

## SCNC BOARD

Barbara Monahan Burke  
Ezra Dweck  
Victor Helo  
Remy Kessler  
Michael McCue  
Ben Neumann  
Richard Niederberg  
Todd Royal  
Lisa Sarkin  
Jeremy Schwarz  
Gail Steinberg  
Ron Taylor  
Rita Villa  
John T. Walker



**PRESIDENT**  
Ben Neumann  
**VICE PRESIDENT**  
John T. Walker

**TREASURER**  
Remy Kessler

**SECRETARY**  
Gail Steinberg

**CORRESPONDING SECRETARY**  
Lisa Sarkin

4024 Radford Ave.  
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6  
Studio City, CA 91604  
Phone (818) 655-5400  
[www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info)

# SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA

**Sunday, May 10, 2009, 10:00am**  
at

**CBS Studio Center, Building 8, MPR-3,  
4024 Radford, Studio City CA, 91604**

The public is requested to fill out a "Speaker Card" to address the Board on any item of the agenda prior to the Board taking action on an item. Comments from the public on Agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the Agenda that is within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction will be heard during the Public Comment period. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker, unless directed otherwise by the presiding officer of the Board. The agenda is posted for public review at: Studio City Neighborhood Council website ([www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info)); as well as CBS Studio Center, Radford and Colfax gates; the Studio City Library, 12511 Moorpark St.; the Studio City Recreation Center, 12621 Rye Ave. and at Carpenter Avenue Elementary School, 3909 Carpenter Avenue, Studio City, CA 91604. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the Neighborhood Council Project Coordinator (213) 473-5391 or by e-mail to [Thomas.Soong@lacity.org](mailto:Thomas.Soong@lacity.org). In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at our website by clicking on the following link: [www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info) or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact [office@scnc.info](mailto:office@scnc.info).

## Agenda

1. Call to Order & Roll Call. (2 min)
2. Comments by President. (1 min)
3. Public Comments on non-agenda items within the Board's jurisdiction. (5 min)
4. Response(s) to public comments by Board Members. (5 min)
5. Government Affairs Committee Report: Barbara Monahan Burke & Rita Villa (40 min).
  - a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports the addition of the following comments regarding the motions brought forward at the PLUM meeting on April 21, 2009, by Council members Weiss and Reyes to the SCNC Community Impact Statement on Council File number 08-2020.**

Re: Council File 08-2020 / PLUM Committee meeting May 12, 2009  
Revisions to City Sign Code

We, the Studio City Neighborhood Council, submit the comments below to the City Planning Commission and City Council as an addition to our community impact statement on Council File 08-2020 regarding revisions to the proposed City sign ordinance that were brought forward on April 21, 2009 at the PLUM Committee meeting by Council members Weiss and Reyes and on April 29, 2009 by Councilmember Tom LaBonge through his letter of the same date.

MOTIONS - As submitted by Councilmember Jack Weiss on 4-21-09:

- We agree with motions number 1 through 6, 8 through 11, and 13 through 16
- We agree with motion number 7. However, no existing digital signs should operate or be used until the Federal and National research and findings are completed and only if they show that there is no detriment to public health, safety, the environment, or to historical buildings/sites.
- We request that you revise Councilmember Weiss' motion 12 to indicate that all signs that have been unlawfully erected without permits to date should be removed.

- We request that you revise Councilmember Weiss' motion 17 to state – "Clarify that the definition of "interior signs" are signs not visible from the public right of way or incidentally visible from public right of way"

MOTIONS - As submitted by Councilmember Ed P. Reyes on 4-21-09:

- We agree with motions number 2 through 4 and 7.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to report back on the feasibility of allowing for a less restrictive minimum acreage and/or square footage and eligible zones for the Comprehensive Sign Program. Studio City does not support the Comprehensive Sign Program as it is presently contemplated in the proposed ordinance. We do not support any decrease in the minimum acreage and/or square footage or any increase in the number of eligible zones.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to define a "Sign Impact Area" as it relates to the Sign Reduction Program. Councilmember Reyes inquired whether the impact area could be expanded. Studio City does not support such an expansion. We support the motion of Councilmember Weiss stated in his motion number 11 above.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to discuss the inclusion of "grandfathered sign districts." He requested that the current ordinance include what was recommended in the original ordinance that was sent to CPC. Studio City does not support the inclusion of any "grandfathered sign districts" in addition to the two included in the proposed ordinance submitted to PLUM by the CPC. The filing of an application for a sign district which has not even begun the public hearing process should not be grandfathered. Neither the proposed Metro/Universal sign district nor the proposed Universal Evolution sign district should be grandfathered.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Department of Building and Safety with the assistance of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to determine what resources have been paid to the City for the sign inspection and enforcement program. He directed that the report should include who has paid, funding information that includes total current account balance, and purpose. In addition, the report should identify what resources are available, or may be available to the City to enforce the law. Studio City would like it to be noted that payments into this fund should not affect the standing of any party in the matter of citywide sign issues.

