

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rivers

**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 08:19 AM

**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** To: Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee Re: Council File 11-1705, Citywide Sign Ordinance  
We do not support the version of the Citywide Sign Ordinance that the PLUM committee commissioned in December 2017. The legislation has many objectionable features: the takedown ratios are too low; signs could be made 20 percent taller or larger on request; it allows on-site digital signs which have never been permitted before. But the most important problem is that it would allow new digital billboards on almost any commercial lot, opening the way to a vast amount of visual blight that would clutter our city, reduce local property values, and make our streets less safe. We much prefer the version that the City Planning Commission wrote in 2015, known as Version B Plus. This legislation has stronger takedown ratios for new signs; it keeps them farther from residential zones than the PLUM version; it has no provision for on-site digital signs; and, most important, it allows digital signs only in highly commercialized sign districts that are already zoned Regional Commercial. This is the version that the PLUM committee should adopt because it regulates digital billboards with a much stronger hand.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dan Silver, MD  
**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 11:30 AM  
**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PLUM COMMITTEE AND CITY COUNCIL May 26, 2108 RE: Support for Version B Plus, Citywide Sign Ordinance, May 28, 2019 Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee: Endangered Habitats League (EHL) strongly supports the City Planning Commission's actions of 10/22/2015 and urges the PLUM committee and City Council to adopt that version of the ordinance. This version of the ordinance is Version B Plus. For your reference, EHL is Southern California's only regional conservation group, and is dedicated to the quality of urban environments as a vital part of comprehensive land use policy. I am also a resident of downtown Los Angeles. The version approved by the PLUM Committee in 2017 is terrible. It would open the entire City to offensive and dangerous signage. It caters to the billboard companies, which as you know, are major donors to Council campaigns. Please stand against special interests ruining the aesthetic fabric of the City's public spaces for their financial gain. And digital signs cause distracted driving! The Planning Commission action: a) Disapproves any AMNESTY for existing billboards that lack permits or have been altered in violation of their permits. b) Disapproves the "grandfathering" of any sign districts that weren't approved or applied for in April, 2009, when the CPC approved the initial version of the new sign ordinance. c) Restricts any new off-site signs, including digital billboards, to sign districts in 22 areas zoned for high-intensity commercial use. d) Requires existing billboards to be taken down before any new off-site signs can go up in sign districts. The takedown ratio of existing signs to new signs would be 5 to 1 for conventional and 10 to 1 for digital. e) Sets administrative civil penalties for sign violators that will act as a real deterrent to illegal billboards and other signage. f) Prohibits off-site signage in city parks and recreation facilities. While this ordinance could and should have gone further, and spared our finest commercial areas from billboard blight, we nevertheless support this compromise. Please reject the prior PLUM action and adopt Version B Plus. Thank you. Yours truly, Dan Silver, MD  
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

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 12:19 PM

**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** As an admirer of the important work done by the Coalition to Ban Billboard Blight, I would like to register my strong objection to the scheduling of the hearing on the Citywide Sign Ordinance on the Tuesday following Memorial Day paired with what appears to deliberate efforts not to inform the groups concerned about the ordinance. Getting to a meeting in downtown Los Angeles, given the huge traveling distances in our city, requires planning ahead for appropriate access and participation by citizens. This seems to be a clear instance of trying to limit access and to avoid fulfilling the legal rights of our city's residents.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brad Pitt  
**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 01:36 PM  
**Council File No:** 11-1705  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Allow me to mention the council file no. 11-1705, and state a clear preference for Version B Plus.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Hays

**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 02:41 PM

**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** For the members of the PLUM Committee at their Meeting on May 28, 2019. Stop caving to the sign industry and approve the Version B Plus Citywide Sign Ordinance written by the Planning Commission. Do what is right for the city and we who live here by approving this reasonable version for the ordinance.  
**APPROVE VERSION B PLUS!**

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara Broide

**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 03:42 PM

**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** This measure has been stuck in the PLUM Committee for YEARS as the PLUM Committee members proposed amendments to weaken the ordinance from the measure passed by the City Planning Commission (Version B+) which numerous neighborhood councils support. It is especially galling to community people who have been following this measure since its inception and who have come out for over 20 hearings, to receive notice of a pending Tuesday, May 28 Sign Ordinance PLUM agenda item/ discussion late on a Thursday afternoon just prior to a three-day holiday weekend. We received no "heads up" prior to the Thursday evening email notice. However, if this hearing is handled as others have been in the past, it will be quite clear that the lobbyists advocating for a weakened Sign Ordinance will have been made aware of the May 28th agenda item well in advance of the Thursday evening notice to the community. This measure is of broad interest to many Angelenos across the City. The current PLUM Committee members were not present and did not hear much of the testimony presented over these many years. And, they are likely only hearing the voices of the outdoor advertising industry who have been relentless in their efforts to place digital billboards at will in locations where they will garner the most financial return for their bottom line -- with no regard for (and with actual denial of) the safety hazard/dangers these signs cause. In a City where the Mayor and DOT claim to seek to reduce injuries and death from traffic accidents ("Vision Zero" program), it is preposterous to permit a roll out of digital billboards on our busy streets. It is, in fact, irresponsible for there are numerous studies from cities around the globe that document the dangers posed by these driver distracting signs. The PLUM Committee, in its consideration of the Sign Ordinance, will be defining the future of LA's visual environment. We will soon be welcoming people from around the world to the Los Angeles Olympics. Do we want our visitors to enjoy the views of the Hollywood Hills, Griffith Park Observatory, our palm trees and landmarks – or do we want them to be overwhelmed by the glaring lights of a digital billboard landscape? Los Angeles has a current BAN on all new billboards and has had this ban since 2002. Permitting digital billboards in defined sign districts permitted in regional commercially zoned areas is a generous

compromise that will permit new signage in sign districts. However, coupled with the privilege to have new billboards must come with a stringent mandatory takedown requirement such as the one adopted by the City Planning Commission. And, further, the Council must instruct the City Attorney to review all relevant paperwork on existing billboards whose legal status may be questionable, to weed out any illegal signs that should not be considered applicable in any takedown agreements. Those should have been evaluated and removed years ago! With the advent of new land use zones such as the RAS and TOC zones, the City is now seeing accelerated residential development on what were formerly commercial arterials. This fact alone should sound a warning bell to those contemplating the addition of digital billboards to these streets. While these signs may distract and overwhelm a commercial location, when they operate adjacent to residential properties -- whether homes, apartments or condominiums, they have a very definite negative impact on the quality of life experienced by their residential neighbors. Those living near a digital billboard are living in the shadows of a 24/7 digital sunrise. The lights blink and shine day AND night. They create health problems for those with migraine headaches and other health conditions (such as for those who experience seizures). The outdoor and indoor residential areas nearby often feel as though they had a disco strobe ball rotating and flashing overhead. The City needs to consider and acknowledged its responsibility for providing for a reasonable quality of life for its residents. The protection of quality of life in an urban environment full of stressors should be more important than bending to the interests of the outdoor advertising industry. Instead of weakening the Sign Ordinance, LA electeds should act to significantly limit digital billboards. A very few billboards on public land where content can be regulated and where the City can share in the financial return (the Chicago model) is a reasonable compromise -- especially understanding that other cities have had the will to say no to new digital billboards. Wouldn't it be nice if LA would, too?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sara Melzer

**Date Submitted:** 05/26/2019 05:21 PM

**Council File No:** 11-1705

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of Los Angeles for 40 years, I am distressed by the growing proliferation of billboards in our city. Having traveled all over the U.S., Europe, Asia and S. America, I am struck by how Los Angeles, more than any other city I have visited, is besieged billboards, allowing consumerism to ride roughshod us. The invasion of billboards puts us at risk in many ways, not least of which is physical – in a car oriented city, drivers are often unduly distracted by the signs – which is of course the whole point of the signs. To stem this dangerous tide, I urge you to adopt the version B Plus of Council file 11-1705. I would also like to express my dismay at the short notice you have allowed the citizens to express their will on this bill. Thank you.