

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Vivian Pine

3440 Mandeville Canyon Rd

Los Angeles, CA 90049

From: **Gregory Zaharoff** <[gregmzee@yahoo.com](mailto:gregmzee@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 4:03 PM  
Subject: Planning And Land Use Management Committee Oct. 18 meeting re: Sign Ordinance  
To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>  
Cc: "[mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)" <[mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)>, "[info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)" <[info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)>

Dear Michael: As a frequent visitor and lover of the beauty of Los Angeles I would like to declare my support for the points below to the Committee. Please distribute my comments to the committee members.

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Gregory Zaharoff  
3621 Klamath St.  
Oakland, Ca 94602

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,  
Rebecca Allen  
3264 Ellenda Ave., 90034

From: **Barbara Broide** <[bbroide@hotmail.com](mailto:bbroide@hotmail.com)>

Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 4:13 PM

Subject: WSSM Comments for PLUM 10/18/11, Agenda Item #3: CF No. 08-2020 and CF 11-1705 -- Sign Ordinance revisions

To: "Michael Espinosa (Council File postings)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>, [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org)

Cc: "Alan Bell - Planning Dept." <[alan.bell@lacity.org](mailto:alan.bell@lacity.org)>, "Daisy Mo (City Planning)" <[daisy.mo@lacity.org](mailto:daisy.mo@lacity.org)>, Paul Koretz - cd 5

<[paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org)>, Christopher Koontz <[chris.koontz@lacity.org](mailto:chris.koontz@lacity.org)>, Councilmember Paul Krekorian <[councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)>, Councilmember Ed Reyes <[councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)>, "Councilmember Jose Huizar" <[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)>

**Please accept the attached letter on behalf of Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association. While we are supportive of a number of the revisions made by staff in the recently released revisions to the City's sign ordinance, we have significant concerns about a number of important issues addressed in the current draft. Our concerns are noted in the attached correspondence.**

**Please submit our comments to the Council File and provide the correspondence to the PLUM Committee members.**

Thank you,

**Barbara Broide  
President  
WSSM**

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

October 17, 2011

Chairperson Ed Reyes and Committee Members Jose Huizar and Paul Krekorian  
c/o Michael Espinosa and Sharon Gin, Legislative Assistant

Via email: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [Sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:Sharon.gin@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 Numerous Sign Ordinance Revisions**  
**Council File Nos. 08-2020 and 11-1705**  
**PLUM Hearing - October 18, 2011, Agenda Item 3**

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian:

We have previously corresponded with the PLUM Committee on the topic of revisions to the City's sign ordinance with our most recent communication being a letter of August 9, 2011. As you may remember, 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. We are "hosts" to a number of digital signs erected following the City's settlement agreements with Clear Channel and CBS Outdoor with a number of those signs being directly adjacent to residential properties. Given our experiences, we wish to speak loudly and clearly in opposition to a number of provisions in the proposed sign ordinance revisions. While a good attempt was made initially by the Planning Dept. and the City Planning Commission to limit the locations of new signage/sign districts to downtown and regional centers, there are so many loopholes and exceptions in the language that the current product is unacceptable. It exposes our City to a proliferation of future signage that is counter to the intent of the 2002 sign ordinance and later efforts of revision. We return to the motion of origin of Council File 08-2020 which said:

That Planning Department, in consultation with the Department of Building and Safety and the City Attorney, revise the sign ordinance to toughen and create easily enforceable time, place, and manner restrictions Citywide to protect neighborhoods; and also to provide clear criteria related to land use designations for sign districts.  
OLD COUNCIL FILE 97-1370

The intent was to make signage standards stronger and to establish guidelines so that the 2002 sign ordinance could be enforced in line with more current court rulings. The purpose was not to create new loopholes that might allow the outdoor advertising industry with new ways to skirt

the 2002 sign ordinance or with the opportunity to undermine the City's resolve to enforce the code.

The citizens of Los Angeles have waited a very long time for the City to "get its act together" and we stand firm in our resolve that lobbying by the sign industry and its representatives, along with interested property owners who stand to benefit from added signage rights, will not seize the day and dilute the intent of and revisions to the sign ordinance. Revisions must be in full compliance with the intent of the 2002 sign ordinance. We support the removal of the provision to allow for "donor signs." We also support the removal of any provisions that could have allowed signage in our public parks. However, it is still necessary to strengthen the ordinance to guarantee that parks with so-called "interior spaces" could not be then designated as an allowable location for signage. We believe that all public property should be protected from commercial sign intrusion, and especially those properties where our children congregate and/or play.

A summary of our concerns follows:

**Inadequate time to comment on new draft:** In August we expressed our concerns related to the lack of adequate notice in advance of the August 9<sup>th</sup> hearing. Again, the community has been presented with inadequate time to respond to a new staff report. This time, the staff report was issued on October 5<sup>th</sup> for a hearing date of October 18<sup>th</sup>. While we are grateful to have had the opportunity to meet with Alan Bell and a group of community leaders prior to the release of the October 5<sup>th</sup> draft, it would be advisable to allow adequate time for neighborhood councils and interested parties to discuss any new proposed changes in the ordinance.

### **Significant changes in proposed amendments warrant return to City Planning**

**Commission (CPC).** One of the strongest reasons for a return to the CPC is the consideration of a "community benefits" option as opposed to a trade of old for new signage. This is a major shift in intent and will have significant impacts. We believe it is unacceptable. As the intent of the 2002 ordinance is to reduce signage and ban any new signs, the net impact of any revisions to the ordinance should seek to secure a NET REDUCTION in signage. The TRADING of a new sign for an old one is not adequate mitigation nor adequate compensation to the City for allowing the privilege of erecting a new sign-- in a sign district, comprehensive sign program or wherever. We believe that removal of existing billboards is the community benefit commensurate with the highly lucrative entitlement for new billboards and supergraphic signage within a sign district. Outdoor advertisers who are granted such an entitlement should NOT ONLY remove signs, they should ALSO contribute to a community beautification fund! But, the fund is not an acceptable mitigation when new signage is permitted. The City Planning Commission convened numerous meetings and held in-depth discussions in committee, subcommittee and during the public hearings in order to establish a balanced policy. Their effort to seek balance with sign removal should not be so seemingly easily disregarded.

**Sign Districts:** The CPC retained the sign district provision allowing off-site and other prohibited sign types in sign districts, but greatly limited the potential for negative impact on communities by allowing districts only in high-intensity commercial areas zoned regional commercial or regional center. The CPC also approved a provision that allowed property owners to erect these kinds of signs only after acquiring and removing existing billboards in the surrounding community at a more than one-to-one square footage ratio. The CPC voted to "grandfather" only two pending applications for sign districts under the current city sign ordinance. We are strongly opposed to the creation of additional special Sign Districts and

especially those that are being presented as having been “in the pipeline” when a number of those have not been heard before any planning committees and have received no specific entitlements.

The revised ordinance now before the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) committee seriously undermines the CPC’s intent by proposing to grandfather more than a dozen pending sign district applications and proposals for special signage in specific plan areas. This could result in hundreds of thousands of square feet of new off-site signage in the city without a single billboard being taken down. Sign reduction must be included in the agreements for the dozen additionally proposed sign districts (if they are allowed to proceed).

In NO CASE should specific plans be used to allow for new signs, sign districts, comprehensive sign programs, etc. As noted earlier, sign districts, if allowed, must be limited to downtown and regional centers. Specific plans may be used to create stronger regulations on signage within a community’s planning area. It should be made crystal clear that specific plan documents cannot be used to allow for off-site signage or to create sign districts in a specific plan’s area.

**Comprehensive Sign Programs:** The revised ordinance exempts properties enclosed by walls or other opaque constructions from the ban on new-off-site signs and other sign regulations as long as the signs are not visible from the public-right-of-way or from any property other than the subject property. This could allow off-site (including digital) signs in city parks, recreational facilities, and other public properties as long as the property met the enclosure and visibility requirement. This loophole must be closed. The city should not be in the business of marketing commercial products and services to a captive audience of adults, youth, and children using public facilities. There should be no Comprehensive Sign Programs permitted on City property including parks, libraries, recreation centers, etc. Current language would appear to allow digital signage in CSP’s so long as they are visible only from the subject property and do not exceed 10 percent of the total signage on the property. This will result in a net increase in the amount of off-site signage in the City – in conflict with the 2002 sign ordinance.

Off-site signs in Comprehensive Sign Programns in overlay districts and Specific Plan areas should continue to be regulated according to current law.

**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.

**Digital/ Electronic Signage:** The CPC prohibited electronic signage outside sign districts, but the revised ordinance would allow them as on-site, or business signs anywhere in the city. The only regulations proposed are a minimum eight-second message duration and a daylight and night-time brightness limit. These regulations fail to address serious issues of energy use, traffic safety, light trespass on residential properties, change in community character, and potential for privacy invasion. At a minimum, a citywide moratorium should be placed on the installation of any new electronic signs and conversion of existing signs until regulations are in place that protect residents, motorists, pedestrians, communities and others from adverse effects.

We strongly support the creation of a study group within the Planning Dept. to establish regulations governing electronic signage (both on-site and off-site) in the City. There are significant quality of life, safety and legal ramifications to the unstudied permitting of such signage. It is important that the City move forward with a plan so that the digital signage does

not become the newest scourge of our City... following in the footsteps of marijuana dispensaries and other blights. Unless PLUM and the CPC are willing to incorporate into the current revisions strict guidelines on brightness, rotation and include buffer zones protecting all residential uses, then a moratorium on the installation of digital signage is in order. Furthermore, it was the stated intent of the PLUM Committee to move forward only with those aspects of the sign ordinance upon which there was significant agreement. There had never been discussions pertaining to on-site signage as earlier efforts determined that there should be separate consideration of on-site signage regulations. Therefore, it is extremely premature to allow for any electronic on-site signage. This must be halted. In addition to the safety, aesthetic and quality-of-life concerns noted above, the City has the responsibility to evaluate and regulate the carbon footprint of the city, energy usage, energy conservation, etc. An analysis independent of data that might be generated by the sign industry on these matters should be required.

**Wall Signs:** The CPC-approved ordinance prohibited any signs covering windows, but the revised ordinance would allow them in sign districts and comprehensive sign programs if the fire department certified that they did not present a safety hazard. While addressing possible flammability concerns, this measure fails to account for the fact that signage adhered to windows can degrade the view to the outside, and seriously affect the quality of life of tenants and neighbors of offices and apartments. This also opens the door to multi-story vinyl and fabric “supergraphic” signs covering entire sides of buildings, and blighting the visual environment of the City. As we are all well aware, the City cannot regulate the content of commercial sign messages.

Allow me to recount to you the sad story about a family in our neighborhood who had the ill fortune of living under the image of a five story supergraphic sign on nearby Pico Blvd. While all of the signs (and their night-time illumination, weekend installations, etc.) were an intrusion into the neighborhood’s privacy and had a negative impact on the quality of life, it was the image of a nearly partially (un)dressed woman that was the straw that broke the camel’s back for one family and resulted in their relocation outside of Los Angeles. The family could not bear to have their five year-old son “greeted” by the vision of this giant woman with plunging neckline watching over the family as they gathered to eat in their home or play in the yard. The sign was visible from street view and from second story bedroom windows from multiple blocks in the area. While flammability is an important issue, it is but one concern that warrants attention. These signs can have a devastating impact on all within their viewing field. Without significant protections and buffer zones for residential communities adjacent to sign districts and comprehensive sign programs, the City will not have done its job in revising the ordinance in a responsible manner.

**Right of Private Action:** The provision allowing property owners within 500 ft. of an illegal sign to file suit if the city fails to enforce citations was removed from the CPC-approved ordinance, but should be reinstated.

**Signs in the Public Right of Way:** The ordinance exempts signage in the public right-of-way from any regulations. This signage should be made subject to applicable regulations of the ordinance. We seek protections for scenic roadways/scenic highways that are so designated in the City’s General Plan and other planning documents. In many cases, a scenic roadway is designated in the General Plan but may not be further named in community or specific plan. Those roadways must have full protection from commercial signage whether or not included in community or specific plans.



**Sign Adjustment:** The ordinance would allow a zoning administrator to approve a 20% deviation from sign area and height, location, projection and clearance, and time limits on temporary signs, and would allow variances for adjustments beyond 20%. These are far from “minor” adjustments and should not be allowed without a public hearing and appeal process.

**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:** We applaud the City’s drafting of civil penalties to be incurred in response to violations of the City’s sign ordinance. The outdoor advertising industry has long demonstrated its arrogance and litigious nature when faced with compliance with codes that restrict its activities. The importance of maintaining the stated proposed fines cannot be underscored strongly enough. In fact, included in the fine structure should be an automatic annual increase tied to the consumer price index so that the City will not have to convene special hearings in order to keep the fines current. The final sign ordinance revisions must include strong enforcement provisions with accompanying large and growing fines for non-compliance. A permitting/inspection 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: Councilmember Paul Koretz and Planning Deputy Chris Koontz, CD 5  
Alan Bell and Daisy Mo, City Planning Dept.

From: **Robert Aronson** <[r\\_aronson@ureach.com](mailto:r_aronson@ureach.com)>

Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 4:49 PM

Subject: Letter to the CPC regarding the draft Citywide Sign Ordinance, Council File 08-2020

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Re: Citywide Sign Ordinance, Council File 08-2020

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar, and Krekorian,

I had thought that the City was moving in the right direction with regulating and reducing the number of off-site signs, but the most recent version of the Ordinance does exactly the opposite.

For decades, developers have done just fine without massive off-site advertising, but these days all of the developers claim that their projects don't pencil out unless they have big signs. This claim is bogus.

Please reject the draft sign ordinance, and please send it back with strong instructions to fix it, and please consider these suggestions:

First, we need to stop all installation of digital signs, unless there are regulations to prohibit them where they cause light pollution and traffic hazards. The amount of energy they use is obscene, and they completely change the character of the community in every location they are present.

Second, please prohibit off-site advertising in City parks and other public property. It is a sad statement that we might sell advertising on public property. The buses and bus shelters are awful, and expansion of this is a blight on public property and leaves us vulnerable to legal arguments of allowing advertising on City property but denying the same advertisement on private property. I know the Court has ruled in the City's favor, but that can't be counted on in the future.

Third, please require removal of at least double the number of square feet of existing signs for each new sign that the City approves.

Fourth, I suggest that all pending sign district applications should either be put on hold, or conditioned to require compliance with the final version of the sign ordinance, including the requirement of removing signs for each sign that is approved.

People care about the blight caused by lots of billboards and flashing signs. Please keep Los Angeles from becoming Times Square.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Robert Aronson  
1215 Appleton Way  
Venice, CA 90291

From: **Jorge Castillo** <[jorgec@alcoholjustice.org](mailto:jorgec@alcoholjustice.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 4:50 PM  
Subject: supporting a new sign ordinance with public health in mind Council File #08-2020  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: Ruben Rodriguez <[rodriguez@pys.org](mailto:rodriguez@pys.org)>

PLUM committee members Ed Reyes, Paul Krekorian, and Jose Huizar

Re: Council File #08-2020 - supporting a new sign ordinance with public health in mind

The Coalition to Ban Alcohol Ads on Public Property supports a sign ordinance that limits new billboards and digital signs and requires the removal of existing billboards.

Billboards promote corporate products such as alcohol that can have a negative affect on the health of communities. Research by the alcohol industry watchdog group Alcohol Justice reports that Los Angeles County pays \$ 2.2 billion in cost due to alcohol harms linked to illness, traffic accidents, crime and injury each year.

We encourage the PLUM Committee to take public health into account when creating an ordinance that will increase the promotion of a product like alcohol.

Ruben Rodriguez, Chair  
Coalition to Ban Alcohol Ads on Public Property in Los Angeles

- \* Asian American Drug Abuse Program Inc.
- \* Boyle Heights Stakeholders Association
- \* Boyle Heights Coalition for a Safe & Drug Free Community
- \* Tarzana Treatment Centers & AWARE Coalition
- \* Community Coalition
- \* Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight
- \* Day One Pasadena
- \* Los Angeles Coalition on Alcohol Policy
- \* Alcohol Justice
- \* Pueblo y Salud
- \* Sierra Club / Los Angeles Chapter
- \* United Coalition East Prevention Project
- \* Women Against Gun Violence
- \* Women's Christian Temperance Union

PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL  
The Voice of the Palisades since 1973

October 17, 2011

Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian  
c/o Michael Espinosa  
Los Angeles City PLUM Committee  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Opposed to Citywide Sign Ordinance as Revised on 10.5.11; Council File No.'s 08-2020, CF [11-1705](#)**

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian;

Pacific Palisades Community Council has twelve major objections to the proposed sign ordinance. But above all else, PPCC demands that off-site signs and digital displays adhere to its Specific Plan as well as all Specific and Community Plans throughout the City of Los Angeles. Communities worked on these plans with the CPC in good faith to assure that signage remains consistent with the low-intensity character of certain neighborhoods (i.e., single family residences, multiple residential structures, commercial uses, community oriented uses, significant open space, and parkland).