Studio City would like to express its gratitude to Councilmember Tom LaBonge for submitting his letter dated April 29, 2009. We support his position that Sign Districts should be limited to one specific geographical area of the City: the Downtown Center. Studio City further agrees with Councilmember Tom LaBonge that provision (b) from Section 9, paragraph B-1 should be removed from the Draft Sign Ordinance.

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports the addition of the following comments to the SCNC Community Impact Statement on Council File number 08-2020 regarding the draft sign ordinance send by the CPC to PLUM and which will be further considered at its meeting on May 12, 2009.**

Re: Council File 08-2020 and CPC's Draft Sign Ordinance - City Planning Case No. 2009-0008-CA

Revisions to City Sign Code

We, the Studio City Neighborhood Council, hereby ask the City Planning Commission and City Council to take the actions below regarding latest proposed ordinance to revise and amend the Los Angeles Municipal Code regulating signs.

1. Prohibit all super graphics. "Wall Signs," as they are now being called, are unacceptable. Otherwise we are concerned that buildings will be constructed with blank walls to accommodate them.
2. Neighborhood Councils ("NCs") should be notified of requests for appeal of Civil Penalties and of proposed Comprehensive Sign Districts. To have the "Code section be consistent," notify NCs of all proposed items effecting billboards and signage rather than cutting them out of the process. NCs represent all stakeholder and should be "at the

table" in accordance with the intent of the City charter to provide NC public oversight of City Government.

3. At the present time Digital signs should be prohibited everywhere in the City, even in Sign Districts.

The City Council voted to support state legislation AB 109 that is being proposed by Representative Mike Feuer for a two-year Moratorium on Digital Billboards. We request that the City Council incorporate the provisions of that legislation into the City's proposed ordinance. This will allow time for the completion of ongoing Federal and National Studies concerning the effects of digital billboards and signs on "public health and welfare," hazards to drivers, pedestrians, residents, property, and communities. Additional items that should be addressed in the proposed ordinance are limiting the effects on the environment and on historical buildings of digital signs and billboards.

4. NCs should be fully represented on the proposed taskforce that will meet in one year.
5. NCs should have the right of Private Action.
6. A discretionary deviation of 20% is too large. There should be no exceptions. Exceptions lead to more litigation.
7. The City of Los Angeles is not only an urban area. Significant portions of the City are suburban and rural.

Studio City is suburban. The two proposed Sign Districts, the Metro/Universal Sign District and the Universal Evolution Sign District are incompatible with the suburban character of Studio City. The proposed Metro/Universal Sign District is wholly in Studio City; The Universal Evolution Sign District is adjacent to Studio City in the County of Los Angeles. These Sign Districts are being proposed separately, however, their combined impact will have a significant detrimental effect which is unacceptable to Studio City Stakeholders.

Sign Districts are one massive loophole in the proposed ordinance. The property owners within the Sign District appear to be allowed to make the decisions about the sign districts. The Community does not have any say. A "Times Square" West will be erected in Studio City, an area that currently has a village atmosphere. This result would be disastrous.

It is insufficient to cite a problem only with single-family residences around any proposed Sign Districts. Residences that are zoned up to R-3 should also be given consideration.

No one needs the glare, noise and onslaught of visual clutter all day and night with the attendant traffic and parking nightmare that Sign Districts create. Sign Districts represent an unwarranted intrusion upon our lives which is, in fact, life altering for the worse.

8. Enforcement and penalties are essential if the ordinance is to be taken seriously.
9. There should be no exception to the requirement that there must be a 660 foot buffer between the freeway and signs unless otherwise permitted by California Codes.
10. (Page C-2) "Signs should not dominate the visual character of an area. The easily enforceable time/place/manner restrictions City wide are to protect neighborhoods." Therefore, again we request that you act to prohibit Digital Signs everywhere even in Sign Districts.
11. Allow only Fine Art Murals to be installed on private property and then only when approved by the Department of Cultural Affairs. Supergraphics should not be permitted under the guise that they are Fine Art Murals.
12. The proposed ordinance would permit Sign Districts to include Supergraphics, Digital, off-site and rooftop signs. Such signage would not comply with the code because they

would dominate the visual appearance of the area. Section 14.4.1 Purpose.E. indicates "That adequacy of message opportunity will be available to sign users without dominating the visual appearance of the area."

