

From: **richard horowitz** <rshorowitzmd@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 6:59 PM

Subject: Sign Ordinance

To: Michael.Espinosa@lacity.org

Mr. Espinosa:

This week I learned of the proposed Sign Ordinance (CF#08-2020 and CF#11-0724) that went before the Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) on October 18.

I wish to register my strenuous objection to these ordinances. Our parks are designed, and in the case of Griffith Park mandated for use as natural environments. That is, unadulterated green spaces that provide a much needed respite for all Angelenos from the urban sites and sounds we are confronted with every day. It is inappropriate and counterproductive to place signs, billboards or banners in these areas. The citizens who use our parks wish to see trees, wildlife, grass and dirt; not asphalt, neon or commercial advertisements.

In the case of Griffith Park, its donation to the city mandates that it be kept in its "natural" state. While the periphery of the park has been used to develop a golf course, and several soccer fields, the entrance and main body of the park has dutifully remained a pristine reserve. It must and should remain so. There is no budgetary need that is so profound to allow these eyesores from scarring our green spaces.

These are misguided and irresponsible ordinances. Their acceptance will be evidence of city governments violation of its fiduciary responsibility to its citizens and electorate. Legal challenges and suits will certainly follow if they are adopted.

Sincerely,
Richard Horowitz