The Pacific Palisades Community Council is part of a large coalition of neighborhood and community councils, homeowner and resident organizations, and park groups who want balance and neighborhood protections restored to the Citywide Sign Ordinance ("Ordinance"). The Ordinance now pending before PLUM must be remanded back to the City Planning Commission for further public workshops and public hearings. The City Charter requires remand because of substantial procedural and substantive changes to the ordinance that the City has made since public hearings were held in 2009.

What follows are the twelve (12) reasons we object to the proposed ordinance. The specifics behind each of these 12 objections and the changes stakeholders want to see are articulated on the chart attached.

1. The "interior sign exception" enables the proliferation of on-site signs throughout the City AND off-site signs in our parks, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses. It must be re-written.
2. There is no net reduction in off-site signs required. The stated purpose and affect of the ordinance has changed to eliminate the net reduction in signage. Thus, the current ordinance is wholly inconsistent with the City's 2002 billboard ban and 2009 hearings.
3. Sign Districts can abut scenic highways, parks, recreation centers and other sensitive uses. There are no restrictions or distance limits.
4. The City can permit Sign Districts, Sign Adjustments and Sign Variances without considering any findings that include residential properties as part of the surrounding environment.

5. The City can permit Sign Districts without any consideration of visibility, or light trespass, upon residential areas.
6. “Community Benefit Measures”, as an alternative to a net reduction in signage, are vague and subjective. They must be re-written.
7. It must be made clear that planning documents (specific plans, overlays, etc.) that regulate signage more restrictively than the ordinance prevail.
8. Sign illumination limits should be cumulative and not just based on one sign.
9. Wall signs, including “supergraphic” signs, should not be allowed to cover windows or doors in sign districts and comprehensive sign programs.
10. Digital displays are not adequately regulated – and they should be.
11. Comprehensive sign programs should not include off-site signs, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses.
12. The ordinance should not grandfather in fourteen (14) sign districts instead of two (2) without a significant allowance of time for public hearings, CEQA study, equity and social justice analysis and study of the community benefit program proposed.

If you have any questions about this material, please feel free to call me at 310-496-9896 (cell) or Jennifer Malaret, the author of the chart at 310-773-7881 (cell).

Sincerely,

Janet Turner,  
Chair

Pacific Palisades Community  
Council  
310-573-0382 home/office

cc's: Councilmember Bill Rosendahl [bill.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:bill.rosendahl@lacity.org), Alan Bell [alan.bell@lacity.org](mailto:alan.bell@lacity.org)



# PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL

---

October 17, 2011

Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar & Kerkorian  
c/o Michael Espinosa  
Los Angeles City PLUM Committee  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Opposed to Citywide Sign Ordinance as Revised on 10.5.11; Council File No.'s 08-2020, CF 11-1705**

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Kerkorian;

Pacific Palisades Community Council has twelve major objections to the proposed sign ordinance. But above all else, PPCC demands that off-site signs and digital displays adhere to its Specific Plan as well as all Specific and Community Plans throughout the City of Los Angeles. Communities worked on these plans with the CPC in good faith to assure that signage remains consistent with the low-intensity character of certain neighborhoods (i.e., single family residences, multiple residential structures, commercial uses, community oriented uses, significant open space, and parkland).

The Pacific Palisades Community Council is part of a large coalition of neighborhood and community councils, homeowner and resident organizations, and park groups who want balance and neighborhood protections restored to the Citywide Sign Ordinance (“Ordinance”). The Ordinance now pending before PLUM must be remanded back to the City Planning Commission for further public workshops and public hearings. The City Charter requires remand because of substantial procedural and substantive changes to the ordinance that the City has made since public hearings were held in 2009.

What follows are the twelve (12) reasons we object to the proposed ordinance. The specifics behind each of these 12 objections and the changes stakeholders want to see are articulated on the chart attached.

1. The ‘interior sign exception’ enables the proliferation of on-site signs throughout the City AND off-site signs in our parks, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses. It must be re-written.
2. There is no net reduction in off-site signs required. The stated purpose and affect of the ordinance has changed to eliminate the net reduction in signage. Thus, the current ordinance is wholly inconsistent with the City’s 2002 billboard ban and 2009 hearings.
3. Sign Districts can abut scenic highways, parks, recreation centers and other sensitive uses. There are no restrictions or distance limits.
4. The City can permit Sign Districts, Sign Adjustments and Sign Variances without considering any findings that include residential properties as part of the surrounding environment.
5. The City can permit Sign Districts without any consideration of visibility, or light trespass, upon residential areas.
6. “Community Benefit Measures”, as an alternative to a net reduction in signage, are vague and subjective. They must be re-written.

7. It must be made clear that planning documents (specific plans, overlays, etc.) that regulate signage more restrictively than the ordinance prevail.
8. Sign illumination limits should be cumulative and not just based on one sign.
9. Wall signs, including “supergraphic” signs, should not be allowed to cover windows or doors in sign districts and comprehensive sign programs.
10. Digital displays are not adequately regulated – and they should be.
11. Comprehensive sign programs should not include off-site signs, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses.
12. The ordinance should not grandfather in fourteen (14) sign districts instead of two (2) without a significant allowance of time for public hearings, CEQA study, equity and social justice analysis and study of the community benefit program proposed.

If you have any questions about this material, please feel free to call me at 310-496-9896 (cell) or Jennifer Malaret, the author of the chart at 310-773-7881 (cell).

Sincerely,

Janet Turner, Chair  
Pacific Palisades Community Council  
310-573-0382 home/office

cc's: Councilmember Bill Rosendahl [bill.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:bill.rosendahl@lacity.org), Alan Bell [alan.bell@lacity.org](mailto:alan.bell@lacity.org)

# PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL

## CITYWIDE SIGN ORDINANCE – SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER ISSUES & DESIRED CHANGES

LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.3, 14.4.3(A) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>APPLICATION OF SIGN REGULATIONS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (1): THE INTERIOR SIGN EXCEPTION MUST BE RE-WRITTEN BECAUSE IT ALLOWS (1) A PROLIFERATION OF ON-SITE SIGNS, AND (2) OFF-SITE SIGNS IN PARKS, RECREATION CENTERS, SCHOOLS AND OTHER SENSITIVE USES</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Qualifying interior signs are not required to conform to all other provisions of the code. Planning has not made it clear to the public that this exception applies to <b>both on-site and off-site signs</b>. It is also not clear that specific plans, overlays and other plans that regulate signage must be complied with. This change is new, first disclosed to the public on 10.5.11.</li> <li>2. Qualifying interior signs will be allowed anywhere (provided they are not visible from public rights of way or adjacent property). The ample public record states that <b>off-site signs should not be allowed in parks, recreation centers and schools where children are captive advertising audiences</b>.</li> <li>3. 'Interior signs' can now face outward and be taller than surrounding buildings or walls. These allowances are completely new, first disclosed to the public on 10.5.11.</li> <li>4. In 2009, the exception for interior signs was supposed to be for large campus type properties such as entertainment, sports, cultural and academic facilities and destinations (reference Weiss Motion, 2009). The ordinance now allows unregulated signs in park recreation facilities, atrium office and apartment buildings, retail plazas and school courtyards.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All provisions of the LAMC to apply to those provisions that regulate signage, including general plan, community plans, specific plans, overlays supplemental use districts and all applicable codes.</li> <li>2. <b>Exempt parks, recreation centers and schools from the interior sign exception.</b> Also exclude other "sensitive uses", i.e., libraries, museums, Historic-Cultural Monuments, and Historic Districts.</li> <li>3. So called "interior signs" must face inward and not be higher than surrounding buildings or walls.</li> <li>4. That the exception must apply to large, campus type properties - or, at minimum, should be limited to sign districts and comprehensive sign programs.</li> </ol>



LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 12, Sec. 13.11(A) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>PURPOSE OF THE LAW THAT REGULATES OFF-SITE SIGNS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (2): A NET REDUCTION IN OFF-SITE SIGNS MUST BE REQUIRED, CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY'S 2002 BAN ON OFF-SITE SIGNS.</u></p>	<p>1. The original purpose of the ordinance has been stricken. <b>A net reduction in signage is no longer required.</b> Without requiring billboard takedown, thousands of square feet in new off-site signage can be put up in the City without a single billboard being taken down. This is a substantive change from 2009 and wholly inconsistent with the 2002 ban on off-site signs.</p> <p>2. An added purpose to the ordinance is to ‘eliminate blight or improve aesthetics or traffic safety’ using a ‘community benefits program’. First disclosed to the public on 10.5.11, this is a substantive change.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restore stricken “purpose” language that requires a net reduction in signage.</li> <li>2. Remand this ordinance back to the CPC for additional public hearings. Provide workshops with Planning, the City Attorney and stakeholders so that we can work together to evaluate the impact and consequences of a community benefit program. The public deserves time to evaluate the impact, consequence and valid “purpose” of a community benefit program as an alternative to any required billboard takedown.</li> </ol>
<p>Sec. 12, Sec. 13.11(B)(3) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>SIGN DISTRICT BOUNDARIES</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (3): SCENIC HIGHWAYS, PARKS AND OTHER SENSITIVE USES CAN ABUT SIGN DISTRICTS AND ARE NOT PROTECTED FROM IMPACTS</u></p>	<p>The ordinance <b>fails to adequately protect scenic highways, parkways, corridors, and secondary highways – along with parks, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses</b> from commercial blight because sign districts can abut them. There is no buffer zone or legal “distance limit”. There are also no distance limits or buffer zones from residentially zoned properties.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There should be no sign districts along scenic highways, parkways or corridors identified as such on state and local planning documents.</li> <li>2. Provide a 1,000-foot distance limit from any sign district boundary to a park, recreation center, school, library, museum, Historical-Cultural Monument, Historic District or residentially zoned property.</li> </ol>

LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 12, Sec. 13.11(B)(4)(d) and Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.22(B)(2), 14.4.22(B)(4) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>SIGN DISTRICT, SIGN ADJUSTMENT AND SIGN VARIANCE FINDINGS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (4): COMPATIBILITY FINDINGS FOR RESIDENTIAL AREAS ARE NEEDED FOR ADJUSTMENTS OR VARIANCES</u></p>	<p>In considering a sign district, the ordinance’s compatibility finding is ‘other nearby signs, other elements of street and site furniture and adjacent properties. <b>Residential properties should be expressly considered</b> as part of what makes the “surrounding environment”, particularly when it is expressed that other signs and street furniture are going to be considered.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modify these code sections to read “The surrounding environment shall be comprised of other nearby signs, other elements of street and site furniture, and adjacent and surrounding properties, <b>including residential areas</b>”.</li> <li>2. Even with a finding that consider residential areas, adjustment should not be allowed and Section 14.4.22 should be stricken.</li> </ol>
<p>Sec. 12, Sec. 13.11(B)(4) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>SIGN DISTRICT FINDINGS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (5): SIGN DISTRICT FINDINGS SHOULD INCLUDE VISIBILITY, OR LIGHT TRESSPASS, UPON RESIDENTIAL AREAS</u></p>	<p>In considering a sign district, the <b>City’s findings do not consider or protect residential areas from visible signs and light trespass</b>. There should be a new finding to protect residential areas.</p>	<p>A new subsection (g) should be added which states that no signs within a Sign District shall be visible from any adjacent or surrounding residential property, nor shall they create light trespass into any adjacent or surrounding residential property. The word “visible” would mean that signs or light emitted from such signs could be seen.</p>

LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 12, Sec. 13.11(C) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY BENEFITS AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO SIGN REDUCTION</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM(6): NET REDUCTION IN SIGNAGE MUST BE REQUIRED / COMMUNITY BENEFIT MEASURES ARE VAGUE, SUBJECTIVE AND MUST BE RE-WRITTEN</u></p>	<p>1. See discussion of PURPOSE OF THE LAW above.</p> <p>2. A new provision, first disclosed on 10.05.11, allows sign credits to be transferred. The transfer of credits can be a significant issue in other areas such as air rights and parking credits. This is a substantive change with unknown impacts and consequences.</p> <p>3 Any community benefits program must contain objective standards. The <b>new community benefit ‘Measures’ are vague and subjective</b>, such as “Other Improvements”, and expose the city to further litigation over off-site signs.</p>	<p>1. Restore stricken language that requires a net reduction in signage.</p> <p>2. Provide at least sixty (60) days for Planning, the City Attorney and stakeholders to work together to evaluate the impact and consequences of a ‘community benefit program’ before any future hearing on this matter. This language must be objective, unambiguous and enable all parties to quantify a “community benefit” that replaces net reduction in signage was central to the 2009 ordinance.</p>
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.3 (F) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>RELATIONSHIP OF SIGN REGULATIONS TO OTHER CODE PROVISIONS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (7): PLANNING DOCUMENTS THAT REGULATE SIGNAGE MUST PREVAIL</u></p>	<p>The ordinance does not unambiguously state that more restrictive <b>planning documents prevail</b> over less restrictive regulations in the code. Such a statement is necessary to protect the local planning process, neighborhoods and the hard work that has gone into many specific plans, overlays, etc.</p>	<p>Add language at the end of Sec. 14.4.3(F) to ensure that any provision of a Planning Document (including but not limited to Specific Plans, Overlay Districts, or conditions imposed under any discretionary approval, permit, development agreement or entitlement) regulating signage that is more restrictive than provided under this article shall prevail.</p>
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.4 (F) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>SIGN ILLUMINATION LIMITS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (8): CUMULATE LIGHT IMPACTS SHOULD BE REGULATED</u></p>	<p>The ordinance only regulates the light intensity of a single sign and says nothing about a grouping of signs. <b>The ordinance should regulate the impacts of cumulate light intensities</b> (particularly the impact on nearby residentially zoned properties) and not just the light intensity of a single sign.</p>	<p>Modify language at the start of Sec. 14.4.4 (F) to read: “No one sign or grouping of two or more signs shall be arranged and illuminated . . .”</p>

LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.9 (C)(3), 14.4.9(C)(4) of the LAMC</p> <p><b>WALL SIGNS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (9): WALL SIGNS SHOULD NOT COVER DOORS OR WINDOWS</u></p>	<p>The ordinance should not allow <b>wall sign to cover windows or doors</b> in sign districts and comprehensive sign programs even if the Fire Department determines that the sign would not create a hazardous condition. Safety is not the only issue. Such signage degrades the view to the outside, degrading the quality of life for office and apartment building tenants. In addition, <b>this allowance opens the door to multi-story vinyl and fabric supergraphic signs</b> covering entire sides of buildings.</p>	<p>Strike the language that allows wall signs to cover windows or doors, i.e., “unless the Fire Department determines that the sign would not create a hazardous condition.” This would also resolve the conflict with Sec. 14.4.4(D)(5) that states that no sign can obstruct the free operation of a door or window. The latter requirement is preferred.</p>
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.19 of the LAMC</p> <p><b>REGULATIONS FOR DIGITAL DISPLAYS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (10): DIGITAL DISPLAYS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY REGULATED – AND THEY SHOULD BE</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The only regulations for electronic signs are that messages can't change faster than 8 seconds and brightness limits (day and evening) cannot be exceeded. Thus, <b>the ordinance fails to address many, many problematic aspects of digital displays.</b></li> <li>2. In 2009, the CPC prohibited electronic signage outside of sign districts. The revised ordinance allows electronic signs as on-site business signs anywhere in the City.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ordinance must have new subparagraphs that regulate: (D) the distance and spacing between digital signs, (E) hours of sign operation (preferably absolute AM and PM limits; other static measurements could be based on zoning, property size, building height, street width and classification, or traffic speed), (F) light trespass or spillover effects on residentially zoned property, (G) limits on energy use and mandated reductions in carbon footprints, (H) glare, and (I) the timing of message transition periods when multiple signs are in close proximity (i.e., a specified number of yards) to each other.</li> <li>2. At minimum, a citywide moratorium should be placed on the installation of any new electronic signs and conversion of existing signs until regulations are in place that protects residents, motorists, communities and others from adverse effects.</li> </ol>

<b>LAMC Section &amp; Problem</b>	<b>Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings</b>	<b>What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!</b>
<p>Sec. 13, Art. 4.4, Sec. 14.4.24 of the LAMC</p> <p><b>COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PROGRAMS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (11):</u>  <u>COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PROGRAMS SHOULD NOT INCLUDE OFF-SITE SIGNS, RECREATION CENTERS, SCHOOLS AND OTHER SENSITIVE USES</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2009, the CPC prohibited off-site signs and other electronic signage within comprehensive sign programs. Now, off-site signs are allowed (provided that they are not visible from the public rights or way or adjacent property). Strike entirely 14.4.24(E)(5) and 14.4.24(E)(6)(d); modify 14.4.24(D) and 14.4.24(E)(1).</li> <li>Comprehensive sign programs should not be allowed in any area of a specific plan, overlay, supplemental use district or other applicable code, that contains special signage requirements.</li> <li>While the 10.5.11 revisions prohibit any comprehensive sign program from including a portion of a “public park”, this language should be clarified and expanded to protect recreation centers, schools, and other sensitive uses.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be no off-site signs in comprehensive sign programs.</li> <li>Restore stricken word ‘Overlay’ to Sec. 14.4.24(B)(2). It is not clear whether a Supplemental Use District necessarily includes an Overlay.</li> <li>Expand 14.4.24(B)(3) such that comprehensive sign programs cannot be requested to include schools, recreation centers, libraries, museums, Historic-Cultural Monuments, and Historic Districts.</li> </ol>

LAMC Section & Problem	Concerns / Substantive Changes from '09 Public Hearings	What Neighborhood Stakeholders Want NOW!
<p>Sec. 14, Art. 4.4 of the LAMC</p> <p><b>APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS AND INTIATED OR APPLIED FOR SIGN DISTRICTS AND SPECIFIC PLANS</b></p> <p><u>PROBLEM (12): 14 SIGN DISTRICTS SHOULD NOT NOW BE 'GRANDFATHERED' INSTEAD OF ONLY 2 SIGN DISTRICTS</u></p>	<p>1. In 2009, the CPC considered 'grandfathering' in just two sign districts for which the new sign regulations would not apply. The existing ordinance grandfathers in 12 more districts for a total of 14 grandfathered sign districts. These new districts are not entitled to grandfathering (no vested rights) and undermine the ordinance's requirements for sign districts under the standards articulated by the Ninth Circuit.</p> <p>2. This grandfathering creates the risk of significant environmental impacts under CEQA. Planning has promise, but not yet provided, a CEQA update.</p> <p>3. There has been no equity analysis done by the City to ensure that the benefits and burdens of sign districts are distributed equally and do not disproportionately burden low income communities and communities of color.</p> <p>4. The inclusion of a new 'community benefit program' makes it unclear how much, if any, sign reduction will take place in these grandfathered districts.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remand this ordinance back to the CPC for additional public hearings and notice. Provide workshops with Planning, the City Attorney and stakeholders so that we can work together to evaluate the impact and consequences.</li> <li>2. Allows sufficient time for publication, review and public hearing on an updated CEQA study.</li> <li>3. The city must perform an equity analysis to ensure that the ordinance has no disproportionate impact on low-income communities and communities of color, and that social justice issues have been adequately considered.</li> <li>4. Remand to CPC for time to evaluate the impact, consequence and valid "purpose" of a community benefit program as an alternative to any required billboard takedown.</li> </ol>

**From:** jreichmann [mailto:[jreichmann@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jreichmann@sbcglobal.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2011 3:46 PM

**To:** '[councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)'; '[councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)'

**Cc:** '[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)'; '[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)'; '[councilmember.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.koretz@lacity.org)'

**Subject:** Sign ordinance changes

**Importance:** High

Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should::

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I don't want my city turned into replicas of Time Square or Las Vegas.

