

Communication from Public

Name: Gregory Wright and Christina Coolidge

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 12:56 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File Number 11-1705: Community Impact Statement on Digital Billboards in Los Angeles Billboards suck, and bright constantly changing digital billboards suck absolutely. At a time of climate crisis and a need to save energy that is as acute as the need for the rapid expansion of non-fossil energy, electricity consumed by a form of commercial blight that uses the commons of our streets and public spaces for a value-less purpose that benefits a tiny number of profit-seekers and that most people despise is indefensible. The City of Los Angeles needs to restrict the number of both digital and static billboards and reduce, year on year, the total number of all kinds of billboards in the City, for a variety of reasons: Both digital and static billboards use electricity for a value-less purpose, at a time when a considerable portion of local electricity still comes from climate stability-endangering fossil fuels -- natural gas (think Aliso Canyon, and the largest methane release in recent California history) and coal, according to the most recent online LADWP power content label. Neither LADWP or the City has ever ordered the conduct of a tally of the amount of electricity consumed by L.A.'s thousands of billboards, despite the urging of at least one citizen (myself) for this over a number of years, including to top officials of LADWP and to my City representatives. At a minimum, such a survey of billboard electricity consumption should precede any finding enabling the expansion of digital or static billboards in L.A. The City Council and the PLUM Committee should, at a minimum, order billboard light curfews so that the most obnoxious effects of billboard illumination, especially the constantly changing luminance and colors of digital billboards, that occur at night will not occur: the well-documented negative effects on people of light intrusion into private residences and bedrooms. Billboards are ugly enough by day; split the difference with the rest of us and order them off at night. The nighttime illumination from billboards is also a large part of a regional outdoor light pollution that negatively impacts wildlife and natural systems: see www.urbanwildlands.org/, www.urbanwildlands.org/ecanlbook.html, and www.anthropocenemagazine.org/2018/06/leds-and-wildlife-impacts/. The article at the last link notes that "in Los Angeles, more than 140,000 LED streetlights were installed without consideration for their impact on wildlife." A similar blunder need not be made with billboards; no expansion of billboards, digital or static, should be considered until the City has made a complete study of the ecological effects of allowing even more light intrusion from our hardscape into what's left of the natural world around us. Stop the expansion of billboard blight now, and reduce the intrusion of billboards, digital and static, and their light into our spaces and lives, year on year, until billboards remain only in a handful of iconic Sign Districts. Gregory Wright (and Christina Coolidge) Member, Green & Beautification Committee / Transportation and Traffic Committee

Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council Member, Coalition to Ban
Billboard Blight / Scenic America

Communication from Public

Name: Elizabeth Floch
Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 01:54 AM
Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am a stakeholder near Crenshaw Boulevard and vehemently oppose the installation of electronic billboards. They are extremely distracting and unsafe for drivers and pedestrians alike. We will have enough to pay additional attention to with the Metro going through, please do not also add this distraction and eyesore. we do not need to be made to feel like we should be watching television or moving ads of that size and brightness while we are trying to drive and stay safe. Also it will potentially affect residents. If they are approved, I ask you to please consider setting a limit on how frequently the ads can change and to make them stationary rather than dynamic. When objects are moving or videos are being shown it is impossible to concentrate on the road. I know this first-hand from formerly living near the one on Manchester. Not safe.

Communication from Public

Name: Lisa Sarkin
Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 07:30 AM
Council File No: 11-1705
Comments for Public Posting: Digital signs must be confined to only sign districts, without exceptions. Specific Plan areas, which are superior to the LAMC and are more restricted, must retain that capacity.

Communication from Public

Name: Victor Mendez

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 08:18 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose clear channels attempts of bringing digital billboards to the Crenshaw corridor. I already have a billboard visible from my home on 11TH ave and it's a nuisance. I do not want to raise my 2 year old with any more distractions that will take away from our way of life in our backyard.

Communication from Public

Name: Socorro Chacon
Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 08:57 AM
Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I work for a drug prevention program in Skid Row (UCEPP) and in solidarity with CCERP in Boyle Heights, which are both programs of Social Model Recovery Systems, Inc. I write this on behalf of our respective membership, asking that you limit “op-in” options and that you strengthen tools to prohibit billboards (including digital ads) and remove illegal signage, especially near sensitive locations. We are greatly concerned about the proliferation of marijuana ads and ask that you not only adhere to state regulations regarding advertising but that you consider stronger restrictions (as it is still considered illegal on the Federal level and there are still many illegal dispensary operators). We are also concerned about the proliferation of alcohol ads near sensitive uses and in impacted communities with disparities for alcohol-related harms.