13. We now have R-3 or more restrictively zoned residences 30 or more feet away from illuminated signs that interfere with the lives of tenants/owners of residences. There should be a strict "shut-off" time for illumination, preferably when the business closes or, at the latest, midnight.
  14. (C-21) Two years is too long for temporary signs on temporary construction walls. These often end up being super graphics. Additionally, they are a target for graffiti.
  15. (C-31) The draft ordinance states "Comprehensive Sign Programs within 500' of a residentially zoned lot is to be "Compatible" with residential uses." Please provide a definition of "compatible." The number of possible comprehensive Sign Program properties in the City of Los Angeles should be stated. CPCs will be excessive exceptions to the proposed ordinance.
  16. (C-40, Section 2.K.) We applaud that Specific Plans are allowed to be the same or more restrictive than the proposed ordinance.
  17. We foresee that Sign Districts will be detrimental to Studio City, both at Metro/Universal and at the Universal/Evolution sites. (C-45.4.(c)) states "The proposed special sign regulations shall not constitute a hazard to the safe and efficient operation of vehicles upon a street or a freeway or create a condition that endangers the safety of persons, pedestrians, or property"; and section (d) states "the proposed special sign regulations will not create light pollution or other negative environmental effects that will be materially detrimental to the character of development in the immediate neighborhood outside the proposed district..." The impact of both the proposed sign districts noted above would clearly violate the intent of these provisions of the proposed ordinance. The unmitigateable impacts of such districts will destroy the character and quality of life of the community of Studio City.
  18. There should be vigorous enforcement of the provisions of the law once it is in place.
- c) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council opposes the amendment to Ordinance No. 172,465 which currently regulates signage for Staples Center ("Arena"). We oppose instillation of electronic signage visible from the Freeway on the Convention Center South Hall, Convention Center West Hall, Convention Center Concourse, and Arena Buildings.**

**Case No.'s CPC-2008-3374-MS and  
ENV: Addendum to EIR SCH #96091061**

6. Comments from Board Members on subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction (5 min).
7. Adjournment (1 min).

SCNC BOARD MEETING – SPECIAL MEETING - MAY 10, 2009

1. Ben Neumann, John Walker, Rita Villa, Barbara Monahan Burke, Lisa Sarkin (secy), Michael McCue, Richard Niederberg, Ron Taylor, Victor Helo (10:16) 8 present – quorum met - all others excused.

2. - 4

5. a) Rita Villa – background on this Planning Dept. is asking the CPC and City Council to change the sign restrictions.

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben – amending the current SCNC CIS – Lisa – it is an amendment to the SCNC current CIS. Ron – what about Sunset Blvd. Richard – Sunset Blvd. is in West Hollywood.

VOTE: 8-0-0

5. b) Rita Villa – background continuation to way in on the sign ordinance. Weiss and Reyes put forth motions to add or change the CPC sign ordinance. LaBonge sent a letter too. The GAC agrees with some of these changes but disagrees with others. This is the reason for this motion

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben. Michael – supports this having worked with the committee.

VOTE: 8-0-0

5. c) Rita Villa – explains study of digital billboards along freeways. Contacted the NC in the area. They were not up to speed and will bring it up at their next meeting. He did not object to our weighing in at this time.

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben. Ben – raised as a point with Rita we should only weigh in within

Studio City unless we are asked. That is why I wanted Rita and Barbara to contact the other NC. John – Should we really weigh in on this? Barbara – citywide issue because it is the convention center. The council only attacked this to make money. Nobody lives near it. Rita – nobody lives within 500 feet. Ben – not really citywide issue. One particular building in one particular area – Ron – suggest one area

Downtown. Concerned about traffic safety and maybe is premature to pass this. Give us back some of our budget, worry about taking this position. Lisa – an exception to the ordinance can cause problems in the future. At Dodger Stadium you can see the lights now. Richard – how can you treat people differently. Barbara - Caltrans says that you cannot have these signs within 660 feet of a state highway. Met with Jim Dantona about the state law, so we do have a right to pass this information. Ben – it has to be particular to the city. It is a slippery slope that we go down here. What if other NCs around Metro/Universal supported it. If the local NC would ask us for support, it would be different.

Understand all the motivations, playing in somebody's sandbox. Michael – I agree with the president, however, our board is more on top of things, the city did get things past us until we were looking for it. I

also support that the president wanted contact with this NC. Ben – no official position. Rita – James De\_\_\_\_\_. Who NC is was? DONE couldn't help us. I had to find it out myself. Downtown NC is the NC, so I contacted them. I went through their list of contacts, bad numbers – until I got to the secondary Contact. He is member of the NC board and LUC. Did not receive notice because nobody lives within 500 feet. There was no other way in the short time. We said go ahead and read to him the motion. My real concern is what this proposal is of putting electric signage to the existing signage ordinance. It is present setting, it will make a down hill path. They may sneak this in before the PLUM meeting. I feel so strongly that we must weigh in now because they are trying to squeeze in. Its Mother's Day and it is appalling. Michael – encourage the board to remember that we have done what the president asked and we may have to be a watchdog.