Members of my Westwood community of Comstock Hills have a digital billboard blinking into their homes every seven seconds. Converting to digital converted their homes into living nightmares.

This is not acceptable. We won a favorable ruling from the Westside Planning Commission when we fought Clear Channel regarding this site. But although it was deemed "illegal" by virtue of the "illegal settlement" that the LA City Council approved, it still remains a cash cow for the billboard company. Just once start thinking of the welfare of your citizens who elected you.

Jan Reichmann, President

Comstock Hills Homeowners Association

Cc: Councilmember Koretz

From: **Jordan Goldman** <[jordgold@gmail.com](mailto:jordgold@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 12:59 PM  
Subject: Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)

Mr. Espinosa, please distribute my comments to the committee members for the Oct. 18 meeting. Thank you!

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one-to-one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

PS - I live in Valencia, but work in Los Angeles... and hope to one day move back to LA proper!

Sincerely,

Jordan Goldman  
28540 N Pietro Dr  
Valencia, CA 91354-2696



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

Regarding: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance.

I'm appalled that you would consider allowing advertising signs in public parks. Not only parks, but all areas of town that are public belong to the people who live in them. People in their own neighborhoods must be able to control their surroundings and not have their environments taken over by outside business interests whose primary purpose is creating profits for themselves by selling their products. A neighborhood can be ruined by crime and poverty, but it can also be brought down by ugliness and demoralized when its own independent personality is plastered over with oppressive amounts of advertising.

Another terrible problem is light pollution and waste of energy from these digital billboards. No one wants these in their neighborhoods. The advertisers don't care, because they can afford to live in neighborhoods that are protected from this ugliness.

Sincerely,

Diana Singleton  
397 Inverness Drive  
La Cañada, CA 91011

From: **Michael Espinosa** <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 3:56 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: Sharon Gin <[sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org)>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Whitehorse Productions** <[whitehorseprod@aol.com](mailto:whitehorseprod@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 3:46 PM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,  
James Belushi  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

From: <[MKrell1026@aol.com](mailto:MKrell1026@aol.com)>

Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 10:40 PM

Subject: Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)

Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Krell

820 So. Gretna Green Way

LA, CA 90049

From: **Kevin Tent** <[kelkintrent@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kelkintrent@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2011 at 12:37 AM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), Tom LaBonge <[councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org)>

Dear Committee Members,

I strongly urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. We have a beautiful city but over the years it has become polluted with ridiculously large and obnoxious billboards. And just when one thinks it can't get any worse these advertisers have come up with digital billboards. They are truly a tragedy. The amount of light pollution is obscene. They're distracting, obnoxious and I would suggest even dangerous, as they distract drivers with there intensity and constantly changing images. Images I'll also add that are often inappropriate for children.

Other cities and towns in our area have sign control. And when you drive through Sierra Madre or even Culver City guess what? It's quite a pleasant experience. It looks nice and esthetically pleasing. If our neighboring cities can control their signage why can't we. Please don't buckle to the pressure of lobbyist working for these insensitive advertising corporations. They will argue they have the right to put up new billboards, but I would argue I have the right not to be subjected to their constant barrage of advertising. I have lived and have been a citizen of Los Angeles for 30 years. Are these companies even located in our city? Are they citizens? Unlikely I'm sure.

So please reject the new proposal to weaken the recent work you've done.

In addition I feel any new ordinance should include the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other type of off-site advertising signs. This will help get us back to a time before our city was overtaken with billboards.

It should also provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.

Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provision of the sign ordinance.

Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use and change in community character.

We should be striving to make Los Angeles a more beautiful city - not a junkier, tackier version of what we have now. Years of neglect of strong sign control have gotten us to where are today. It's time to undo some of that damage and protect what natural beauty we still have left.

Sincerely,

Kevin Tent  
5234 Los Bonitos Way  
Los Angeles, CA 90027

From: **Eric Wrobbel** <[eric@ericwrobbel.com](mailto:eric@ericwrobbel.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 9:44 PM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

I am in advertising. But I am appalled at the advertising blight that litters our city.

Advertising certainly has its place. I should hope so. But NOT in the public space. I'm serious! There are all manner of media for advertising (magazines, TV, etc.) that do not encroach upon the public and impose unwanted messages to a captive audience. Off-site signage and billboards are blight. They are nothing more than corporate graffiti.

The purveyors of this blight want you to see things their way. Well, their way is "Blade Runner."

It's time to take a stand.

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.

Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.

Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.

Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Eric Wrobbel  
20802 Exhibit Court  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

Attached is my letter to PLUM on behalf of six Los Angeles stakeholder organizations with regard to the proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance scheduled for a hearing on Tuesday, October 18, 2011,

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my views on the matter.

Sincerely,

John P. Given, Esq.  
(310) 471-8485

LAW OFFICE OF JOHN P. GIVEN

2461 Santa Monica Blvd., #438

Santa Monica, CA 90404

john@johngivenlaw.com

(310) 471-8485

***Via hand delivery to PLUM Committee: Chairman Reyes, Committee Member Huizar,  
Committee Member Krekorian***

October 18, 2011

Council of the City of Los Angeles  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Proposed Ordinance Revising Citywide Sign Regulations  
Council File Nos. 08-2020, 11-1705  
(City Planning Commission Case No. CPC-2009-0008-CA)

Dear Chairman Reyes and Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use  
Management Committee:

This letter is written on behalf of the Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight,<sup>1</sup> Hillside  
Federation,<sup>2</sup> Brentwood Residents Coalition,<sup>3</sup> Pacific Palisades Residents Association,<sup>4</sup>  
Holmby-Westwood Property Owners Association,<sup>5</sup> and Westwood South of Santa

---

<sup>1</sup> The Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight is a registered non-profit 501(c)(4) organization dedicated to defending our public spaces and protecting our visual environment. BBB represents groups and individuals committed to defending the urban landscape of Los Angeles from a proliferation of billboards, supergraphic signs, and other forms of outdoor advertising that blight our public spaces.

<sup>2</sup> The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, founded in 1952, represents thirty-three homeowner and residents associations that span the Santa Monica Mountains from Pacific Palisades to Mt. Washington. It represents more than 200,000 constituents. The Federation's mission is to protect the property and the quality of life of the residents of the Santa Monica Mountains and other hillside areas of Los Angeles and its environs.

<sup>3</sup> The Brentwood Residents Coalition is a grass roots, non-profit advocacy group whose purposes are to preserve and enhance the environment and quality of life in Brentwood, to protect the integrity of residential neighborhoods, to assist with planning, to uphold zoning and municipal codes, to encourage traffic safety, and to educate the public on issues that affect quality of life and the environment.

<sup>4</sup> Pacific Palisades Residents Association is an all volunteer non-profit Palisades community-wide organization established 1958 with mission to preserve and protect mountain, community and coastal recreational resources; protect single family residential neighborhoods with rational planning by upholding zoning and municipal codes; and educate elected officials and public on issues that impact quality of life and the environment.

<sup>5</sup> Holmby-Westwood Property Owners Association represents 1,100 single family homes on the westside of Los Angeles and recently celebrated its fiftieth year serving our community. The Mission of the HWPOA is to engage the forces that affect and impact the quality of life within Holmby-Westwood in a positive manner to ensure the protection and preservation of the quality, character, and property values of the Holmby Westwood community.

Monica Boulevard Homeowners Association.<sup>6</sup>

The City Charter is unequivocal that the City Planning Commission's guidance during the process of adoption, amendment, or repeal of a zoning ordinance is mandatory, unless the CPC has delegated its authority to the Director of Planning. LOS ANGELES, CAL., CHARTER § 559.<sup>7</sup> The CPC has not delegated its authority to the Director of Planning on this ordinance. Moreover, the ordinance has been substantially modified during the more than two and a half years since the CPC transmitted its report and recommendation to the Council and requires further review by CPC before the Council may take final action.

There are two clear rationales for the City Charter requirement that modified ordinances go back to the CPC prior to final action by the City Council. First, the CPC is unquestionably the City commission with the most expertise with regard to zoning and land use issues. By definition, the Commission is charged with providing advice and guidance to elected officials, municipal departments and agencies on all manner of land use issues within the City. CHARTER § 551. Individual commissioners generally have many years of training and experience in land use planning.<sup>8</sup> In fulfilling its obligations under the Charter, the Commission works closely with the Director of Planning and Planning staff. Second, the CPC often gains invaluable input from the community at its hearings. For example, even during its accelerated schedule on the ordinance now before PLUM, the CPC received more than four and a half hours of public testimony over the course of five separate hearings during the first three months of 2009 alone. The ordinance has changed substantially since then, and requires additional public comment. Due to CPC's unique expertise, its hearings provide the best opportunity for community members to contribute meaningful input to the City on proposed land use ordinances.

In addition, it seems likely that some CPC commissioners might like to have another opportunity to formally review the revised ordinance. Following the Directors Report at

---

<sup>6</sup> Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association, established as a non-profit mutual benefit organization in 1971, represents over 3,800 *single-family and condominium* homes located between Santa Monica and Pico Boulevards on the north and south, and Beverly Glen and Sepulveda Boulevards on the east and west.

<sup>7</sup> All references are to the current City Charter, operative July 1, 2000, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>8</sup> A few examples of the land use expertise among sitting commissioners: Commission President Roschen is an architect honored as a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects, served for 15 years on the Hollywood Community Redevelopment Agency, and is an expert on a variety of land use topics, including green building and energy efficient design; Commissioner Burton is a land use attorney and served multiple terms on the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission, including serving as President; Commissioner Cardoso is an Urban Planner graduate of UCLA with two decades of land use planning experience; Commissioner Kim served as a Central Area Planning Commissioner prior to joining the CPC; Commissioner Romero has served the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority in several capacities, including as Chief of Urban Projects and Watershed Division; and, Commissioner Woo, a former Los Angeles City Council member, has a Master of City Planning degree from UC Berkeley, taught urban planning and development at USC for seven years, and is currently Dean of the College of Environmental Design, Cal Poly Pomona.



the CPC hearing on August 11, 2011, for example, Commissioner Freer asked Deputy Planning Director Alan Bell: “Under what circumstances might we have the pleasure of receiving this back to us, or would we, ever?”<sup>9</sup>

The stakeholder organizations respectfully request that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee not follow the first two recommendations of the October 5, 2011 letter from the Deputy Director of Planning regarding the proposed sign ordinance now before PLUM.<sup>10</sup> Instead, for the reasons outlined above and discussed more fully below, PLUM must refer the proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance back to the CPC so that it may fulfill its obligations under the City Charter.

## **I. THE CITY CHARTER REQUIRES THE CPC TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCES, WHETHER ORIGINAL OR MODIFIED**

The City Charter states that the CPC “*shall*:

- (a) give advice and make recommendations to the Mayor, Council, Director of Planning, municipal departments and agencies with respect to City planning and related activities and legislation;
- (b) make recommendations concerning amendment of the General Plan and proposed zoning ordinances in accordance with Sections 555 and 558;
- (c) make reports and recommendations to the Council and to other governmental officers or agencies as may be necessary to implement and secure compliance with the General Plan; and
- (d) perform other functions prescribed by the Charter or ordinance.”

CHARTER § 551 (emphasis added).

Charter § 558 spells out the process by which land use ordinances may be adopted, and restates that the recommendation of the CPC is required before the Council may take action on an ordinance. *See* CHARTER § 558(b)(2).<sup>11</sup> The CPC’s recommendation to approve or disapprove of a proposed ordinance is what determines whether the Council may pass an ordinance with a simple majority or must obtain a two-thirds majority.

---

<sup>9</sup> An “mp3” recording of this portion of the August 11, 2011, CPC hearing is available at: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/StaffRpt/Audios/CPC/2011/08-11-2011/03DirectorsReportb.mp3>.

<sup>10</sup> To wit, the first two recommendations of the Deputy Director’s letter are to:

- “1. Adopt the Planning Department’s reports dated July 22, 2011 and October 5, 2011.
- “2. Approve the attached ordinance and direct the City Attorney to review for form and legality and prepare and present an ordinance for final consideration by PLUM.”

<sup>11</sup> “After initiation, the proposed ordinance, order or resolution shall be referred to the City Planning Commission for its report and recommendation regarding the relation of the proposed ordinance, order or resolution to the General Plan and, in the case of proposed zoning regulations, whether adoption of the proposed ordinance, order or resolution will be in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice . . . *After* the City Planning Commission has made its report and recommendation, or after the time for it to act has expired, the Council may consider the matter.” CHARTER § 558(b)(2).

CHARTER § 558(b)(3). The current Charter provides that “to the extent the provisions of this Charter are the same in terms or effect as provisions of the Charter . . . they shall be construed and applied as a continuation of those provisions.” CHARTER § 110(b). Section 558(b)(2) is a continuation of former Charter § 97.2, which states, perhaps even more clearly than the current Charter does, that an ordinance must be presented to CPC for approval or disapproval prior to action on the ordinance by the City Council.<sup>12</sup> *Accord, Schofield v. Los Angeles*, 120 Cal. App. 240 (Cal. Ct. App. 1932).<sup>13</sup>

Although the municipal code provides time constraints within which the CPC must act in providing its report and recommendation to the Council, *see* LAMC § 12.32(C)(6), neither the Charter nor the municipal code appears to provide support for the proposition that the Council may act on a substantively modified ordinance without, at some point, receiving the CPC’s further recommendation prior to taking final action. Where, as here, the ordinance before Council contains substantial changes, the City’s Charter and statutory scheme requires that CPC be given the opportunity to recommend approval or disapproval of the proposed ordinance before the City Council may take final action. The practice of referring ordinances, orders, or resolutions back to CPC for further review and approval due to even minor modifications is historic, such that in 1964 the CPC passed a resolution delegating authority to the Director of Planning under previous City Charter § 97.8.<sup>14</sup> The purpose of the 1964 delegation was for the CPC to avoid spending time on “routine matters of a repetitive nature” when modifications requiring further review were only editorial or clerical in nature, and not substantive, as often happens following re-drafting of an ordinance for form and legality by the City Attorney.

This is consistent with California state law, which requires that a city council “may approve, modify or disapprove the recommendation of the planning commission; *provided that any modification of the proposed ordinance or amendment by the legislative body not previously considered by the planning commission during its hearing, shall first be referred to the planning commission for report and recommendation[.]*” CAL. GOVT. CODE § 65857 (Deering 2011) (emphasis added). Of course, not all land use sections of the Government Code specifically apply to a charter city such as Los Angeles, *see* CAL. GOVT. CODE § 65803, but the City’s Charter and

---

<sup>12</sup> Former Charter § 97.2 states, in part, that “[n]o ordinance, order or resolution shall be adopted by the Council effectuating . . . the establishment, change or repeal of regulations applying within any of said zones, districts, yards, open spaces, or setbacks *unless it shall have first been submitted to the City Planning Commission for report and recommendation . . .*” LOS ANGELES, CAL. CHARTER § 97.2 (1969).