Communication from Public

Name: John Walker

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 09:34 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am a Block Captain, Past President of the Studio City Neighborhood Council for 6 years and a Community Activist with an email list of over 1000 Stakeholders in Studio City. I know that I speak for all of them when we request that DIGITAL SIGNS only be allowed within the COMMERCIAL SIGN DISTRICTS. As you are already aware, NO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL has ever supported digital signage outside of designated Sign Districts. It only creates VISUAL BLIGHT in neighborhoods. Thank you. Respectfully, John Walker

Communication from Public

Name: Hathaway

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 09:36 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: As a resident of the Park Mesa Heights community I would like to strongly oppose any instillation of digital billboards anywhere in this neighborhood. These digital billboards are very distracting to drivers and can cause accidents. They are also disruptive to people who live within their view and cause anxiety and stress to families and especially children with the flashing lights flooding their homes. Please DO NOT allow this in our neighborhood.

Communication from Public

Name: Mark Finlay

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 09:59 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing because I a concerned local resident I do NOT want LED billboards on Crenshaw. They are distracting and add to light pollution. pls add my comments to file.

Communication from Public

Name: Judy Price

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 10:08 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am opposed to allowing digital billboards outside the designated zones. All billboards add blight to our City landscape and digital billboards are even worse. Drivers do not need this added distraction.

Communication from Public

Name: B. Broide

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 10:15 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: The PLUM Committee needs to return to the Sign Ordinance version that was recommended from the City Planning Commission in October of 2015. Since that time, the PLUM Committee under past-chair Huizar, worked diligently to weaken the City's ability to reign in sign blight AND was looking for ways to deliver to the outdoor advertising industry ways for digital billboards to plaster the City. It seems that all have forgotten that the starting point of these policy discussions is the City's 2002 Sign Ordinance that banned the erection of any and all new billboards. In addition, any existing billboards that were altered from their original permit were deemed to be illegal. It is from that starting point that the Planning Dept. proposed a new ordinance -- which was a BIG compromise in that it allowed for a mechanism to erect new billboards. However, those new signs would have been limited to SIGN DISTRICTS and those sign districts were limited in placement to land zoned for intense commercial uses. All good ideas and a balance between those who sought to preserve and protect the existing ordinance and its ban on new signs and the commercial interests so desperate to cash in onThe PLUM Com the financial gains to be won from plastering the City with digital signs. The majority of members of the current PLUM Committee were not a part of the earlier hearings discussions. They may or may not have read the studies from cities around the world that have now documented the dangers caused by digital billboards. They may, however, have heard the industry's bogus claims that digital billboards are no more distracting than static signs. (!) There are countless reasons to reign in digital billboards and to strongly contain their placement in Los Angeles. When tourists come to LA, they come to see the Hollywood sign and our palm trees, mountains and scenic vistas. When Angelenos go to bed at night, they do not want to see the flashing glaring lights of digital signs creeping into their bedrooms, strobing in their yards and onto their balconies 24/7 (They blink and shine even in daylight.) When bike riders and pedestrians cross our streets, they do not want to be hit by a driver distracted by a digital billboard overhead. When drivers wait for a turn signal at a corner, they do not want to be delayed (or cause added congestion) by watching the changing messages on a digital billboard--rather than the traffic. (And, did you know