Friendly motion - Ron – we are in danger of holding their place while they are

Getting this together. One of my problems is that we write this motion, I oppose this motion because we are not nimby. Prefer a motion that said that the process has not “The Board of the SCNC opposes adoption of the amendment to ordinance 172465 by the City Planning Department on May 11, 2009. The amendment has not been addressed by other government agencies , including but not limited to NCs, who have jurisdiction over laws governing signage. The CPD shall take no action until the city council adopts a new signage ordinance.” Second Michael

Richard – we want the 660 firmly and would take a lot off our backs. Maybe it is not our business, maybe we are nimby, so these signs cannot be in SC. Ben – it is less the issue of the sign ordinance, is it a slap on the wrist, because it is the way you are doing it. This is how the motion reads to me. Barbara – on this motion, we should put someplace in there that NC are not included. John – I'm a little unclear where signage is allowed, not allowed VOTE: 9-0-0

Ron – rita second

**From:** "Terri J. Freedman" <cuicksilver@gmail.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 9:56 PM  
**Subject:** Do NOT grandfather sign districts

Dear Barbara,

As an LA County citizen, taxpayer, and member of Ban Billboard Blight, I vehemently oppose the current proposal to grandfather additional sign districts. As someone who commutes all over LA regularly, I am affected by many of the pending districts, especially two of these districts which are bound by freeways.

Sign districts as a whole are a horrendous idea and are counter-intuitive to creating a livable environment for Angelinos. They are the loophole in the otherwise laudable revised sign ordinance in that they give practically unlimited power to advertisers to produce the most distracting, demanding, artificial, ugly, and obnoxious signage on the streets of LA. It is not only dangerous (CA DMV reports 1 in 4 accidents are caused by being distracted), but it is immoral. Lest I sound pretentious, consider that advertisers have spent billions, probably more, trying to learn how to capture a person's attention. Psychologically, a person cannot naturally avoid bright, colorful, large images adjacent to earth-toned buildings and streets. By allowing such advertising, we are selling something we don't have the rights to--a person's thoughts. Advertisers may argue it's only momentary and unobtrusive, but we know it's not insignificant based on the price they are willing to pay for it.

Additionally, if more sign districts are grandfathered, advertisers will use this as a precedent to discover other areas to be eligible for becoming a sign district and fight the city on existing restrictions--as you can see from the legal issues the city has faced from advertisers during its billboard moratorium and recent initiative to revise sign restrictions.

This is a terrible proposal; I urge you to vote against it and encourage your associates to do the same.

I greatly appreciate your time and understanding.

Respectfully,

Terri J. Freedman  
2429 Ocean Park Blvd. Apt B  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

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

May 8, 2009

City of Los Angeles PLUM Committee  
City Hall, Room 395  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
ATTN: Barbara Greaves, Legislative Assistant  
RE: City Plan Case No. 2009-0008-CA // Sign Ordinance

Dear Chairman Reyes and PLUM Committee Members Huizar and Weiss,

I write with the deepest of concern for the credibility of the pending sign ordinance. Thousands of hours of hard work have been invested by the City and its constituents to bring forth a balanced and responsible sign ordinance to govern the appropriate placement of signs in the coming years. It is likely that this ordinance will effect more people across the City than any other passed this year.

As we are all aware, there is currently a lobbying effort underway to have the five sign districts that are "pending" be grandfathered in under the old/former regulations. These five potential sign districts have not gone through an entitlement process. No hearings have been held; the City Planning Commission has not convened meetings to discuss them and, in fact, two of the proposed sign districts are nothing more than motions brought forth by interested councilmembers.

The overwhelming majority of citizens of Los Angeles do not want to see any sign districts beyond Hollywood and Downtown. Yet, the proposed sign ordinance in seeking to balance the interests of citizens and the outdoor advertising industry, will create a mechanism for the establishment of a number of sign districts with their locations clearly defined by and tied to the City's General Plan. Their establishment will also be coupled with a mandatory reduction in existing signage. To allow additional sign districts to be introduced at this time will undermine the new ordinance before it has a chance to be implemented. You will be opening the door and placing a "welcome litigators" mat at the stairs of City Hall and before the outdoor advertising industry. The City can ill afford having to defend itself against a new round of lawsuits brought by this rather litigious industry. This can and must be avoided.

Please gather the strength to tell those who seek these districts that you regretfully must say no. Special opportunities granted to some always come back to haunt the City. The courts have been clear and firm on this. Let us create this new law and protect it from the start with respect for the important goals it seeks to achieve for Los Angeles.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Barbara Broide  
President



**From:** Kevin Hall <kph227@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <council...>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 6:32 PM  
**Subject:** Don't Grandfather in Sign districts

Dear Council Members,

Please don't allow any more pollution of our cityscape by these sign polluters. They are ruining our city. I feel cheap, and angry, every time I drive down the road and I am assaulted by these signs, digital, supergraphic, crass, ugly, you name it.

So there I am, driving down the road, ANGRY. Don't we have enough of those drivers already?