<sup>13</sup> “It is manifest it was the legislative intent in the drafting of the charter provisions under consideration, to provide for a city planning commission in fact, as well as in name, and not to allow any zone ordinance to be passed until the proposed ordinance was submitted to the commissioners, whose duty required the making of recommendation as to whether the particular ordinance submitted to them should or should not be passed.” *Schofield v. Los Angeles*, 120 Cal. App. 240, 245 (Cal. Ct. App. 1932).

<sup>14</sup> *See* Resolution of the City Planning Commission (July 27, 2000), attached to Memorandum of Gabriele Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II of the City Planning Commission, to All [Planning Department] Staff (August 11, 2000).

Code are not in conflict with state law, and the City’s historic practice has been to bring even minor modifications back to CPC, as evidenced by the necessity of the 1964 and 2000 resolutions by CPC to delegate authority to the Director to approve otherwise-conforming ordinances that contain minor editorial and clerical changes.

Because the CPC has neither had the chance to report and recommend on the modified sign ordinance now before PLUM, nor has it delegated authority to the Director of Planning to act on its behalf, the proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance must be returned to CPC for its report and recommendation prior to further Council action.

**II. THERE IS NO DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF THE MODIFIED SIGN ORDINANCE.**

The Director of Planning, the “chief administrative officer of the Department of City Planning,” is charged with preparing all proposed zoning and other land use regulations. CHARTER § 553. For an initiated zoning ordinance, as here, “[t]he Director shall make a recommendation for action on the matter, which recommendation *shall then be heard by the Planning Commission.*” LAMC § 12.32(C)(2) (emphasis added).

Following the report and recommendation of CPC transmitted to Council in April 2009, multiple substantive revisions of the sign ordinance have been made by the Planning Department. The Director of Planning and Planning Department staff are to be commended for educating stakeholders on the continued revisions to the Citywide Sign Ordinance, being receptive to additional public input, and responding to concerns of City actors, including PLUM, the City Attorney, and the Department of Building and Safety, during recent months. These actions are not, however, an adequate substitute for the guidance CPC provides the City Council as mandated by the City Charter.

The City Charter allows the CPC to delegate authority to the Director of Planning “to approve or disapprove for the Commission any ordinance, order or resolution or modification thereto which is subject to the provisions of Section[] . . . 558.” CHARTER §§ 559. The CPC has *not* recommended approval or disapproval of the nonconforming modifications made to the Citywide Sign Ordinance, nor has it delegated its authority to the Director of Planning to do so on its behalf.<sup>15</sup>

There is only one resolution providing standing delegation of authority to the Planning Director. The standing delegation allows the Director “to approve or disapprove for the City Planning Commission any ordinance, order or resolution or modification thereto . . .

---

<sup>15</sup> Review of all CPC agendas posted at the Department of Planning web site since the CPC acted to recommend approval of the sign ordinance on March 26, 2009 as it then existed, fails to disclose any CPC agenda item related to delegating authority to the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove of modifications to that ordinance.

which conform [sic] with the last action of the City Planning Commission upon such matter, when in the exercise of sound discretion and judgment, he or she determines that such ordinance, order or resolution conforms with the expressed intent of the City Planning Commission even though there may be minor changes for editorial and clarification purposes therein.”<sup>16</sup>

When read in isolation, it is hard to understand how one could interpret this resolution to provide the sweeping authority to the Director or Planning Department necessary to recommend approval or disapproval of ordinances upon which CPC has previously acted if those ordinances have been substantively modified at all. When read in context, it is even more apparent that the motivation to pass the July 27, 2000 resolution was CPC’s desire to continue delegating to the Director only matters that conform in substance with prior CPC action. This previous act of delegation shows that even conforming matters require referral back to the CPC for an additional report and recommendation to Council due to the “minor changes for editorial and clarification purposes” made during the legislative process, most often after the City Attorney has re-drafted an ordinance, order, or resolution for form and legality.<sup>17</sup>

The practice of referring back to CPC is historic, as evidenced by the standing delegations of authority passed by the CPC in 1964 and 2000. The motivation for the 2000 ordinance seems to be that the 1964 resolution was no longer valid, since, as of July 1, 2000, the 1964 resolution was superseded by the new City Charter. *See* July 27, 2000 resolution at ¶¶ 2-3.<sup>18</sup> The CPC, intending to continue its delegation of authority to the Director for those ordinances that conform in intent, but contain minor clerical changes, noted that “Charter Section 559 is inherently the same provision that was permitted by Section 97.8 of the previous City Charter which was superseded on July 1, 2000[.]” *Id.* at ¶ 2.

Nonetheless, in Deputy Planning Director Alan Bell’s report to PLUM dated October 5, 2011, the Planning Department recommends PLUM approve the now substantially modified sign ordinance.<sup>19</sup> But neither the Director of Planning nor Deputy Director Bell have authority to recommend approval of the currently proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance on behalf of the CPC, because the ordinance contains so many substantive

---

<sup>16</sup> Memorandum of Gabriele Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II of the City Planning Commission, to All [Planning Department] Staff (August 11, 2000) (attaching the July 27, 2000 resolution of the CPC, as well as the September 30, 1965 “Action of the City Planning Commission” upon which the July 2000 resolution was based in part) (attached as Appendix A).

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Deputy Director Bell’s letter states:

“Staff recommends that PLUM take the following actions:

1. Adopt the Planning Department’s reports dated July 22, 2011 and October 5, 2011.
2. Approve the attached ordinance . . .”, etc.

Letter from Alan Bell, Deputy Planning Director, to PLUM, p.2 (Oct. 5, 2011) (*hereinafter* Bell Report).

changes that it cannot, “in the exercise of sound discretion and judgment,” be said to conform with the ordinance approved by the CPC on March 26, 2009.

Instead of acting upon the Deputy Director’s unauthorized requests for action, PLUM must refer the modified Citywide Sign Ordinance back to the CPC for its report and recommendation as required by the Charter.

### **III. The October 5, 2011 Revision of the Citywide Sign Ordinance Does Not Conform with the March 26, 2009 Revision Previously Approved by the CPC**

A comparison of the proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance recommended for Council approval by the CPC on March 26, 2009 and the version currently before PLUM discloses a large number of substantive differences between the two.<sup>20</sup> These many differences, some of them quite profound in effect, clearly show that the current revision of the Citywide Sign Ordinance does not substantively conform to the March 26, 2009 revision that the CPC recommended for approval by the City Council.

Two of the proposed changes of greatest concern are even described by Deputy Director Bell as “significant revisions.” The first of these adds an entirely new “Community Benefits Program” that, according to Deputy Bell, “has been developed as an option that could potentially . . . *replace required Sign Reduction* for proposed Sign Districts.”<sup>21</sup> Although labeled a “Community Benefits” provision, this revision completely undercuts one of the true benefits of the Citywide Sign Ordinance, a reduction in billboard proliferation within our City. Introducing an option late in the process, only *after* the ordinance has already received a recommendation of approval by the CPC, which allows applicants the possibility of trading off certain “community benefits” (likely to benefit applicants as much or more than the community) “*in lieu of all* or a portion of the sign reduction requirement” is a terrible way to go about drafting and enacting such a significant piece of legislation.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, the changes to the “Grandfathering” provisions of the Citywide Sign Ordinance are cause for serious concern. “Grandfathering” of pending Sign Districts or

---

<sup>20</sup> Both versions of the Citywide Sign Ordinance are part of the administrative record, and available for download at the Council File Management System website. See Transmittal from CPC to City Council: Letter from James Williams, Executive Assistant to CPC, to City Council, Attachment 8 (Ordinance (Appendix C)) (Apr. 8, 2009) (*hereinafter* March 26, 2009 Ordinance), available at: [http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008/08-2020\\_rpt\\_cpc\\_4-8-09.pdf](http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2008/08-2020_rpt_cpc_4-8-09.pdf); and, Letter from Alan Bell, Deputy Planning Director, to PLUM, Attachment 1 (Proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance) (Oct. 5, 2011) (*hereinafter* Oct. 5, 2011 Ordinance), available at: [http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2011/11-1705\\_RPT\\_PLAN\\_10-05-11.pdf](http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2011/11-1705_RPT_PLAN_10-05-11.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> Bell Report, pp. 1, 3-4, *supra* note 19 (emphasis added); see also, Bell Report Attachment 1 (Proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance (Oct. 5, 2011)), pp. 5-7.

<sup>22</sup> Bell Report, p.3.

Specific Plans allows “sign types prohibited by the proposed sign ordinance.”<sup>23</sup> In the original Citywide Sign Ordinance, two pending Sign Districts were approved for grandfathering “because they had already been approved by the CPC prior to its approval of the new sign ordinance[.]”<sup>24</sup> Subsequent to the March 26, 2009 ordinance being recommended for approval by the CPC, there are now a total of fourteen Sign Districts or Specific Plans asking for exemptions. Planning has revised the ordinance to allow this by changing the cutoff date for eligibility for “grandfathering” from March 26, 2009, to August 9, 2011.<sup>25</sup> There is no compelling reason to justify the change, and it is unquestionably a substantive revision of the sign ordinance that requires further review by the CPC before the Council may take final action.

An additional example of a significant substantive revision is the so-called “interior sign exception” added to Sec. 13 of the Oct. 5, 2011 ordinance.<sup>26</sup> In the original proposed ordinance, there is *no* exception to this code section, which states simply that: “[a]ll exterior signs and sign support structures shall conform to the requirements of this article and all other applicable provisions of this Code.”<sup>27</sup> Following the CPC’s recommendation of approval of the March 26, 2009 ordinance, the “interior sign exception” cited above was added. By its plain meaning, this exception could allow off-site signs within public parks. It seems most unlikely that the CPC could have intended this result, and such a dramatic change requires the CPC’s further review.

There are also cases of code language being reinstated in the Oct. 5, 2011 revision after having been specifically stricken from the March 26, 2009 version. For example, the current municipal code section dealing with the area of monument signs is as follows:

“A. Area.

1. The sign area of monument signs shall not exceed 1.5 square feet per foot of street frontage nor a maximum of 75 square feet for the sign face visible to the same direction of traffic.
2. The combined sign area of monument signs, projecting signs, wall signs, illuminated architectural canopy signs, pole signs, roof signs and window signs shall not exceed four square feet for each foot of street frontage.”

LAMC § 14.4.8(A). In the March 26, 2009 proposed ordinance, recommended for approval by the CPC, that language was stricken and replaced with the much simpler: “Area. The maximum sign area of any one monument sign shall not exceed a total of 60 square feet for all the sign faces.”<sup>28</sup> But the Oct. 5, 2011 proposed ordinance would strip away this simpler language and reinstate the status quo ante by re-adopting the existing

---

<sup>23</sup> Bell Report Attachment 2 (“Grandfathering” of Pending Sign Districts and Specific Plans), p. 1.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> Compare Oct. 5, 2011 Ordinance, Sec. 14, pp. 44-45 (APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS...), with March 26, 2009 Ordinance, Sec. 12, p. C-47.

<sup>26</sup> Oct. 5, 2011 Ordinance, *supra* note 20, pp. 13-14.

<sup>27</sup> March 26, 2011 Ordinance, *supra* note 20, p. C-6.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at C-12.

municipal code provision.<sup>29</sup> There are numerous examples of similar reinstatements in the Oct. 5 revision, all evidence that the ordinance now before PLUM has been substantively changed and requires the CPC to report and recommend anew before the Council may take final action on the ordinance.<sup>30</sup>

To further underscore this point, following is a non-exhaustive list of sections of the currently proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance before PLUM that are substantively different from those in the March 26, 2009 ordinance, as well as several provisions removed entirely from the earlier version:<sup>31</sup>

*Section 1:* Change Section 11.5.7 – Section K. Sign Regulations;

*Section 4:* Delete 12.21.1(B)(3)(c);

*Section 5:* Reinstate previously deleted Section 12.22(A)(23)(a)(6)(i);

*Section 7:* Reinstate previously deleted Section 12.22(A)(23)(c)(1)(iii);

*Section 11:* Add new section amending LAMC § 91.6216.4.3;

*Section 12:*

- 1) Change 13.11(A) “Purpose” (of “SN” Sign Districts);
- 2) Change 13.11(B) “Establishment of Districts,” including:
  - a. Change boundary requirements
  - b. Change required findings
- 3) Change 31.11(C), instituting the Community Benefit Program as an option to Sign Reduction requirements;
- 4) Change 13.11(D) “Sign Regulations”;
- 5) Change 13.11(F) “Administration” (changes to required findings);

*Section 13:*

- 1) Change 14.4.1 “Purpose” (add subsection (F));
- 2) Change 14.4.2 “Definitions,” including:
  - a. Add definition for and limitation to “Aerial View Sign”

---

<sup>29</sup> See Oct. 5, 2011 Ordinance, *supra* note 20, pp. 19-20 (now renumbered as Sec. 14.4.7).

<sup>30</sup> These examples include (all referencing the Oct. 5, 2011 revision) reinstatement of: § 14.4.5(A)-(C) (entitled “Freeway Exposure”); § 14.4.9(A) (“Projecting Signs - Permitted”); § 14.4.9(A) (“Wall Signs – Area”); § 14.4.10 (“Illuminated Architectural Canopy Signs – Area”); § 14.4.9(A)-(C) (“Pole Signs”); and, § 14.4.12 (“Roof Signs”) (entirely removed from the March 26, 2009 revision, but reinstated in the Oct. 5, 2011 revision).

<sup>31</sup> Note that the numbering scheme between versions is different as a result of re-organization. To avoid confusion, the code section numbers above are taken from the Oct. 5, 2011 revision, except where they refer to provisions removed from the March 26, 2009 version.

- b. Add definition for “Can Sign”
  - c. Add definition for “Captive Balloon Sign”
  - d. Add definition for “Exterior Sign”
  - e. Add definition for “Hanging Sign”
  - f. Change definition for “Off-Site Sign”
  - g. Change definition for “On-Site Sign”
  - h. Add definition for “Pillar Sign”
  - i. Add definition for “Sandwich Board Sign”
  - j. Change definition for “Wall Sign”
- 3) Change 14.4.3 “Application,” including subsection (A), “Scope”
- 4) Change 14.4.4:
- a. Remove “digital displays from 14.4.4(C)(8)
  - b. Modify 14.4.4(C)(9)
  - c. Remove the subsection from 14.4.4(C) regarding roof signs
  - d. Change 14.4.4(D) to add (D)(5)
  - e. Change 14.4.4(F) “Sign Illumination Limitations”, and add clause regarding digital displays
  - f. Remove former 14.4.4(K) “Maximum Sign Area”
  - g. Remove former 14.4.4(M) “Maximum Number of Signs”
  - h. Add exception to 14.4.4(M) “Relief”
  - i. Add 14.4.4(N) “Replacement of Signs on Historic Buildings”
- 5) Remove former 14.4.5 “Hazard to Traffic”
- 6) Change 14.4.5 “Freeway Exposure”:
- a. Change 14.4.5(A) to increase distance for which code section applies, among other changes
  - b. Reinstate previously removed 14.4.5(A) paragraph 2, 14.4.5(B) & (C)
- 7) Change 14.4.7 “Monument Signs”:
- a. Remove previous language and reinstate language specifically removed from 14.4.7(A) in March 26, 2009 revision
  - b. Remove previous language and reinstate language specifically removed from 14.4.7(C)-(E) in March 26, 2009 revision
- 8) Change 14.4.8(A) & (B) “Projecting Signs”: Remove previous language and reinstate language specifically removed from March 26, 2009 revision, add new language



- 9) Change 14.4.9:
  - a. Reinstate language specifically removed from March 26, 2009 revision of 14.4.9(A)
  - b. Remove exception from 14.4.9(C) "Location" and add clauses related to LAFD to (C)(4) and (C)(5)
  - c. Simplify 14.4.9(E) "High Rise Signs"
  
- 10) Change 14.4.10 "Architectural Canopy Signs; change 14.4.10(A):
  - a. In subsection (1) remove previous language and reinstate language specifically removed in March 26, 2009 revision;
  - b. In subsection (3)-(4) reinstate language specifically stricken in March 26, 2009 revision.
  
