide for the right of private action. The City of Los Angeles has a well documented reluctance to initiate legal action, despite flagrant violation of the municipal code. Budget constraints may exacerbate the City’s failure to act. “Frivolous” lawsuits seem rather unlikely given the cost of filing and the lack of potential monetary gain to the civic minded groups likely to file such an action. Delay in action until all courses of remedy are exhausted equates to a free ride for years for the offending parties. The past history of the City and its commitment to enforcement are evidence enough to justify right of private action.

The new “Donor Sign” definition (proposed LAMC Art. 4, Sec. 14.4.2) should be deleted. This definition (included for large university campuses and areas that are in the process of drafting a specific plan) arguably regulates content. It does not specify whether donor signs are recognized as off-site or on-site signs. The definition may provide a loophole for unregulated signage in areas that have existing specific plans in place that ban only “off-site commercial signage”, with nothing specifically said about on-site donor signs, or off-site noncommercial/possibly “donor” signs.

The Off-Site Sign Definition (proposed LAMC Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.2) should be clarified. We support the Pacific Palisades Community Council’s recommendation that the word “exclusively” be inserted before “used to advertise” in this definition – to be consistent with the definition of “on-site” signs and encompass all forms of commercial advertising.

Digital Signs. In an ideal world, the courts will rule to uphold the Summit case court decision thus throwing out the billboard settlements and removing the mechanism that allowed for the modernization of standard billboards to digital format. However, as we do not live and work in an ideal world, the City must prepare for any eventualities. CD 5 has long sought to have PLUM consideration of an ICO to provide protection against digital signage; however, (and very unfortunately), that motion has not been permitted to move forward. A process must be defined in the new ordinance that allows for better local governance of signage.

The only new digital signs that should be allowed in the City would be those that meet all size, placement and lighting restrictions and guidelines and lie within the small number of sign districts that have already received their entitlements.

One of the very core missions of government is to protect the safety and health of its citizens. If the City of Los Angeles takes this mission seriously, it will incorporate into the new ordinance language that will halt the installation of any new digital signage until after the completion of a federal traffic safety study currently underway. These signs are designed to catch the eye of the passing (or waiting) driver – thus placing all those on or near the roadways in danger. They have significant negative impacts on their neighbors who experience light, and sound intrusions. And, finally, they are energy hogs that will contribute to the City's carbon footprint if allowed to proliferate. The proposed regulations on brightness, message, impacts of light spillover and duration can be considered for existing digital signs (after those that should never have been erected are removed), but ignore the real problems created by the signs. We propose a moratorium on any new digital signage or conversion until resolution of the Summit case and until a comprehensive set of regulations is provided and subjected to public scrutiny.

Opportunities to remove existing illegal signage should be maximized. We continue to wait for the published inventory of signs in the city so that we may identify illegally placed signage for removal. We strongly support language that results in the elimination of all signage that is unlawful under the current code (or that was not granted a permit under prior regulations).

Enforcement: The final sign ordinance revisions must include strong enforcement provisions with accompanying large and growing fines for non-compliance. A permitting process must include the generation of funds to pay for a full team of inspectors able to inspect each sign annually. There may be opportunities for the City to explore the establishment of new enforcement teams that can better monitor compliance with City regulations. Such teams would be self-supporting from a financial point of view not drawing upon the General Fund for their cost.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please notify us of any and all upcoming meetings and/or hearings on matters pertaining to the sign ordinance and its revisions.

Sincerely,



Barbara Broide
President

cc: Paul Koretz and Chris Koontz, CD 5; Alan Bell and Daisy Mo, City Planning Dept.



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Against the sign ordinance file 08-2020

1 message

Linda Mok <runamok2@verizon.net>
To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org
Cc: info@banbillboardblight.org

Tue, Aug 9, 2011 at 12:13 AM

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO THE MEMBERS FOR THE AUGUST 9, 2011 MEETING.
THANK YOU

To: Planning & Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian.

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

I am opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance. It was made public too quickly to mount an adequate defense to this latest insult to citizens and voters. We need to pull down billboards, esp., those annoying, distracting and dangerous digital shape shifters. Geeze, I hate those things.

This proposed ordinance does not stop the erection of more billboards, etc. and does not reduce the number of them. The “Grandfathering sign district applications that have never even reached a planning commission hearing” is a joke – isn’t it? If not, we get hundreds of new shape shifting billboards without the bad guys having to comply with tougher regulations, including a mandatory takedown of existing billboards in the surrounding community.

And if the scuttle butt (did I spell that correctly?) is true, the ordinance will result in the desecration of our public parks too. Once again, the government mismanages money and the citizenry pays, over and over and over. I think it’s long past time for a large scale revolt – starting at the polls.

Very truly yours,

Linda Mok

P.S. Shape shifters belong on STTNG, not on our streets.

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 6361 (20110808)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>



BRENTWOOD Community Council

149 S. Barrington Ave., Box 194, Los Angeles, CA 90049

www.brentwoodcommunitycouncil.org

August 8, 2011

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Paul Krekorian
c/o Michael Espinosa- Legislative Assistant
Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers,

The Brentwood Community Council ("BCC") is the broadest based Brentwood community organization. The BCC has 25 seats, including 13 from homeowner groups, 1 multi-family, 2 members-at-large, and 8 from organizations including public and private schools, religious, public safety, volunteer, environmental, and business districts.

We are opposed to passage of the new sign ordinance first made public by the planning department July 22. **MORE TIME IS REQUIRED FOR COMMUNITY REVIEW AND INPUT!**

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.

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

Sincerely,

Nancy Freedman

Chair, Brentwood Community Council

Gjf165@gmail.com

310-472-9775

CC: Councilmember.Rosendahl@lacity.org

Whitney.Blumenfeld@lacity.org

Paul.Backstrom@lacity.org

Joaquin.Macias@lacity.org

Michael.LoGrande@lacity.org

Alan.Bell@lacity.org



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

Please stop expansion of advertising!

1 message

SALNLA96@aol.com <SALNLA96@aol.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 7:32 PM

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Keep our parks free of advertising!!

DR. SARAH NAPIER

TELE: 323-665-7403

FAXCIMILE: 323-665-8809

E-MAIL: SALNLA96@AOL.COM



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

NO to Signage at City-Owned Facilities and Parks

1 message

Levin, John <jlevin@barringtonmedia.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 4:07 PM

To: "tom.labonge@lacity.org" <tom.labonge@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.reyes@lacity.org" <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, "councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org" <councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org>, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org" <Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org>

Dear Tom,

LA's parks are one of its greatest resources, providing a needed respite from the pressure, sprawl and media clutter of our wonderful city for literally thousands of residents every day. So I am shocked that the city is considering despoiling our parks by selling advertising in them. This should simply not happen.

Please 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. Our parks must be treated as precious, protected area, not as a revenue generating facility.

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

Thank you for your support.

John

John Levin | Vice President
Barrington Media

6210 Wilshire Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90048
jlevin@barringtonmedia.com

323.934.5800 office
323.854.5466 mobile



Michael Espinosa <michael.espinosa@lacity.org>

NO Advertising in Our Parks!

1 message

Carol Cetrone <perpetua99@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 9, 2011 at 8:51 AM

Cc: michael.espinosa@lacity.org, councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.reyes@lacity.org, garcetti@council.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,
Carol Cetrone
Silver Lake