Kevin Hall

**From:** "MARILYN NOYES" <marnoyes@msn.com>  
**To:**  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 2:45 PM  
**Subject:** Please DO NOT grandfather in sign districts

As a resident of West Los Angeles who is affronted by the huge proliferation of signs in my neighborhood, I have had it with billboard companies extorting the city attorney's office and making policy that strangles the visual atmosphere of our city. I look at underperforming stores in my neighborhood, and their property owners couldn't care less, because they rake in money by polluting the visual space above their buildings with endless, often violent advertising.

Do not grandfather in those sign districts that have neither been approved nor undergone an environmental impact process. What you should be doing is making the existing owners of properties that profit from all that billboard advertising revenue pay a monthly share of the windfall they take in. The offsite advertising signs create blight in our neighborhoods and the digital billboards pose terrible distractions for drivers passing through our areas. Instead of having thriving businesses on their properties that can generate healthy volumes of sales tax for our city, these people rake in profits that they do not share with the city that they are part of.

Do not grandfather in those five sign districts. DO make people who rent advertising space on their properties pay into the city's coffers. They are riding high while every ordinary citizen and every city department and employee suffers. It's WRONG!

Marilyn Noyes  
Los Angeles, 90025

**From:** Albert Gasser <albertmail@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 1:33 PM  
**Subject:** NO grandfathering of sign districts

Honorable Barbara Greaves,

Please stop the hijacking of our City by corporate advertising.  
Let's create neighborhoods by the people and for the people, not  
vehicles for corporate dominance of our city and our lives.

Grandfathering of sign districts is in direct conflict with the  
intent of writing a new sign ordinance to stop the proliferation of  
billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising  
invading our visual landscape.

Please vote against grandfathering!!

With best regards,

Albert Gasser

Albert Gasser  
2018 Rosilla Place  
Los Angeles, CA 90046

albertmail@sbcglobal.net

**From:** Jordan Goldman <jordgold@gmail.com>  
**To:** <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <council...>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 1:28 PM  
**Subject:** Please vote NO to grandfathering sign districts

Grandfathering sign districts will create enormous legal problems for our City in the future, and make it incredibly difficult to enforce the new sign regulations. Please don't allow this cycle to be repeated again - vote no on grandfathering sign districts!

- Jordan Goldman - constituent, District 5  
1549 1/2 S Wooster St  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

**From:** rev erto <revertto@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <council...>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 12:50 PM  
**Subject:** No grandfathering of sign districts

I'm writing to plead that you oppose the grandfathering of sign districts. The City of Los Angeles must not let the billboard companies operate with impunity. There are already too many billboards, and the proliferation of digital billboards in this city is disgusting. Don't let the billboard companies skirt attempts to rein them in.

Sincerely,  
Ryan Vincent

**From:** Jan Book2 <jan@janbook.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 12:11 PM  
**Subject:** NO grandfathering of sign districts

Dear Barbara Greaves,

Please do NOT grandfather in the 5 pending sign districts which have not already received CPC approval. Please require them to be subject to the much more stringent sign district provisions in the new ordinance.

I understand that 2 signed districts which had already received CPC approval will be grandfathered in. I can accept that because the decision was decided before the new ordinance was approved.

But the visual blight must stop sometime and it needs to be now.

Thank you.

Jan Book  
Venice, CA  
310/392-1426

**From:** Eric Wrobbel <eric@ericwrobbel.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/9/2009 8:37 AM  
**Subject:** Sign Districts--please NO grandfathering!

Please DON'T grandfather those other 5 sign districts!

Such an action be unfair to the residents of this city in two ways. First, because it allows more signage without the protections and mitigations of the new ordinance. And second, because we residents will have to pay to defend the legal challenges the city will surely face from sign companies who didn't benefit from these exceptions.

Please say NO!

Sincerely,  
Eric Wrobbel

**From:** "Dr. David Allan" <10801takesigndown@gmail.com>  
**To:** Barbara Greaves <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, Ed Reyes <councilmember.re...>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 10:01 PM  
**Subject:** No Grandfathering of sign districts

Dear PLUM Representatives,

I have been informed that the grandfathering of the 5 sign districts has been tabled and I want to strongly oppose any such idea. If there is even a remote chance of increased signage or the risk of lawsuits that has plagued the city in the past, vote it down.

We need to set strong measures to protect our city from signage blight and the throng of advertisers that would not hesitate to crush the visual landscape of Los Angeles for the sake of their own personal gains.

I understand first hand what can happen when this issue gets out of hand. I would only hope you caught my story on the last KCET Billboard Confidential. If not you can see it on my last post at [www.10801takesigndown.blogspot.com](http://www.10801takesigndown.blogspot.com).

I have placed well over 200 of my supporters in the the Bcc: section of this email, so they can be informed of this issue.

Supporters please visit Ban Billboard Blight <<http://banbillboardblight.org/?p=2272>> to learn more on an initial meeting that will be coming up this Monday, May 11th.

Say no and disallow any grandfathering.