- 11) Change 14.4.11 "Pole Signs":
  - a. Reinstate language specifically removed from March 26, 2009 revision of 14.4.9(A)
  - b. Reinstate language specifically removed from March 26, 2009 revision of 14.4.9(B), increase limits four-fold
  - c. Reinstate language specifically removed from March 26, 2009 revision of 14.4.9(C)
  
- 12) Reinstate 14.4.12 "Roof Signs": Entire section reinstated after having been removed from the March 26, 2009 revision;
  
- 13) Reinstate 14.4.13(B) to "Window Signs";
  
- 14) Change 14.4.14 "Marquee Signs";
  
- 15) Added new 14.4.15(A) to "Temporary Signs";
  
- 16) Added new paragraph as 14.4.16(F)(8) "Temporary Signs on Temporary Construction Walls";
  
- 17) Add reference to Cal. Building Code to 14.4.18 "Awning Signs";
  
- 18) Add new 14.4.19 "Digital Displays"
  
- 19) Change 14.4.21 "Signs in A and R Zones": increase max sign area six sq. ft. to 20 sq ft, add monument signs to subsections (C)(3)-(4)
  
- 20) Change 14.4.22 "Sign Adjustments" and 14.4.23 "Sign Variance, alter findings required;

- 21) Change 14.4.24 “Comprehensive Sign Program”: change purpose, change eligibility, add new subsections (b)(2)-(3); elevate initial decision maker and appellate body to CPC and Council, respectively; now allows max 10% off-site signs (previously allowed none); different findings required; omitted amendment of CSPs;
- 22) Add option to 14.4.25 “Continuation of Nonconforming Signs” to allow repairing in compliance with California Historical Building Code when applicable;
- 23) Change 14.4.26 “Violations and Administrative Civil Penalties” (numerous changes);
- 24) Delete former 14.4.24 “Right of Private Action”

*Section 14:* Substantial Change to “Application of Regulations to Existing Projects and Initiated or Applied for Sign Districts and Specific Plans” (a.k.a. – “Grandfathering”), resulting in an increase from two to fourteen “grandfathered” SN sign districts;<sup>32</sup>

*Section 15:* Change 19.01(G) “Sign Applications” – triple fee for Comprehensive Sign Program compared to March 26, 2009 ordinance;

*Section 16:* Change Article 4.4 “Statement of Intent.”

After reviewing the numerous substantive changes between the March 26, 2009 proposed ordinance recommended for approval by the CPC and the Oct. 5, 2011 version currently before PLUM, outlined above, the inescapable conclusion must be that CPC’s previous recommendation of approval cannot apply to the current version of the ordinance, and that the proposed ordinance should be referred back to the CPC for its additional report and recommendation.

---

<sup>32</sup> See also Letter from Alan Bell, Deputy Planning Director, to PLUM, Attachment 2 (Proposed “Grandfathering” List) (Oct. 5, 2011)).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons discussed above, it is premature for PLUM to take action on the Director's first two recommendations. The stakeholder organizations therefore respectfully request that PLUM refer the proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance back to CPC so that it may fulfill its obligations under Los Angeles City Charter §§ 551 and 558.

Sincerely,



John P. Given, Esq.

Enclosure  
cc (via e-mail):

City Council:

- Councilmember Ed Reyes – [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Paul Krekorian – [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Dennis Zine – [councilmember.zine@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.zine@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Tom LaBonge – [councilmember.labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.labonge@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Paul Koretz – [paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Tony Cardenas – [councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Richard Alarcon – [councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Bernard Parks – [councilmember.parks@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.parks@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Jan Perry – [jan.perry@lacity.org](mailto:jan.perry@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Herb Wesson – [councilmember.wesson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Bill Rosendahl – [councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Mitch Englander – [councilmember.englander@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Eric Garcetti – [councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org)
- Councilmember Jose Huizar – [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)

Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa – [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)

City Attorney Carmen Trutanich – [ctrutanich@lacity.org](mailto:ctrutanich@lacity.org)  
Special Assistant City Attorney Jane Usher – [jane.usher@lacity.org](mailto:jane.usher@lacity.org)  
Deputy City Attorney Kenneth Fong – [kenneth.fong@lacity.org](mailto:kenneth.fong@lacity.org)

City Planning Director Michael LoGrande – [michael.logrande@lacity.org](mailto:michael.logrande@lacity.org)  
Deputy Planning Director Alan Bell – [alan.bell@lacity.org](mailto:alan.bell@lacity.org)  
City Planning Associate Daisy Mo – [daisy.mo@lacity.org](mailto:daisy.mo@lacity.org)

City Planning Commission – [cpc@lacity.org](mailto:cpc@lacity.org)

Commission President William Roschen – [roschen@rvca.org](mailto:roschen@rvca.org)

Commission Executive Asst. James Williams – [james.k.williams@lacity.org](mailto:james.k.williams@lacity.org)

Stakeholder Organizations:

Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight – [info@billboardblight.org](mailto:info@billboardblight.org)

Hillside Federation – [president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)

Brentwood Residents Coalition – [brc90049@aol.com](mailto:brc90049@aol.com)

Pacific Palisades Residents Assoc. – [barbara@kohn.com](mailto:barbara@kohn.com)

Holmby-Westwood Property Owners Assoc. – [jerbrown@ucla.edu](mailto:jerbrown@ucla.edu)

Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. HOA – [bbroide@hotmail.com](mailto:bbroide@hotmail.com)



# Los Angeles City Planning Commission

221 North Figueroa Street, Room 1600, Los Angeles, CA 90012-2601 (213) 580-5234

DATE: August 11, 2000  
TO: All Staff  
FROM: Gabriele Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II  
City Planning Commission

**SUBJECT: DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING  
TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION ON  
CERTAIN MATTERS.**

Pursuant to Section 559 of the City Charter, the Planning Commission has the authority to delegate to the Director of Planning the authority to act on its behalf on any " ordinance, resolution, or modification thereto ..."

In the past, the Commission has delegated this authority to the Director in two areas. The first instance is where the Commission has acted on an ordinance or resolution and the language of the ordinance, consistent with the original ordinance, has subsequently been redrafted by the City Attorney as to form and legality or where there have been minor changes by the City Council consistent with the expressed intent of the Planning Commission. The second instance is the Commission's delegation to the Director the authority to act on "plan approvals". This latter category has been modified to allow the Director more latitude in setting these actions for decision by the Planning Commission.

At its meeting of July 27, 2000, the City Planning Commission officially adopted the attached resolution to continue these delegations.

This action was approved by the following vote:

Moved: Weil  
Seconded: Widom  
Ayes: Landau, Menzer, Oakley, Scott, Walker  
Absent: Jackson, Schnabel

Attachment: Resolution

## RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Section 559 (Delegation of Authority) of the City Charter, adopted by the voters at the General Municipal Election held June 8, 1999, permits the City Planning Commission to authorize the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the City Planning Commission any ordinance, order or resolution or modification thereto which is subject to the provisions of Charter Sections 555 (General Plan - Procedures for Adoption) or 558 (Procedures for Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Certain Ordinances, Orders and Resolutions); and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned delegation of authority to the Director by the City Planning Commission permitted by Charter Section 559 is inherently the same provision that was permitted by Section 97.8 of the previous City Charter which was superseded on July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned delegation of authority to the Director by the City Planning Commission has been a longstanding practice that originated on July 11, 1964, when the City Planning Commission, by resolution, authorized the Director to approve for the City Planning Commission and/or for the Board of Zoning Adjustment those ordinances, orders or resolutions which the Director finds conform with the latest approved applicable portion of the General Plan, or which conform with the last action of the City Planning Commission or Board upon such matter; and

WHEREAS, on September 30, 1965, as contained in City Plan Case No. 13505-A, the City Planning Commission approved a resolution further authorizing the Director to act upon ordinances, orders or resolutions on behalf of the City Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, such delegation of authority by the City Planning Commission has been successful in reducing the number of City Planning Commission actions on routine matters or of a repetitive nature; and

WHEREAS, there will likely continue to be instances when final ordinances, orders or resolutions will contain minor editorial changes which will be incorporated into the final draft but where no substantive changes are made from the last action of the City Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, in order to avoid a considerable number of unnecessary referrals of final ordinances, orders or resolutions to the City Planning Commission, it is necessary to continue the longstanding policy of authorizing the Director to approve or disapprove for the City Planning Commission those ordinances, order or resolutions which the Director finds conform with the latest approved applicable portion of the General Plan, or which conform with the last action of the City Planning Commission upon such matter; and

WHEREAS, Municipal Code Section 12.24 M 1 permits the City Planning Commission to delegate to the Director the authority to approve or disapprove, on their behalf, plans for the development of an approved or deemed-approved conditional use site, subject to reasonable guidelines and policies to be followed in the exercise of the delegated authority; and

WHEREAS, on November 5, 1987, the City Planning Commission adopted a policy allowing delegation of authority to the Director to approve plans for the development of an approved or deemed-approved conditional use site if the approval of plans met certain specified guidelines;

WHEREAS, it is necessary to continue the general policy commenced in 1987 allowing the delegation of authority to the Director to approve plans for the development of an approved or deemed-approved conditional use site so to avoid a considerable number of unnecessary referrals of plan approvals to the City Planning Commission, provided reasonable guidelines and policies are followed by the Director in the exercise of the delegated authority.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Director of Planning is hereby authorized, in accordance with Charter Section 559, to approve or disapprove for the City Planning Commission any ordinance, order or resolution or modification thereto which is subject to the provisions of Charter Sections 555 or 558 and which the Director finds conform with the latest approved applicable portion of the General Plan, or which conform with the last action of the City Planning Commission upon such matter, when in the exercise of sound discretion and judgment, he or she determines that such ordinance, order or resolution conforms with the expressed intent of the City Planning Commission even though there may be minor changes for editorial and clarification purposes therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director of Planning is hereby authorized, in accordance with Municipal Code Section 12.24 M 1, to approve or disapprove, on behalf of the City Planning Commission, plans for the development of an approved or deemed-approved conditional use site, subject to the following guidelines and policies to be followed in the exercise of the delegated authority:

1. Approval of the plans does not conflict with previous City Planning Commission actions on the site;
2. The proposed project substantially conforms with all conditions of the original authorization; and
3. The Director shall impose conditions as he or she deems necessary to protect the best interests of the surrounding property or neighborhood, or to secure an appropriate development in harmony with objectives of the General Plan:

C:\MyFiles\Delegationres  
revised 7/20/00

*Moss*  
*B.M.*  
*Q*

**CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
ACTION OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

CITY PLAN CASE NO. 13505-A

SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

To further authorize the Director of Planning the right to act upon ordinances, orders or resolutions which conform with the expressed intent of the City Planning Commission and/or the Board of Zoning Adjustment, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Section 97 of the City Charter, as amended by a vote of the people on April 2, 1963, permits the City Planning Commission to authorize the Director of Planning to approve for the Commission or the Board of Zoning Adjustment any ordinance, order or resolution which conforms to the last action of said Commission or Board; and

WHEREAS, the Commission on July 11, 1964, did, by resolution, authorize the Director to approve for the City Planning Commission and/or for the Board of Zoning Adjustment those ordinances, orders or resolutions which he finds conform with the latest approved applicable portion of the Master Plan of the City, or which conform with the last action of said Commission or Board upon such matter; and

WHEREAS, such delegation of authority by the Commission has been successful in reducing the number of Commission actions on routine matters of a repetitive nature; and

WHEREAS, the Director has followed the practice of presenting a draft of the final ordinance, order or resolution to the Commission and/or Board of Zoning Adjustment whenever there have been any differences between the final draft and that approved in the last action of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, there have recently been several final ordinances wherein minor editorial changes have been incorporated in the final draft but where no substantive changes have been made from the last action of the Commission or Board; and

WHEREAS, it appears that this has resulted in a considerable number of unnecessary referrals of final ordinances, orders or resolutions to the Commission and/or Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Director of Planning is hereby authorized to approve for the City Planning Commission and/or for the Board of Zoning Adjustment those ordinances, orders or resolutions which he finds conform with




SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

the latest approved applicable portion of the Master Plan of the City, or which conform with the last action of said Commission or Board upon such matter when in the exercise of sound discretion and judgment he determines that such ordinance, order or resolution conform with the expressed intent of the Commission or Board even though there may be minor changes for editorial and clarification purposes therein.

Adopted September 30, 1965

VOTE:

Moved: Flanagan  
Seconded: Riedel  
Ayes: Jarvis, Mackaig, Branch

  
Edith S. Jameson, Secretary  
City Planning Commission

**EXCERPTS FROM**  
**CITY OF LOS ANGELES CHARTER**

**Sec. 559. Delegation of Authority.**

The City Planning Commission may authorize the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the Commission any ordinance, order or resolution or modification thereto which is subject to the provisions of Sections 555 or 558. In exercising that authority, the Director must make the same findings as would have been required for the City Planning Commission to act on the same matter. An action of the Director under this authority shall be subject to the same time limits and shall have the same effect as if the City Planning Commission had acted directly.

**Sec. 555. General Plan - Procedures for Adoption.**

**Sec. 558. Procedure for Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Certain Ordinances, Orders and Resolutions.**

From: **Barbara Broide** <[bbroide@hotmail.com](mailto:bbroide@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2011 at 1:58 AM  
Subject: FW: Plum Sign Ord - File Nos. 08-2020 and 11-1705  
To: "Michael Espinosa (Council File postings)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>, [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org)

Please enter the email below from Mr. Brown into the council file. Thank you.

---

From: [philbrown44@roadrunner.com](mailto:philbrown44@roadrunner.com)  
To: [bbroide@hotmail.com](mailto:bbroide@hotmail.com)  
Subject: FW: Plum Sign Ord  
Date: Mon, 17 Oct 2011 22:11:31 -0700

The address does not seem to be working. After this non-delivery, I tried [committeec/omichael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:committeec/omichael.espinosa@lacity.org), and also [plumcommitteec/omichael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:plumcommitteec/omichael.espinosa@lacity.org), either of which did not work.

PB

---

**From:** philip brown [mailto:[philbrown44@roadrunner.com](mailto:philbrown44@roadrunner.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2011 9:45 PM  
**To:** 'michael.espinosa@lacity.org'  
**Subject:** Plum Sign Ord

The Citywide Sign Ordinance as it stands now is not good for Los Angeles.

Please return the ordinance to City Planning for further study and review.

Public workshops and hearings should be a part of the process.

Phil Brown, Architect

1864 Benedict Canyon Drive

LA, 90210

From: **Maria** <[mbfisk@verizon.net](mailto:mbfisk@verizon.net)>  
Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2011 at 6:57 AM  
Subject: Fw: Re Proposed Sign Ordinance  
To: Michael Espinosa <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

I was unable to find the letter that I sent yesterday within the Council File Mgmt System – Online Docs.

Please make sure that this is submitted this morning, as soon as possible.

There may be some confusion with CF#s? If so please submit to **CF#08-2020**.

Appreciated!  
Maria

**From:** [Maria](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2011 9:23 AM  
**To:** [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org) ; [Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org) ; [Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org)  
**Cc:** [Michael Espinosa](#)  
**Subject:** Re Proposed Sign Ordinance

Dear PLUM Committee Members,

**RE Council File Nos. 08-2020; 08-3386-S1; 11-1705: proposed Citywide Sign Ordinance (revision 10/5/11)**

Forwarding my letter for your review and consideration.

Mr. Espinosa would you kindly submit to Council File Management System - Online Docs.

Thank You,  
Maria Fisk

October 16, 2011

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

**Re: Council File Nos. 08-2020; 08-3386-S1; 11-1705 Citywide Sign Ordinance**

Dear PLUM Committee Members:

For decades, despite the numerous moratoria and the so-called "bans" on billboards and other intrusive signs, the City of Los Angeles has yet to establish a meaningful ordinance that will regulate this out-of-control industry. Here in Granada Hills we have had our serious issues with sign companies, as well. Within the Chatsworth Street Business District we have been subjected to billboards covered with graffiti or adult themed ads. After years of community mobilization and outcry these billboard companies and city officials finally responded. Additionally, there has been no determination made as to which of these billboards are legally permitted.

Our city must not push through a measure that would cater to outdoor advertisers. For far too long they have been allowed to run amuck with so little consideration given to the communities where they advertise. **Therefore, I strongly urge you to reject the latest draft of the proposed sign ordinance and remand it back to the City Planning Commission for further public workshops and hearings.**

Remanding the ordinance is required by the City Charter because of substantial procedural and substantive changes to the ordinance that the City has made since public hearings were held in 2009. Stipulations within the latest draft of the proposed Sign Ordinance that require additional consideration:

- Before this ordinance moves forward, LADBS Sign Unit must inventory and map all off-site signs. The locations of illegal off-site signs must be identified and their owners should be required to remove them.
- It must be made clear that planning documents (Specific/Community Plans, overlays, etc.) that regulate signage more restrictively than the ordinance must prevail.
- There is no net reduction in off-site signs required. The stated purpose and effect of the ordinance has changed to eliminate the net reduction in signage. Thus, the current ordinance is wholly inconsistent with the City's 2002 billboard ban and 2009 hearings.
- The City can permit Sign Districts, Sign Adjustments and Sign Variances without considering any findings that include residential properties as part of the surrounding environment.
- Off-site signs must demonstrate economic and other benefits to the surrounding community. Permits should be issued on a temporary basis and permit renewal will be dependent upon local community review, input and approval.
- Sign Districts can abut scenic highways, parks, recreation centers and other sensitive uses. Further restrictions and distance limits must be included.
- Wall signs, including "supergraphic" that cover buildings, parking garages and other structures pose a serious safety hazard and must be banned.

- The ‘interior sign exception’ enables the proliferation of on-site signs throughout the City AND off-site signs in our parks, recreation centers, schools and other sensitive uses. Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- “Community Benefit Measures”, as an alternative to a net reduction in signage, are vague and must be rewritten.
- The City can permit Sign Districts without any consideration of visibility, or light trespass upon residential areas. Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character. Sign illumination limits should be cumulative and not just based on one sign.
- The ordinance should not grandfather in fourteen (14) sign districts instead of two (2) without a significant allowance of time for public hearings, CEQA study, equity and social justice analysis and study of the community benefit program proposed.