that one option to be considered by PLUM is the placement of NUMEROUS digital billboards at select intersections: "to allow signs to be clustered at intersections"?) Part of the Oct. 2015 sign ordinance B+ draft contained provisions to remove existing billboards -- in exchange for the right to erect new signs in sign districts. Now the Council members are considering an "in-lieu" fee payment that would allow billboard companies to avoid mandatory sign removals. However, one of the most appalling policy considerations now on the table is something that the industry has been seeking since these discussions began (one could wager successfully that this has been the key topic of discussions behind closed doors) and that is the issue of "relocation agreements." The outdoor advertising interests would like to trade in their old static signs now located across the City and turn them into new fancy digital billboards -- not all of them, but those located on boulevards that command the highest revenues from advertisers. Under options presented to PLUM is the ability to not only convert existing billboards from static to digital, but to take credits for existing signs, relocate them to a more lucrative location and digitize them. (The term used by the industry is to "modernize" the signs.) This is a truly insidious effort that should be rejected outright by the city. Where else could anyone suggest that, for example, an old Ford Taurus could be traded in for a top of the line Porshe SUV or other luxury model? Keep in mind that the monthly revenue for a well placed digital sign can generate \$ 125,000 a month as compared to a static sign's revenue of a few thousand dollars. In the current discussions, there is no mention of economic equivalencies. There is, however, some mention in the Planning Dept. report to PLUM for August 13th of the opportunity to establish a cap on the number of new digital signs to be permitted under a new ordinance. That concept is CRITICAL. Under many options presented, the City could see a vast increase in billboards, digital billboards that are "in your face" and have a huge impact on the visual landscape. While we must seek the removal of existing signage, it is critical that the numbers of digital signs be strongly limited and that mandatory removals of existing signs be required to clean the landscape. The City's visual landscape should not be for sale.

Communication from Public

Name: Sidney Wagner

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 10:57 AM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: It has come to my attention that Clear Channel is trying to enact a change to signage regulations in their effort to erect electronic billboards along the Crenshaw Corridor. As a taxpayer and resident of this neighborhood I would like to register my vehement opposition to this plan. These electronic billboards have no place in our neighborhood. They are a danger to public safety and will only add one more distraction on an already dangerously distracting thoroughfare. These billboards cause drivers to take their eyes off the road for a longer period of time than the already existing distractions of a congested roadway, pedestrians both in crosswalks and jaywalking, an at grade train line, bike lanes and scooters all over the place. I think there is little doubt that these electronic signs will cause an increase in traffic accidents and I think it would be criminal to allow that to happen when it is completely unnecessary. In addition to being a traffic hazard, they are also a cause of light pollution, which is an assault on the people living in the neighborhood. And worse, for those neighbors whose apartments and homes will be in the direct line of sight of the signs it will rob them of their quiet enjoyment of their own property. They will be forced to keep their blinds shut all the time if they don't want to be assaulted by the light. So please do everything in your power to not allow Clear Channel (or anyone else) assault our beautiful neighborhood with these menaces to our health, safety and peaceful enjoyment of our residences. Thank you, Sidney Wagner 3112 West 46th St Los Angeles, CA 90043

Communication from Public

Name: Christopher Church
Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 11:01 AM
Council File No: 11-1705
Comments for Public Posting: Digital billboards are an eyesore and make driving more dangerous. This kind of blight will degrade our quality of life, especially in already stressed areas like Crenshaw Boulevard. Say no to corporate interests for a change and represent the interests of the people of this city rather than corporate influence-peddlers.

Communication from Public

Name: Jacko Luong

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 12:33 PM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am in favor of making commercial mural art legal within the city. Mural art can provide creativity, a destination for pedestrians, a conversation, promote local commerce on public or commercial spaces on an otherwise eyesore of a nondescript wall. They invite visitors to slow down and to experience moments. They provide pride of ownership to a wall and incentivize the proprietor to defend it and upkeep it against graffiti. Allowing for commercial mural art will provide jobs and boost local economy and sales tax revenues. Please allow commercial mural arts in the new sign code revision.

Communication from Public

Name: Heather

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 01:49 PM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protest the digital billboards that are proposed to be coming to Crenshaw. There is a billboard currently directly behind my home (I live on 11th ave at 48th), and it is already an eye sore in the sense that it provides a bright light directly beaming in our backyard. A digital billboard will cause more problems as these are residential areas. I have a toddler, whom needs sleep along with myself and husband. With a digital billboard creating what can appear to be as a light show can cause sleep disorders. Please do not have digital billboards come to the Crenshaw area. Thanks.

Communication from Public

Name: Shirley Jones

Date Submitted: 08/13/2019 05:36 PM

Council File No: 11-1705

Comments for Public Posting: I do not want to see digital billboards placed on Crenshaw Blvd because this will cause distracted driving and increase the chance of more motor vehicle accidents happening up and down Crenshaw. NO.