Sincerely,

Dr David Allan

--

David Allan, D.C.  
1700 Westwood Blvd. Suite 2D  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
Skype: wellnessfacilitator  
Chiropractic Office: (310) 923-0707  
123 Wellness/Anti-Aging: (310) 773-1993



**Barbara Greaves - Council File 08-2020, Sign Ordinance Revisions - No New Sign Districts, please**

---

**From:** "Robert Aronson" <r\_aronson@ureach.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <councilmember.weiss@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 9:45 PM  
**Subject:** Council File 08-2020, Sign Ordinance Revisions - No New Sign Districts, please

---

Hi,

I am strongly opposed to amending the proposed new sign ordinance to allow five new sign districts in addition to the two sign districts already grandfathered by the current version of the proposed sign ordinance.

These five sign districts could add approximately 100,000 square feet of new commercial advertising in the public space, the equivalent of 150 full-size billboards. This is in conflict with the public's goals and intentions in demanding a new sign ordinance, which is to STOP the proliferation of billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising invading our visual landscape.

I hope that the PLUM Committee will reject the proposal to allow five new sign districts.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Robert A. Aronson  
1909 Ocean Front Walk #4  
Venice, CA 90291-4148

---

Get your own "800" number  
Voicemail, fax, email, and a lot more  
<http://www.ureach.com/reg/tag>

**From:** David Allan <wellnessfacilitator@gmail.com>  
**To:** <10801takesigndown@gmail.com>  
**CC:** Barbara Greaves <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, Ed Reyes <councilmember.re...>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** NO GRANDFATHERING OF SIGN DISTRICTS

Dear PLUM Representatives,

I have been informed that the grandfathering of the 5 sign districts has been tabled and I want to strongly oppose any such idea. If there is even a remote chance of increased signage or the risk of lawsuits that has plagued the city in the past, vote it down.

We need to set strong measures to protect our city from signage blight and the throng of advertisers that would not hesitate to crush the visual landscape of Los Angeles for the sake of their own personal gains.

I understand first hand what can happen when this issue gets out of hand. I would only hope you caught my story on the last KCET Billboard Confidential. If not you can see it on my last post at [www.10801takesigndown.blogspot.com](http://www.10801takesigndown.blogspot.com).

Say no and disallow any grandfathering.

Sincerely,

Dr David Allan

--  
David Allan, D.C.  
1700 Westwood Blvd. Suite 2D  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
Skype: wellnessfacilitator  
Chiropractic Office: (310) 923-0707  
123 Wellness/Anti-Aging: (310) 773-1993

**From:** Daniel Fink <danielfink@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <councilmember.weiss@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <cou...>  
**CC:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 6:24 PM  
**Subject:** sign ordinance/sign districts/NO GRANDFATHERING

Dear Councilmembers Reyes, Huizar, Weiss:

PLEASE heed to voices of the voters, citizens, and taxpayers.

We do NOT want any more billboards.

The proposed sign ordinance should certainly NOT grandfather in any more special sign districts than the two which have actually been approved.

Any others, which may have been proposed but which have not yet been studied or approved, should be required to go through whatever new process will be specified by the proposed ordinance.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this issue.

Daniel J. Fink  
9736 Saturn Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

310.266.6991

Zone 1 Representative  
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council  
(for identification purposes only)

**From:** "Tom Safran" <Tom@tsahousing.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <council...>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 6:17 PM  
**Subject:** Revised Sign Ordinance

Dear Plum Committee members:

As a developer and property manager in the greater LA area and as a resident and businessman in the City of LA, I urge you to support the Planning Commission and resist grandfathering proposed sign districts and projects that could lead to a large proliferation of digital and supergraphic signs:

- 1- All of the surrounding cities don't allow it: Pasadena, Glendale, Santa Monica, Culver City, Beverly Hills, Burbank. They're all very successful, desirable cities in which to have businesses. Why? Because they're more attractive places to live and work.
- 2- Los Angeles City is one of the least attractive (from a "built environment") cities in the United States because we have had virtually no controls over signage and billboards. I moved here from Chicago in 1970 and it was known then as the "Outdoor" capital of America. All that has happened since is it's gotten so much worse.
- 3- I prefer to develop and own property in almost any other City other than Los Angeles because I don't feel my investment will be protected. I'm currently working on three Los Angeles City projects. Two are in redevelopment areas because I feel the redevelopment agency and its strict guidelines will protect my investment. The other project is in West LA. I'm hopeful that Councilman Rosendahl will help protect my investment there.
- 4- One of the few commercial areas in Los Angeles City, San Vicente Blvd. in Brentwood, that prohibits billboards and has a strict signage program (it's in a Specific Planning area) has the highest rents and lowest vacancies rates for retail and office in the City. Wilshire Blvd used to be the premier street. But not anymore. The Wilshire portion is a garish collection of billboards and signage.
- 5- Covering buildings with signs and billboards (except in specially designated areas like the Sunset Strip in West Hollywood or parts of downtown Hollywood or an Entertainment area around Staples) creates visual blight and will ultimately have a detrimental effect on property values and business activity. But the City has allowed this blight on virtually every commercial thoroughfare.
- 6- Yes, we're in a difficult economic time. But please don't use that excuse to grant exemptions to make LA in the long term an unpleasant place to live and work. Other cities are not doing it.

And finally let's all remember Ogden Nash's ditty:

"I think that I shall never see a billboard lovely as a tree. Alas

unless the billboards fall, I shall never see a tree at all."

Sincerely,

Tom Safran

---

Thomas L. Safran

11812 San Vicente Blvd., Suite 600

Los Angeles, CA 90049

(310) 820-4888

**From:** manzonita <manzonita@gmail.com>  
**To:** <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <co...  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 6:01 PM  
**Subject:** please do NOT grandfather any new sign districts

Dear Councilmen and Ms. Greaves,

please do not support the grandfathering of any additional sign districts.

In fact, if you could possibly \*shrink\* the one I live near, in Hollywood, that would also be appreciated. It was drawn badly and is, in my opinion, administered quite badly, though I do not know exactly where the fault lies. One might almost think that the Fire Department is the only functioning city department!!! I would love it if you could prove me wrong.

Digital signs are awful, and I don't like supergraphics much better. Digital signs literally hurt my eyes, which are sensitive. They are also ugly, wasteful, and distracting to motorists.

By the way, this issue will be the chief determinant of my vote for City Attorney (absent some larger scandal emerging...), and I will remember how each of you votes in the future, for whatever little that may be worth.

I don't think this issue is going to go away. And you would be voting against the will of your constituents, I feel confident, were you to support or in any way encourage increased signage abuse in our fair city.

Sincerely,  
N.C. Manzo

**From:** "jhall68" <jhall68@socal.rr.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 5:52 PM  
**Subject:** No to grandfathering of SIGN Districts'....Why are you working WITH Sign companies to destroy our city?

A concerned citizen.....Los Angeles is probably the ugliest City I have ever been in and I have traveled the world and lived and worked in 9 countries.

This city gets uglier by the day and it is a fact sign companies and ANY company with MONEY \$\$\$\$ can get 'Past Legislation and Change LAWS to make even more money'.

Anyone with a few million can spend little to get a LOT.....How is that?

I cannot wait to get OUT of this city soon.....Give it to the Illegal's and the Profiteers! \$\$\$\$\$

Good Luck

James, veteran  
Nato Command  
Home owner, Encino, CA 91316

**From:** Leslie Eichenbaum <doctorleslie@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 5:27 PM  
**Subject:** NO grandfathering of sign districts

Dear Ms. Greaves:

The proliferation of billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising has horribly cheapened our neighborhood, created a visual landscape more reminiscent of LAX, Times Square, or some place other than a charming suburban area. It is unattractive to drive through, to live in, and reduces property values. Would you like to live across from this screaming display? Please don't inflict it on us.

Very truly yours,  
Dr. Leslie Eichenbaum

Leslie Eichenbaum

Dr. Leslie Eichenbaum  
doctorleslie@earthlink.net  
818.789.7443  
3501 Terrace View Drive  
Encino, CA 91436



**From:** "Eileen Pollack Erickson" <eileen@slpmanagement.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <council...>  
**Date:** 5/8/2009 5:16 PM  
**Subject:** Please, do not "grandfather" sign districts

Dear PLUM Committee:

Please, do not allow the five sign districts that have not received CPC approval to be "grandfathered!"

This would be in direct conflict with the new sign ordinance which intention is to stop the proliferation of billboards, supergraphics and other forms of advertising invading our visual landscape. Any districts that are grandfathered would not be required to remove an equivalent number of billboards in the area, and residents in the community will lose the intended protections. Further, granting this enormously valuable exception to selected property could keep the city in court defending its sign ordinance for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eileen

Eileen Pollack Erickson

11949 W. Jefferson Blvd. #101

Culver City, CA 90230

310/305-3093, ext.110

**From:** "Gregory D. Wright" <bg534@lafn.org>  
**To:** <councilmember.weiss@lacity.org>, <councilmember.reyes@lacity.org>, <cou...>  
**CC:** <councilmember.greuel@lacity.org>, "Lexi Richards" <Lexi.Richards@lacity...>  
**Date:** 5/11/2009 5:24 AM  
**Subject:** No Grandfathering of Los Angeles 'Sign Districts': Enough is Enough!

Ed Reyes, Chairman  
Jack Weiss  
Jose Huizar  
and Barbara Greaves, Legislative Aide  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
Los Angeles City Council

Messrs. Reyes, Weiss, Huizar; and Ms. Greaves:

The City of Los Angeles has multiple times as many billboards as any of the people who live here want to see junking up the common viewshed that belongs to all of us!

Forget about grandfathering the five sign districts that haven't received City Planning Commission approval, an action that could result in a huge increase in digital and supergraphic signs without any of the protections and community benefits mandated by the new ordinance. And granting this enormously valuable exception to selected property owners with loose criteria could keep the city in court defending its sign ordinance for years to come.

The world and this state and city are suffering the ever worse effects of a rapidly worsening problem of climate change due to the continued discharge of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere which -- like the viewshed of this city -- belongs to all of us, not just to a handful of corporations -- and the politicians who support them -- that make a lot of money with billboards and electronic signs whose illumination with mostly coal-fired electricity uselessly pumps even more carbon into the sky.

Ditto the growing problem of light pollution and its growing insidious effects on wildlife and ecological balance. Read the November 2008 National Geographic magazine for more about this.

This uncontrolled expansion of ugly, insulting, carbon-intensive advertising in an environment that belongs to all of us gives the lie to any pretense by Los Angeles's political leaders -- that's you -- that this city is serious about "going green."

For just one example, the Metro Universal, through which I travel on a regular basis on the Red Line, is proposing more than 50,000 square feet of off-site signage, including unlimited-size supergraphics and fully-animated digital signs up to 4,000 square feet in size that would be illuminated 24 hours a day. The new sign ordinance would have required an equivalent removal of billboards in the area, as well as protections for residential areas from light and other effects, but if the sign district is grandfathered none of those provisions will apply. So shelve it.

Nix also to the Metropolis project downtown, which has proposed large-scale digital advertising facing the 110 freeway; the Midtown Crossing shopping center, with more than 15,000 square feet of illuminated billboards facing on major streets; and the Panorama Place mixed-use project in Panorama City, which proposes 18,000 square feet of lighted and digital billboards. That's nearly 100,000 square feet of new commercial advertising in the public spaces just for those four projects, or the equivalent of 150 full-size billboards!

Enough!

Only one of those sign districts has even been through environmental review, and none have had public

hearings. Two other proposed sign districts, City West on the west side of the 110 freeway downtown, and Koreatown, a 19-square block area, are just motions you have made, and haven't begun to be processed by the planning department, so the number and type of signs that might be proposed is unknown. (Although you might know.)

This grandfathering of signs is in direct conflict with the intent of writing a new sign ordinance to end the proliferation of billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising invading our visual landscape.

It has the smell of political arrogance and environmental ignorance.

Gregory Wright  
14161 Riverside Drive, #3  
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423  
(818) 784-0325  
greg@newciv.org

11 May 2009

**From:** "Manuelle Charbonneau" <manuellecharbonneau@usa.net>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/11/2009 12:49 AM  
**Subject:** No to grandfathering sign districts

Greetings,

I am a mother of two kids and have never been involved before with any grassroots efforts in the Los Angeles area, but I feel that the city of Los Angeles that I loved so dearly has been taken over by vulgar commercial interests at the expense of the residents and the visual landscape. It is a very sad sight these days driving around Los Angeles being assaulted by all these digital billboards and others supergraphic advertising.

I urge you to say NO to the proposed grandfathering of sign districts. Those sign districts are in direct conflict with the intent of writing a new sign ordinance to STOP the proliferation of billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising invading our visual landscape. I hope that you know that local residents are concerned about this lowering quality of life and the visual landscape in Los Angeles.

Thank you.  
Manuelle Charbonneau  
10357 Bannockburn Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

**From:** Sarah Hays <sirrah@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/10/2009 5:13 PM  
**Subject:** NO Grandfathering of Sign Districts

Dear Ms. Greaves -

Please register my opposition to the grandfathering of Sign Districts that is in direct conflict with the intent of writing a new sign ordinance to STOP the proliferation of billboards, supergraphics, and other forms of outdoor advertising invading our visual landscape.

Thank you.

-- Sarah Hays  
10509 Blythe Avenue, Los Angeles CA 90064  
310/558-3538 - sirrah@sbcglobal.net

**Barbara Greaves - NO grandfathering of sign districts.**

---

**From:** Michael Monagan <mmonagan@lausd.net>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/10/2009 8:42 PM  
**Subject:** NO grandfathering of sign districts.

---

**From:** Dan Silver <dsilverla@me.com>  
**To:** <barbara.greaves@lacity.org>  
**Date:** 5/10/2009 12:35 PM  
**Subject:** Grandfathering of sign districts - OPPOSE

Dear Ms. Greaves:

When the PLUM Committee meets, pending sign districts must not be "grandfathered." It is now well understood how damaging such districts are to the fabric and identity the City. Sign districts cover up our architectural landmarks, destroy the character of our most important regional public spaces, and turn urban life into crass commercialism. Please, finally get tough on this plague, and do not grandfather any sign districts.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dan Silver, Executive Director  
Endangered Habitats League  
8424 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite A 592  
Los Angeles, CA 90069-4267

213-804-2750  
dsilverla@me.com  
www.ehleague.org