The City of Los Angeles should not be turned into replicas of Times Square or Las Vegas. Please do everything you can to protect our City for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves Los Angeles and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

  
Maria Fisk

Cc: All Councilmembers

From: <[cheryltiano@aol.com](mailto:cheryltiano@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 3:11 PM  
Subject: The latest draft of the Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Tiano  
3646 Mandeville Canyon Road  
Los Angeles, California 90049

From: <[sschw56079@aol.com](mailto:sschw56079@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 3:08 PM  
Subject: Sign Ordinance--CF#08-2020 ---PLUM hearing Tuesday  
To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilmember.labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.labonge@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)

RE: Sign Ordinance CF#08-2020, PLUM hearing Tuesday

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

The board of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association voted unanimously during its September meeting to support the Hillside Federation in its OPPOSITION to the current proposed new sign ordinance.

Significant neighborhood and environmental protections have been removed from this version of the ordinance. We feel the provision that allows advertising to be placed in parks to be particularly egregious along with other troubling aspects of this ordinance as it stands in its latest October 5th draft.

We cannot support this gutted ordinance in its present form and must strongly oppose it.

We urge you to vote against it.

Sarajane Schwartz  
President of the Hollywoodland Homeowners Association



From: **marilyn stone** <[mkstone3@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mkstone3@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 3:56 PM  
Subject: Sign ordinance  
To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)

To whom it may concern,

I am concerned about the changes to the city sign ordinance. The ordinance must go back to the City Planning Commission as required by the City Charter. The Ordinance must include mandatory reductions in the number of signs throughout the city. I hope you will give this matter your full attention.

Thank You,

Marilyn K Stone  
4912 Queen Victoria Rd.  
Woodland Hills,CA.91364

From: **Donald Cooper** <[malibudad@verizon.net](mailto:malibudad@verizon.net)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 11:21 AM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Donald Cooper  
7560 Cowan Avenue  
Los Angeles 90045

From: <[SALNLA96@aol.com](mailto:SALNLA96@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 2:05 PM  
Subject: City Sign Ordinance  
To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)

The new sign ordinance must go back to the City Planning Committee due to the numerous changes that have been made and according to City Charter. Watkins and Latham do not represent the people of LA. Why were they allowed to rewrite the ordinance??  
Sarah Napier

From: **Bernadette Soter** <[bsoter@earthlink.net](mailto:bsoter@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 12:25 PM  
Subject: CF #08-2020 dated 10/5/2011  
To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)

Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee:

The version of Sign Ordinance #08-2020 revealed to the public at the August 9, 2011 PLUM hearing was a textbook example of an ordinance written by the industry it was meant to regulate.

The revised version of the ordinance that is before you now continues to reflect the billboard industry's outsized influence in this matter. While some beneficial changes appear to have been made, the net effect of the current language still permits signs and billboards to proliferate and to appear in heretofore prohibited areas. Where the language does not expressly allow proliferation, it contains loopholes that can be used to justify signs in ostensibly off-limits places such as parks and publicly owned spaces.

The purpose of the Sign Ordinance is not to promote corporate goals, but to reduce and regulate billboards and invasive signing in Los Angeles. I am respectfully asking you to ensure that the final language of the ordinance be written to ensure this outcome.

Thank you,  
**Bernadette Soter**  
2640 N. Commonwealth Ave  
L.A. CA 90027  
[bsoter@earthlink.net](mailto:bsoter@earthlink.net)

From: **Stefanovska, Malina** <[stefanov@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:stefanov@humnet.ucla.edu)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 11:55 AM  
Subject: billboards  
To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>

Dear Committee Members:

I live close to Westwood blvd. I can't sleep at night because of the flashing lights of billboard signs, and had to explain to my first grader what "HUNG" meant and why there are so many women's legs spread around his face, as we couldn't avoid his gigantic stare in our face.

Therefore,

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square. Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Professor Malina Stefanovska,  
Chair,  
Department of French and Francophone Studies  
U.C.L.A.  
tel. 310/794-5084  
[stefanov@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:stefanov@humnet.ucla.edu)  
405 Hilgard Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1550

From: **Marian Dodge** <[president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)>

Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 10:20 AM

Subject: Sign Ordinance CF# 08-2020

To: Ed Reyes <[councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)>, Jose Huizar <[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)>, Paul Krekorian <[Councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)>, Michael Espinosa <[Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)>

Dear PLUM Committee:

Attached is the letter from the Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations regarding the Sign Ordinance to be heard at tomorrow's PLUM meeting.

Marian Dodge, President  
Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations  
[www.hillsidefederation.org](http://www.hillsidefederation.org)

P.O. Box 27404  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
323-663-1031  
[president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)  
[www.hillsidefederation.org](http://www.hillsidefederation.org)



PRESIDENT  
Marian Dodge  
CHAIRMAN  
Charley Mims  
VICE PRESIDENTS  
Mark Stratton  
Wendy-Sue Rosen  
SECRETARY  
Donna Messinger  
TREASURER  
Don Andres

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
City Hall, Room 395  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

October 17, 2011

Re: Sign Ordinance CF# 08-2020

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar, and Krekorian:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., representing thirty-three homeowner and resident associations spanning the Santa Monica Mountains, is opposed to the revised Sign Ordinance (CF# 08-2020) as it is currently written. The Ordinance now bears little resemblance to the Sign Ordinance that was approved by the City Planning Commission (CPC) in 2009.

The changes are so significant that even the intent of the ordinance has been altered. The original intent of the Sign Ordinance was to produce a net reduction in signage. That line has been deleted and replaced with "aesthetics." Since the intent of the ordinance is no longer the same, it should be returned to the CPC because it is essentially a new ordinance.

The Comprehensive Sign Program should be eliminated in its entirety. It is nothing more than a means of creating mini sign districts throughout the city. City parks and other city properties are no place for commercial advertising.

The newly added "Community Benefits Measures" must be eliminated as an alternative to removing existing signs. All of the suggested measures are things that are already required of developments. They would be getting credit for something that they are supposed to do anyway.

The ordinance fails to provide a buffer between sensitive use areas such as schools, hospitals, HPOZs and Historic-Cultural Monuments. Nor does it respect Specific Plans and Scenic Corridors.

Changes to the Ordinance have weakened it and inserted so many exceptions as to render it vulnerable to lawsuits.

The Hillside Federation recommends that the Sign Ordinance be returned to the City Planning Commission for review, more public input, and to meet the original intent of signage reduction.

Sincerely,

*Marian Dodge*

Marian Dodge, President

Bel Air Knolls Property Owners  
Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners  
Bel Air Ridge Association  
Benedict Canyon Association  
Brentwood Residents Coalition  
Canyon Back Alliance  
Crests Neighborhood Assn.  
Franklin Ave./Hollywood Bl. West  
Franklin Hills Residents Assn.  
Highlands Owners Assn.  
Hollywood Dell Civic Assn.  
Hollywood Heights Assn.  
Hollywoodland Homeowners  
Holmby Hills Homeowners Assn.  
Kagel Canyon Civic Assn.  
Laurel Canyon Assn.  
Lookout Mountain Alliance  
Los Feliz Improvement Assn.  
Mt. Olympus Property Owners  
Mt. Washington Homeowners All.  
Nichols Canyon Assn.  
N. Beverly Dr./Franklin Canyon  
Oak Forest Canyon Assn.  
Outpost Estates Homeowners  
Pacific Palisades Residents Assn.  
Residents of Beverly Glen  
Roscomare Valley Assn.  
Shadow Hills Property Owners  
Sherman Oaks HO Assn.  
Studio City Residents Assn.  
Tarzana Property Owners Assn.  
Torreyson Flynn Assn.  
Upper Mandeville Canyon  
Whitley Heights Civic Assn.

CHAIRPERSONS EMERITUS  
Shirley Cohen  
Jerome C. Daniel  
Patricia Bell Hearst  
Gordon Murley  
Polly Ward

CHAIRMAN IN MEMORIUM  
Brian Moore

From: **Marian Dodge** <[president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 12:16 PM  
Subject: CF# 08-2020 & 11-1705  
To: [Sharon.Gin@lacity.org](mailto:Sharon.Gin@lacity.org)

Attached is the letter from the Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations regarding the Sign Ordinance CF# 08-2020 to be heard at tomorrow's PLUM meeting.

Marian Dodge, President  
Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations  
[www.hillsidefederation.org](http://www.hillsidefederation.org)



P.O. Box 27404  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
323-663-1031  
[president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)  
[www.hillsidefederation.org](http://www.hillsidefederation.org)



PRESIDENT  
Marian Dodge  
CHAIRMAN  
Charley Mims  
VICE PRESIDENTS  
Mark Stratton  
Wendy-Sue Rosen  
SECRETARY  
Donna Messinger  
TREASURER  
Don Andres

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
City Hall, Room 395  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

October 17, 2011

Re: Sign Ordinance CF# 08-2020

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar, and Krekorian:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., representing thirty-three homeowner and resident associations spanning the Santa Monica Mountains, is opposed to the revised Sign Ordinance (CF# 08-2020) as it is currently written. The Ordinance now bears little resemblance to the Sign Ordinance that was approved by the City Planning Commission (CPC) in 2009.

The changes are so significant that even the intent of the ordinance has been altered. The original intent of the Sign Ordinance was to produce a net reduction in signage. That line has been deleted and replaced with "aesthetics." Since the intent of the ordinance is no longer the same, it should be returned to the CPC because it is essentially a new ordinance.

The Comprehensive Sign Program should be eliminated in its entirety. It is nothing more than a means of creating mini sign districts throughout the city. City parks and other city properties are no place for commercial advertising.

The newly added "Community Benefits Measures" must be eliminated as an alternative to removing existing signs. All of the suggested measures are things that are already required of developments. They would be getting credit for something that they are supposed to do anyway.

The ordinance fails to provide a buffer between sensitive use areas such as schools, hospitals, HPOZs and Historic-Cultural Monuments. Nor does it respect Specific Plans and Scenic Corridors.

Changes to the Ordinance have weakened it and inserted so many exceptions as to render it vulnerable to lawsuits.

The Hillside Federation recommends that the Sign Ordinance be returned to the City Planning Commission for review, more public input, and to meet the original intent of signage reduction.

Sincerely,

*Marian Dodge*

Marian Dodge, President

Bel Air Knolls Property Owners  
Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners  
Bel Air Ridge Association  
Benedict Canyon Association  
Brentwood Residents Coalition  
Canyon Back Alliance  
Crests Neighborhood Assn.  
Franklin Ave./Hollywood Bl. West  
Franklin Hills Residents Assn.  
Highlands Owners Assn.  
Hollywood Dell Civic Assn.  
Hollywood Heights Assn.  
Hollywoodland Homeowners  
Holmby Hills Homeowners Assn.  
Kagel Canyon Civic Assn.  
Laurel Canyon Assn.  
Lookout Mountain Alliance  
Los Feliz Improvement Assn.  
Mt. Olympus Property Owners  
Mt. Washington Homeowners All.  
Nichols Canyon Assn.  
N. Beverly Dr./Franklin Canyon  
Oak Forest Canyon Assn.  
Outpost Estates Homeowners  
Pacific Palisades Residents Assn.  
Residents of Beverly Glen  
Roscomare Valley Assn.  
Shadow Hills Property Owners  
Sherman Oaks HO Assn.  
Studio City Residents Assn.  
Tarzana Property Owners Assn.  
Torreyson Flynn Assn.  
Upper Mandeville Canyon  
Whitley Heights Civic Assn.

CHAIRPERSONS EMERITUS  
Shirley Cohen  
Jerome C. Daniel  
Patricia Bell Hearst  
Gordon Murley  
Polly Ward

CHAIRMAN IN MEMORIUM  
Brian Moore

From: **Michael Norton** <[Michael@corniche.com](mailto:Michael@corniche.com)>

Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 10:09 AM

Subject: HHWNC Plum letter

To: [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.labonge@lacity.org), [councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

On behalf of the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council President Anastasia Mann, please find attached a letter regarding the Council's PLUM activity.

Kind regards,

**Michael Norton**

Executive Assistant to the Chairman & CEO

8721 W Sunset Blvd, Suite 200  
West Hollywood, CA 90069  
[michael@corniche.com](mailto:michael@corniche.com)

D: 310.358.4210

F: 310.358.4211

[Facebook](#)   [Twitter](#)   [WordPress](#)   [Corniche Club newsletter](#)

[www.corniche.com](http://www.corniche.com)

[www.anastasiasafrica.com](http://www.anastasiasafrica.com)

[www.cornicheentertainment.com](http://www.cornicheentertainment.com)



October 17th, 2011

To: City of Los Angeles  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Councilmember Ed Reyes, Chairman  
Councilmember Jose Huizar  
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance Revisions

Dear Committee Members:

The Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council passed the following motion concerning citywide sign ordinance revisions at our meeting on September 21, 2011. Please consider our concerns regarding the grandfathering of unapproved projects as you deliberate.

Motion

WHEREAS the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of the Los Angeles City Council will hear the revised citywide sign ordinance (Council File 08-2020, 08-3386-S1) on October 18, 2011.

WHEREAS the revised citywide sign ordinance differs significantly from the sign ordinance approved by the City Planning Commission on March 26, 2009, which went through a lengthy public review process.

WHEREAS the revised citywide sign ordinance seeks to grandfather sign districts in two proposed but unapproved projects in our community (CPC-2008-3512-GPA-ZC-HD-BL-SN-CUB-CUW-CU-ZAD-SPR and CPC-2007-251-GPA-ZC-SP).

WHEREAS the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council is comprised of stakeholders who volunteer their time to “create a more livable community and city by establishing an open line of communication” between our community and government officials and “assist the City and other neighborhoods in finding solutions to common problems.”

WE THEREFORE MOVE that the Planning and Land Use Management committee follow the recommendations of the City Planning Commission that “only Sign Districts approved by the CPC as of March 26 2009 will be grandfathered.” Proposed projects that have not yet been approved should be subject to the requirements of the new ordinance.

Respectfully Yours,

Anastasia Mann  
President – Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood  
Council

Cc: Councilmember Tom LaBonge  
Councilmember Eric Garcetti

*7095 Hollywood Boulevard, Box 1004  
Los Angeles, CA 90028-8912*

From: **Nan Waldman** <[nan@nanwaldman.com](mailto:nan@nanwaldman.com)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 9:09 AM  
Subject: Please distribute for Oct. 18 meeting to members of LA City Council re Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

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

This letter is about Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Mayor and Committee Members:

I live in West Los Angeles. PLEASE vote against and do not allow to progress the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance.

Instead, we need to:

- Remove existing billboards with more than a one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Protect city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Do not approve pending sign district applications unless they conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character, do not allow anything else to occur -- no new signs; and the ones not in compliance should be removed immediately.

The Quality of Life in Los Angeles is unique to this area. We choose to live here because of its unique nature. Do not change Los Angeles into copies of 'Everywhere, USA' and PLEASE, Please, *please* -- do everything in your power to advocate preserving the beautiful and calm experience of this City of Angels for me, my family, my neighbors, tourists, and everyone else who loves the city and wants to protect its beauty as a vibrant and cohesive, and yes, unique, place to live, to visit, and work.

Sincerely,

Nan Waldman, Esq.  
Educational Consultant  
[1640 5th Street 1-A](mailto:nan@nanwaldman.com)  
[Santa Monica CA 90401](mailto:nan@nanwaldman.com)  
(323) 515-2626  
[nan@nanwaldman.com](mailto:nan@nanwaldman.com)

From: **Dennis Hathaway** <[dennis@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:dennis@banbillboardblight.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 9:57 AM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 PLUM comment letters  
To: [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org)

Dear Ms. Gin:

Last week I sent a comment letter in advance of tomorrow's PLUM committee meeting on Council File 08-2020, the citywide sign ordinance revisions. I e-mailed the letter in care of Michael Espinosa, who I have since learned is no longer the committee's legislative assistant. I know that a number of other people e-mailed letters in care of Mr. Espinosa, as well. I hope that you're able to make sure that these comment letters get to the committee members in advance of tomorrow's meeting, and that they are posted with the council file on the city's website.

I sincerely apologize for myself and others for the inconvenience this may have caused.

Dennis Hathaway

--

Dennis Hathaway

President, *Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight*

2700 Military Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90064

310-386-9661

***Defend Our Public Spaces, Protect Our Visual Environment***

[www.banbillboardblight.org](http://www.banbillboardblight.org)

From: <[TomKalette@aol.com](mailto:TomKalette@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 2:13 PM  
Subject: Billboard Blight  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)

Dear Committee Members:

I am writing you to ask that you reject the most recent draft of the citywide sign ordinance. The present proposal appears to be written by the billboard industry for the billboard industry.

Please consider the following revisions:

1. Require the removal of existing billboards with more than one to one square foot ratio.
2. Exempt city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
3. Suspend the approval of all pending applications until this new ordinance is passed.
4. Prohibit digital signage within 500 feet of a residential neighborhood.

It is my desire that what happens to look like Vegas, should stay in Vegas.

Sincerely,

Tom Kalette  
1015 Gayley Ave #522  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

From: **Martin Bagish** <[bagfish23@gmail.com](mailto:bagfish23@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 10:54 AM  
Subject: Billboard Blight  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Cc: [councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Your name & address

Martin Bagish

2731 Angus Street

LA, CA 90039

From: **Michael Monagan** <[mmonagan@lausd.net](mailto:mmonagan@lausd.net)>  
Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 8:25 PM  
Subject: Please read at Oct 18th meeting/ Billboards  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

The Occupy LA movement is an indication of how many of us feel about corporations taking over our lives. Please represent the people you represent rather than the corporations.

Sincerely,

Michael Monagan 3341 Fay Ave. Culver City, CA 90232



From: **EveA** <[evea1@mac.com](mailto:evea1@mac.com)>  
Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 9:52 PM  
Subject: sign ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

please distribute my comments to members at oct 18 mtg

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Eve Axelrad

3300 Mandeville Canyon Rd, LA 90049

From: **Radics, Katalin** <[kradics@library.ucla.edu](mailto:kradics@library.ucla.edu)>  
Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 11:29 PM  
Subject: please protect the city  
To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>  
Cc: "[info@banbillboardlight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardlight.org)" <[info@banbillboardlight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardlight.org)>

Please distribute this letter to the members of the Committee below.

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Katalin Radics

2516 Angelo Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90077

From: **David Blank** <[blank@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:blank@humnet.ucla.edu)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 6:33 AM  
Subject: citywide sign ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

I urge you, please, to distribute to the members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee at their next meeting my plea that they reject the draft of the city sign ordinance. I have been disturbed by the proliferation of extremely bright and distracting digital billboards lately, two of which have been put up one block from my home. Not only do these digital billboards, which are very, very large, light up the night sky to such an extent that they can at times disturb sleep, but their changing colors and pictures can be seen to distract drivers on Wilshire Boulevard, creating a dangerous situation.

The new version of the sign ordinance seems to me a total, abject surrender to the interests of advertisers, with no consideration of the wishes of residents. Not only will our city, with its juxtaposed residential and business interests, resemble Times Square, where no one lives and people come only to gape, but even our city parks will cease to be a refuge from crass, ugly commercialism.

Please do not allow these developments to go unchecked, in the interests of a sane and sound urban environment for our residents.

Sincerely,  
David Blank

---

David Blank  
Chair, Department of Classics  
UCLA  
100 Dodd Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
310-206-8562; msg. -825-4171; fax -206-1903  
[blank@ucla.edu](mailto:blank@ucla.edu)

From: <[Nancyjaffe@aol.com](mailto:Nancyjaffe@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 7:41 AM  
Subject: please uphold ban on excessive billboards!  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Please help us to maintain the character of residential neighborhoods--and to provide fewer distractions for drivers--by upholding the ban on many kinds of billboards. All your efforts greatly appreciated.

Thanks.

Nancy Jaffe

From: **David Rosenstein** <[rsnstndvd@yahoo.com](mailto:rsnstndvd@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 8:32 AM  
Subject: Sign Ordinance - Draft  
To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>  
Cc: david g mail <[drosey36@gmail.com](mailto:drosey36@gmail.com)>

Please ensure that this letter is part of the committee meeting

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 strongly disagree with the latest draft of the sign ordinance. Sign pollution is a huge and growing problem in our city which, I believe, greatly compromises our quality of life.

Please reject the current draft and ensure that any future versions include, as a minimum, :

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Thank you,

David Rosenstein

302 Amalfi Drive

Pacific Palisades, CA

From: **Steven Meiers** <[stevenameiers@hotmail.com](mailto:stevenameiers@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 10:02 AM  
Subject: Opposition to City-Wide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

Could you please forward this email to the members of the Los Angeles City Council PLanning and Land use Management Committee, Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian. Thank you.

Steven Meiers

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair  
Councilmember Jose Huizar  
Councilmember Paul Krekorian  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Los Angeles City Council

Re: Council File 08-2020 City Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar and Krekorian:

I sent an email to Councilman Rosenhahl, my Councilman, opposing the city-wide sign ordinance. It appears I should have sent that email to each of you, so I've pasted the text of the email below and ask that you please consider it in connection with your consideration of the city-wide sign ordinance. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Meiers

Dear Councilman Rosendahl,

Please accept this email as my opposition to the proposed city-wide sign ordinance.

Please let me start by telling you just a little bit about me. I'm grew up in Los Angeles, went to public schools through high school in Los Angeles and then, on scholarships, to USC, practiced law for 40+ years in Los Angeles, am a 60+ year resident of Los Angeles, have lived on the west side of Los Angeles since 1968 and have had my current home in Brentwood for the past 25 years.

In recent years, the quality of life of Los Angelenos, to the extent local goverment has an impact, has declined, in part because traffic has become increasingly burdensome (a consequence of increased building permits for office buildings and multiple unit residences) and in part because what we see, when we'd hope not to, is intrusive commercial advertising.

I understand, of course, that building construction results in jobs, which so many deserately

need. The impact of signage on jobs, however, is miniscule in comparison, while the impact of signage on the quality of life of residents is anything but miniscule, with the contribution of the new billboards to local revenues also being small in relation to the whole. Respectfully, here the benefit does not approach the detriment.

I would ask that new billboards be prohibited in city parks and public facilities and that no new billboards be erected unless four conditions are met, as follows (where applicable, the word "billboard" below should be read to include other signage):

(1) for every new billboard, an existing billboard be replaced or taken down;

(2) for each new billboard, the square footage of replaced billboards and billboards taken down must at least equal the square footage of the new billboard without any carryover (to illustrate, if a new billboard has 1,000 square feet and three billboards having 400 square feet each are taken down, the additional 200 square feet may not be carried over to other new billboards);

(3) the square footage of new digital billboards (but not digital billboards taken down) should be deemed equal to the square footage of the new digital billboard multiplied by the number of different screens the billboard can, or is permitted to, project; and

(4) no new digital billboards should be permitted until comprehensive regulations are carefully thought through and finally enacted so as to protect residents from, among other things, traffic hazards, the visual pollution digital billboards create (it being hard to block the out), and unnecessary energy use.

Councilman Rosendahl, this is one of those times when, if an unfortunate ordinance is approved, it will be extremely difficult or impossible to repeal or roll it back, with any such repeal or roll back no doubt being subject to litigation alleging property rights are being taken without due compensation.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this email.

Very truly yours,

Steven Meiers

From: JEAN T UIDENICH <[kinichstation@msn.com](mailto:kinichstation@msn.com)>

Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 11:07 AM

Subject: Ban Billboard Blight

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)

Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto: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 Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square. Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Jean Uidenich

Stan Kincses

991 S. Carmelina Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90049



From: **Bernie Schiffer** <[schiffer\\_b@yahoo.com](mailto:schiffer_b@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 11:21 AM  
Subject:  
To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square. Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Bernard Schiffer

410 S. Gretna Green Way

From: **Robert W. Pann** <[bobpann@earthlink.net](mailto:bobpann@earthlink.net)>

Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Subject: Sign Ordinance

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Cc: [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org), [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.koretz@lacity.org), [councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org), [councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org), [councilmember.parks@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.parks@lacity.org), [councilmember.perry@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.perry@lacity.org), [councilmember.wesson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org), [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [councilmember.englander@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.englander@lacity.org), [councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org)

**¡Estimado don Miguel Espinosa!**

**Please distribute my comments below to all committee members at the October 18th meeting:**

---

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 urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:**

**Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.**

**Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.**

**Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.**

**Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.**

**I most certainly do NOT want Los Angeles, the City of the Angels, to be turned into a crass, degrading and cluttered "billboardlandia." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a QUALITY place in which to live and work.**

Sincerely,

Robert W. Pann  
2512 Aiken Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

From: **Michael Espinosa** <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 8:13 AM  
Subject: Fwd: Sign Ordinance  
To: Sharon Gin <[sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org)>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Judith Pacht** <[spondee123@verizon.net](mailto:spondee123@verizon.net)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 11:26 AM  
Subject: re: Sign Ordinance  
To: [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Michael Espinosa and Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square. Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Judith Pacht  
910 Gretna Green Way  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

From: **Nancy Freedman** <[gjf165@gmail.com](mailto:gjf165@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 3:57 PM  
Subject: File [08-2020](#) Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: bill rosendahl <[councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org)>, la councilmembers Reyes <[councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)>, councilmember Huizar <[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)>, Councilmember Krekorian <[councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org)>  
Cc: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)

Letter submitted by Brentwood Community Council for PLUM Hearing Tuesday, October 18, 2011



# BRENTWOOD Community Council

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

[www.brentwoodcommunitycouncil.org](http://www.brentwoodcommunitycouncil.org)

October 15, 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](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)  
200 North Spring Stree  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 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 14 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.

The BCC voiced objection to passage of the Citywide Sign Ordinance made public July 22, 2011 due to lack of time for the community to review and give input. This recent October 5, 2011 proposed ordinance has the same rushed time frame, which is not fair to citizens who will be affected by the design of the Citywide Sign Ordinance. This is a very in depth, often vague, serious intrusion on the blight and health of all Angelenos. It would be prudent to allow local councils and homeowner groups more time to circulate, talk about, and understand details regarding the ordinance to allow your constituents a voice in the process. There should not be a rush to pass this when so many decisions will affect our generation, and that of our children, the rest of our lives. Changes made from the first public ordinance

on March 26, 2009 are extensive and questionable as to the ability to protect residents from the negative impacts of outdoor advertising.

We ask that the ordinance return to the City Planning Commission to restore mandatory billboard removal and other community protections, and to give community groups (councils and homeowners) time to study and comment on details of the ordinance. It would be inappropriate for PLUM to pass the ordinance on to City Council at this juncture.

The following are concerns BCC would like addressed:

Comprehensive Sign Programs – The CPC included this provision to allow special signage rules for large properties like shopping centers and college campuses, but the provision didn't allow any off-site or electronic signage generally prohibited by the ordinance. The revised ordinance would allow those generally prohibited sign types if they aren't visible from the public-right-of-way and don't exceed 10 per cent of the total signage on the property. This means a net increase in the amount of off-site signage in the city, which is contrary to the spirit of the 2002 ban on new off-site signs.

Vaguely drafted sections of the ordinance need to be rewritten for exactness to eliminate *any* doubt as to interpretation.

Off-site signs in Comprehensive Sign Programs should only be visible from the subject property.

A moratorium should be placed on new digital until a properly researched ordinance can be drafted. Decisions such as spacing between signs, hours of operation, energy issues, glare, need study.

City parks should be categorically excluded from any Comprehensive Sign Program.

Permitting increase of new digital/electric sign density must be counterbalanced by removal of an existing billboard. A "community benefit package" of repairing sidewalks, placing wires underground and the like, is not a substitute for removing an actual sign. The blight of the multitude of signs is already intolerable. This "beautification" alternative escalates the quantity of signs and poor quality of life in the Los Angeles area.

Off-site signs in Comprehensive Sign Programs in overlay districts and Specific Plans should continue to be regulated according to current law.

Over-sized wall signage should be limited to sign districts and Comprehensive Sign Programs.

Grandfathered sign districts, including proposed ones, should be required to remove billboards and signs outside the districts as a compensatory benefit to the community.

The City must not allow new electronic or digital signage without addressing energy use, light pollution, traffic safety and aesthetic issues. The City must make major revisions to the ordinance that now only encourages more sign blight.

Let's preserve our visual environment. Let us be an example to other cities in effectively *controlling* sign blight, not falling prey to sign industry greed.

Sincerely,



Nancy Freedman, Chair  
Brentwood Community Council  
[GJF165@gmail.com](mailto:GJF165@gmail.com)

CC: [Councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org)  
[Councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)  
[Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)  
[Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org)

From: **John Rosenfeld** <[rosenfel@ucla.edu](mailto:rosenfel@ucla.edu)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 5:34 PM  
Subject: The draft of the revised citywide sign ordinance  
To: <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilmember.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.koretz@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
Dear Committee Members:  
Dear Sirs,

The latest draft of the proposed citywide sign ordinance, if enacted, will turn Los Angeles into an unattractive cheesy mimic of the worst aspects of Las Vegas. I, for one, would boycott any business that chooses to advertise using the garish billboards and electronic signs that would result from the enactment of the ordinance as proposed. Please don't move our city any further away from being a family-friendly place into an unattractive honky-tonk dump!

John L. Rosenfeld  
2401 Arbutus Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1208  
[rosenfel@ucla.edu](mailto:rosenfel@ucla.edu)



From: <[brigtroy@roadrunner.com](mailto:brigtroy@roadrunner.com)>

Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 6:26 PM

Subject: BAN BILLBOARD BLIGHT - sign ordinance -Oct. 18 PLUM Comm. meeting

To: [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org), [councilmember.zine@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.zine@lacity.org), [councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org), [councilmember.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.koretz@lacity.org), [councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org), [councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org), [councilmember.parks@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.parks@lacity.org), [councilmember.perry@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.perry@lacity.org), [councilmember.wesson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org), [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [councilmember.english@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.english@lacity.org), [councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)

Cc: [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

To: Members of the PLUM Committee

City council members

Mayor Villaraigosa

Please heed the ordinary citizens of Los Angeles in their request to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance.

At any rate, despite the efforts of industry lobbyists, any changes in the ordinance should AT LEAST

1. require removal of existing billboards at more than a 1:1 ratio in exchange for any new billboards,
2. keep commercial advertising out of public parks and facilities,
3. require pending applications to comply with these provisions,
4. prohibit digital signage anywhere until appropriate regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards and degrading of communities.

Help stop Los Angeles from becoming the poster child for advertising run amok. It's ugly and it shows a lack of respect for citizens like me.

Sincerely yours,

Brigitta B. Troy  
350 S. Bristol Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

--

Brigitta Troy

From: <[MKrell1026@aol.com](mailto:MKrell1026@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 10:29 PM  
Subject: Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org), [councilmember.reves@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reves@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org)

Please see attached letter regarding Council file 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance.

South Brentwood Residents Association  
149 South Barrington Ave. #194  
Los Angeles, California 90049

October 17, 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

Via email: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Re: Council file 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers:

I am writing on behalf of the South Brentwood Residents Association (SBRA). SBRA represents approximately 3,000 home-owners and renters who reside in the southern area of Brentwood. Additionally, SBRA represents the interests of *all* multi-family residents living in Brentwood.

We request that:

- The ordinance be returned to the City Planning Commission to restore mandatory billboard removal and other community protections. The community must have sufficient time to review the proposal and offer informed input.
- A moratorium be placed on new electric and digital signs until a properly researched ordinance can be drafted. Size, hours of operation, light trespass on residential properties, traffic safety, energy issues, and aesthetic issues all need to be considered.
- City parks be specifically excluded from any Comprehensive Sign Program.
- The removal of existing billboards be required in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission be required to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.

Why was the work of the City Planning Commission so drastically changed by the Planning Department? Please consider this important issue and take the time to provide a plan that respects the quality of life for all Angelinos; one that is not crafted by the sign industry.

Sincerely,

*Marylin Krell*

Marylin Krell, President  
South Brentwood Residents Association  
Mkrell1026@aol.com

cc:

Councilmember Bill Rosendahl  
Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa

From: **Hmhandel** <[hmhandel@aol.com](mailto:hmhandel@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, Oct 15, 2011 at 10:59 PM  
Subject: Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [infor@billboardblight.org](mailto:infor@billboardblight.org)

Dear Committee Members,

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
  - Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
  - Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
  - Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.
- I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Thank you for distributing my comments to the members for the October 18 meeting.

Sincerely,

Haya Handel  
123 S. Gunston Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

From: <[stephanie@stephanieriseley.com](mailto:stephanie@stephanieriseley.com)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 10:12 AM  
Subject: BLADE RUNNER ADS! DANGEROUS DISTRACTION to DRIVERS!  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance  
Dear Committee Members:

Please be aware that your own financial "ties and connections" will face scrutiny. Kickbacks are lovely, but can dangerous... for everyone. So please don't be wind up like that the Bell guy. He can't spend that money in jail, can he? I watch the council meetings on TV...and now people pay attention. I'm copying the letter this letter, because I'm too busy making a living here in Los Angeles. I'm a native, and I don't like what's happening to the town! Stop this now!

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Riseley  
1214 South Orlando Avenue  
LA, 90035

323.933.4377

<http://www.stephanieriseley.com>

Read chapters of "Love From Both Sides" at:

<http://sriseley.findhornpress.com/>

From: **stuart bloom** <[strtbloom@gmail.com](mailto:strtbloom@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 10:55 AM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020  
To: [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)

**To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee**

**Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance**

**Dear PLUM Committee Members:**

**I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:**

- . Provide absolute protection for scenic highways, parkways, corridors, Specific Plan areas, residential neighborhoods.**

- . Provide absolute protection for parks, schools, libraries and other public facilities from commercial advertising.**

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.**

- . Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.**

- . Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.**

- . I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.**

**Sincerely,**

**Dr. and Mrs. Stuart Bloom  
2915 Corda Lane  
Los Angeles, CA.  
90049**

From: **Carole Kent** <[freckleyfreckles@yahoo.com](mailto:freckleyfreckles@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 1:42 PM  
Subject:  
To: [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
RE: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

Provide absolute protection for scenic highways,, parkways, corridors, Specific Plan areas, residential neighborhoods.

Provide absolute protection for parks, schools, libraries and other public facilities from commercial advertising.....

Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.

Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance

Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character

I do not want the areas of the City I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square. Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors and everyone else who loves the City and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Kent  
16438 Sloan Dr.  
Los Angeles, California 90049

From: **Lisa Sarkin** <[lsarkin@studiocitync.org](mailto:lsarkin@studiocitync.org)>

Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2011 at 8:04 AM

Subject: Los Angeles City Sign Ordinance 08-2020

To: [sharon.gin@lacity.org](mailto:sharon.gin@lacity.org), [councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org), [councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org), [councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org)

Cc: [councilmember.zine@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.zine@lacity.org), [councilmember.labonge@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.labonge@lacity.org), [paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org), [councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org), [councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org), [councilmember.parks@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.parks@lacity.org), [jan.pearry@lacity.org](mailto:jan.pearry@lacity.org), [councilmember.wesson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.wesson@lacity.org), [councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org), [councilmember.english@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.english@lacity.org), [councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org), [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), [ctrutanich@lacity.org](mailto:ctrutanich@lacity.org), [jane.usher@lacity.org](mailto:jane.usher@lacity.org), [kenneth.fong@lacity.org](mailto:kenneth.fong@lacity.org), [michael.logrande@lacity.org](mailto:michael.logrande@lacity.org), [alan.bell@lacity.org](mailto:alan.bell@lacity.org), [daisy.mo@lacity.org](mailto:daisy.mo@lacity.org), [cpc@lacity.org](mailto:cpc@lacity.org), [roschen@rvca.org](mailto:roschen@rvca.org), [james.k.williams@lacity.org](mailto:james.k.williams@lacity.org), [info@billboardblight.org](mailto:info@billboardblight.org), [president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org), [brc90049@aol.com](mailto:brc90049@aol.com), [barbara@kohn.com](mailto:barbara@kohn.com), [jerbrown@ucla.edu](mailto:jerbrown@ucla.edu), [bbroide@hotmail.com](mailto:bbroide@hotmail.com), "John T. Walker" <[jwalker@studiocitync.org](mailto:jwalker@studiocitync.org)>

Dear Sharon:

Please distribute the attached letter to the councilmembers for us. I really appreciate your assistance with this matter.

Best regards, Lisa

--

Lisa Sarkin, Vice President  
Studio City Neighborhood Council Board Member  
Chair Land Use Committee  
CD2 Appointee - Ventura/Cahuenga Blvd. Corridor Specific Plan Review Board

SCNC office (818) 655-5400 Home office (818) 980-1010  
FAX (818) 980-1011 Cell (818) 439-1674



**SCNC BOARD**

Jeffrey Carter  
Ben Di Benedetto  
Victor Helo  
Wayne Kartin  
Remy Kessler  
Ben Neumann  
Richard Niederberg  
Todd Royal  
Lisa Sarkin  
Lana Shackelford  
Gail Steinberg  
Ron Taylor  
Pasha Vafaee  
Rita C. Villa  
John T. Walker  
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.  
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6  
Studio City, CA 91604  
(818) 655-5400

**PRESIDENT**  
John T. Walker  
**VICE PRESIDENT**  
Lisa Sarkin  
**TREASURER**  
Remy Kessler  
**SECRETARY**  
Rita C. Villa  
**CORRESPONDING SECRETARY**  
Lana Shackelford

[www.studiocitync.org](http://www.studiocitync.org)

---

October 18, 2011

Honorable City Council Members  
Ed Reyes  
Jose Huizar  
Paul Krekorian

**Sent by Email**

**Re: Proposed City Sign Ordinance 08-2020**

Dear Councilmembers:

I am the appointed representative for the Studio City Neighborhood Council (SCNC) with regard to the City Sign Ordinance. I am unable to attend the hearing today. Please accept this letter as our recommendations on this ordinance.

The SCNC concurs with the letter hand delivered to you from John P. Given.

The current proposed sign ordinance has no resemblance to the ordinance diligently compiled by the City Planning Commission. The inclusion of 10 additional 'grandfathered' sign districts is inconsistent with CEQA. Many other issues for which the City Planning Commission discussion and decided upon have been removed. Other issues are added without discussion by the City Planning Commission.

Please return Council File 08-2020 to the City Planning Commission for continued discussion with stakeholders through-out the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you for considering of our position. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Lisa Sarkin, Vice President  
Studio City Neighborhood Council

LS/lS

From: **David R Garfinkle** <[drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net](mailto:drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net)>

Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 2:48 PM

Subject: Comments on Proposed Sign Ordinance

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Mr. Espinosa

Please distribute the attached letter to each of the PLUM committee members before the PLUM meeting on October 18 and post the letter under the public comments portion of the Council File directory for the proposed ordinance.

Thank you

David R. Garfinkle

President, Tarzana Property Owners Association

# Tarzana Property Owners Association

October 14, 2011

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Los Angeles City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

## **Subject: Council Files 08-2020, 08-3386-S1: Citywide Sign Ordinance**

The latest revisions proposed by the Planning Department for the ordinance to revise and amend the Los Angeles Municipal Code regulating signs contains a number of very positive attributes including:

- Prohibition of balloon signs except in sign districts,
- Adoption of a fair appeals hearing process,
- Establishment of rules for a fair determination of “legal” signs,
- A plan to map all off-site signs,
- Prohibition of signs covering exterior windows except in sign districts,
- Prohibition of sandwich signs except in sign districts, and
- Prohibition of digital signs in A and R zones.

The Tarzana Property Owners Association strongly supports those provisions. However, we feel that the proposed ordinance has a number of serious flaws which we sincerely hope the PLUM Committee will remedy.

**Sign Districts.** We are strongly opposed to the grandfathering of additional special Sign Districts. Sign Districts that have currently been approved at the PLUM level should be allowed to continue under the provisions in place at the time of their submission. All others must be subject to the regulations of the proposed ordinance.

**Comprehensive Sign Program.** Again, we fail to see any 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 as is the case for signs exterior to the developments. The argument for the need for larger signs interior to a larger development makes little sense. While the explanation of the Planning Department is slanted toward signs on college campuses, museums, stadiums, etc, the ordinance language is clearly meant to allow excess signage in commercial areas.

**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 do not understand 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.

**Digital Signs.** We applaud the Planning Department's new provision which would prohibit digital signage in R and A zones. However, the suggestion 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. The proposed regulations on brightness, message, and duration are fine for existing digital signs, but ignore 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 adopted and subjected to public scrutiny.

**Sign Reduction and Community Benefits in Sign Districts.** The original provisions of the ordinance called for removal of more than one square foot of existing signage for every new sign in a Sign District. The current revision emasculates the requirement by allowing substitution of an ill-defined "public benefit". Essentially all of the postulated public benefits are currently required by existing code provisions. The proposed substitution of these ill defined and unnecessary "public benefits" is simply a ploy by the sign industry to gain additional signage without the need to remove any existing signs. The CPC and Planning Department recognized the lack of utility of public benefits in prior versions of the proposed ordinance.

**Removal of Existing Unlawful Signs.** Removal of existing illegal signs is not adequately covered in the proposed ordinance or any prior proposals to amend signage regulation: elimination of existing unlawful signs. That is, signs erected without a permit or which violate the terms of the permit issued. As noted above, we support the suggestion of a study to ascertain a fair method of determining the legal status of older signs whose status may be uncertain. We need to remove the remaining illegal large signs such as billboards, pole signs and roof signs, but a reasonable method must be adopted. We also support the proposal that violators be given 15 days to remove large signs designated (and owner notified) as illegal. Small signs, such as sandwich signs and window signs, must be removed within one day of notice. The on-going city-wide effort to identify unlawful signage and the proposed study to map all off-site signs will provide the required information on which signs are unlawful.

**Sign Unit Funding.** We are not sure that the proposal to create a separate funding source for a sign unit is a good idea. We are absolutely appalled at the proposal to fund the unit by private donations. Comparison of this version of the proposed ordinance jointly developed by the Planning Department and the CPC to the current version shows the overwhelming influence the sign lobby already exerts. **How can anyone even contemplate allowing them the additional leverage gained by funding the organization that is supposed to regulate the industry?**

In summary, we urge the PLUM and later the City Council to abide by that old adage: **KIS, keep it simple:** eliminate the Comprehensive Sign Program and grandfathering of additional special sign districts, pass an ordinance incorporating the provisions that the citizenry of Los Angeles is crying out for, and, perhaps most important, vigorously enforce the provisions of the law once it is in place.

David R. Garfinkle  
President, Tarzana Property Owners Association  
[president@tarzanapropertyowners.org](mailto:president@tarzanapropertyowners.org)  
[www.tarzanapropertyowners.org](http://www.tarzanapropertyowners.org)  
P.O. Box 571448  
Tarzana, CA 91357

cc. Councilman Dennis P. Zine

From: **Marilyn Bush** <[MarilynBush@roadrunner.com](mailto:MarilynBush@roadrunner.com)>

Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 3:42 PM

Subject: Reference CF#08-2020

To: [Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org)

The proposed changes in the Sign Ordinance triggers a mandatory return to the City Planning Commission as required by the City Charter. "A net reduction in signage" changed to "aesthetic benefits" is clearly a substantive change to the ordinance. Many residents of Los Angeles, myself included have been desirous of a great reduction in billboards and an enforcement of the laws and regulations which have been passed by our City Council. It is sad that those laws and regulations are not enforced. Please do not let this change in the proposed Sign Ordinance go forward.

Thank you,

Marilyn Bush  
4411 Los Feliz Blvd. PH1  
Los Angeles, CA 90027

From: **Sarah Hays** <[sirrah@sbcglobal.net](mailto:sirrah@sbcglobal.net)>

Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 4:29 PM

Subject: REJECT DRAFT OF CITYWIDE SIGN ORDINANCE

To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Cc: Paul Koretz <[paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org)>, [Mayor@lacity.org](mailto:Mayor@lacity.org), Ban Billboard Blight <[info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org)>

Dear Mr. Espinosa - Can you please distribute this to the PLUM Committee members before the Oct 18 meeting where the Sign Ordinance will be discussed? Thank you.

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:

Just this past week, I took an out-of-town guest to Sunset and Vine for a Hollywood History tour. I was dismayed to see that all of the new and renovated buildings there are covered in advertising. I guess that some decision has been made to make Hollywood into another Times Square, and I am very glad that I do not have to live or work there and look at those signs shouting at me day and night. Please do something to preserve the rest of our city from becoming like what I saw this week. The latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance does little to protect the residents and workers who spend time in our city, and I urge you to reject it.

At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

Some illegal billboards in West Los Angeles where I live have been removed, and it has made such a difference to be able to see the buildings instead of being assaulted by huge whiskey bottles and gigantic hamburgers. However, digital billboards have been installed without any attention to how these impact our neighborhoods. Don't sell us out to the sign companies! Stand up for the citizens! Please do all you can to protect our city for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves this city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Sarah Hays  
10509 Blythe Ave - Los Angeles CA 90064  
310/558-3538 - [sirrah@sbcglobal.net](mailto:sirrah@sbcglobal.net)

From: **edward** <[edvhunt@earthlink.net](mailto:edvhunt@earthlink.net)>

Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 4:33 PM

Subject: FW: Stop Lobbyists From Gutting Sign Ordinance

To: Ed Reyes <[councilmember.reyes@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.reyes@lacity.org)>, Jose Huizar <[councilmember.huizar@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.huizar@lacity.org)>, Paul Krekorian <[Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org](mailto:Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org)>

Cc: [mayor@lacity.org](mailto:mayor@lacity.org), Maggi Fajnor

<[maggi4f@gmail.com](mailto:maggi4f@gmail.com)>, [hsdncboard@googlegroups.com](mailto:hsdncboard@googlegroups.com), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org), Jane Usher <[jane.usher@lacity.org](mailto:jane.usher@lacity.org)>, [alphadesignpartnership@yahoo.com](mailto:alphadesignpartnership@yahoo.com), [EHilton@icfi.com](mailto:EHilton@icfi.com)

To: Planning And Land Use Management Committee

Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, Chair

Councilmember Jose Huizar

Councilmember Paul Krekorian

October 16, 2011

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Edward Villareal Hunt, AIA, ASLA

4928 West Melrose Hill  
Los Angeles, CA 90029

323.856.9914, Cell: 323.646.6287

[edvhunt@earthlink.net](mailto:edvhunt@earthlink.net)

From: <[MELSY29@aol.com](mailto:MELSY29@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 5:44 PM  
Subject: reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance  
To: [councilmember.weiss@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.weiss@lacity.org), [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.

- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.

- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.

- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,  
Melissa Kent & Scott Robertson  
2129 S. Canfield Ave.  
Los Angeles CA 90034



From: **a stek** <[stek@usc.edu](mailto:stek@usc.edu)>  
Date: Sun, Oct 16, 2011 at 11:05 PM  
Subject: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance. please oppose  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Dear Mr. Espinosa,

Can you please forward this letter to the members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee?

Thank you.  
Alice Stek

Re: Council File 08-2020 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

The proliferation of billboards and other large advertising is a civic embarrassment. Just imagine what an attractive city Los Angeles could be without the urban blight of oversized advertising. Please do everything you can to protect our city for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Alice Stek, MD  
Venice

From: **Mavis Gallenson** <[mgallenson@la.ladas.com](mailto:mgallenson@la.ladas.com)>  
Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 10:15 PM  
Subject: Stop Revised Citywide Sign Ordinance  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)

Dear Mr. Espinosa-

Please distribute this to the city council PLUM committee (Messrs Reyes, Krekorian, Zine, LaBonge, Koretz, Cardena, Alarcon, Parks, Perry, Wesson, Rosendahl, Englander, Grcetti, Huizar, and Villaraigosa.

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.

Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.

Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.

Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

Sincerely,

Mavis Gallenson

LADAS & PARRY LLP  
3670 Mandeville Canyon Road  
LA CA 90049

From: **Brendan Folan** <[mredhead@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mredhead@sbcglobal.net)>

Date: Fri, Oct 14, 2011 at 3:53 PM

Subject: Citywide Sign Ordinance

To: "[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)" <[michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)>, "[councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org)" <[councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rosendahl@lacity.org)>, "[mavor@lacity.org](mailto:mavor@lacity.org)" <[mavor@lacity.org](mailto:mavor@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 Citywide Sign Ordinance

Dear Committee Members:

I urge you to reject the latest draft of the citywide sign ordinance. At a minimum, any sign ordinance revisions should do the following:

- Require the removal of existing billboards at a more than one to one square footage ratio in exchange for any new billboards or other types of off-site advertising signs.
- Provide absolute protection for city parks and other public facilities from commercial advertising.
- Require any pending sign district applications not yet approved by the City Planning Commission to conform to the takedown provision and other future provisions of the sign ordinance.
- Prohibit digital signage anywhere until comprehensive regulations are in place to protect communities from light pollution, traffic hazards, excess energy use, and change in community character.

I do not want the areas of the city I work in and travel through to be turned into replicas of Times Square or "Blade Runner." Please do everything you can to protect it for me, my family, my neighbors, and everyone else who loves the city and wants it to be a good place to live and work.

I have personally witnessed a large number of accidents at several intersections near my home where electronic billboards have been installed in the last several years, and I believe that these billboards are a large part of the problem in creating not only visual blight but also a huge distraction that poses a serious threat to the safety of motorists traveling on these streets. So-called supergraphics are equally problematic. Two buildings in particular (both adjacent to freeways - one by the 405 and Century Blvd., the other off the 10 near Overland Ave.) stand out for having repeatedly infringed on city ordinances. Besides being unsightly, such supergraphics also pose a huge threat to the fire safety of a building.

Sincerely,

Brendan Folan  
7834 McConnell Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

From: **Barbara Dohrmann** <[dohrjamb@aol.com](mailto:dohrjamb@aol.com)>  
Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2011 at 9:59 AM  
Subject: CF#[08-2020](#) ~~ Citywide Sign Ordinance ~~ Oct. 18, 2011 PLUM Comm. Meeting  
To: [michael.espinosa@lacity.org](mailto:michael.espinosa@lacity.org)  
Cc: [councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org](mailto:councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org), [info@banbillboardblight.org](mailto:info@banbillboardblight.org), [gif165@gmail.com](mailto:gif165@gmail.com), [president@hillsidefederation.org](mailto:president@hillsidefederation.org)

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Councilmember Ed Reyes, Chair  
Councilmember Jose Huizar  
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Re: Council File No. 08-2020

Dear Committee Members:

After reviewing the Sign Ordinance approved by the Planning Commission in 2009 and comparing it to the proposed sign ordinance currently being presented to you, I must respectfully request that you return the ordinance to the Planning Commission (CPC) for further consideration including full public review.

During the more than two (2) years that have elapsed since the CPC's decision in this matter, numerous changes of a substantive nature have been made to the proposed ordinance without compliance with the required public notice and public hearings. Lacking full legal compliance, the matter before you today is premature.

Although all matters presented for your consideration are important, this sign ordinance contains troublesome provisions of citywide concern and is totally lacking in protections for parks, schools, scenic and other sensitive areas that are generally accorded protection under our laws. Like most residents, I am concerned about the prospect of increasing blight that the current proposal most certainly assures. But the proper forum for hearing such views is the CPC.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dohrmann  
16437 Sloan Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

cc: Councilmember Bill Rosendahl  
Brentwood Community Council  
Hillside Federation  
Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight