

Council File 11-1705 // PLUM 12/12/17 Item (3)

Barbara Broide

Dec 12, 2017 1:45 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

We are troubled that many changes have now been incorporated into a draft citywide sign ordinance -- some of which have not seen community discussion or prior consideration by the City Planning Commission.

We are equally troubled that the release of the new draft ordinance was done late last week during the holiday season with scheduled discussion on the PLUM agenda for today, December 12th in what many would consider the holiday season (with tonight being the first night of Chanukah).

After having this measure under PLUM's consideration for YEARS, why the sudden interest to move it along in December when citizens are busy? There is something very wrong with the issuance of these reports and draft ordinance with so little time before this Committee's scheduled consideration/meeting on them that such that NO neighborhood council could possibly receive the new documents submitted to the file, issue a Brown noticed meeting announcement and have time to consider the issues presented in order to submit a CIS in time for today's hearing. Knowing that you are well aware of the constraints of the NC public noticing requirements, what are community folks left to think? That it is Christmas time and the LA City Council's PLUM Committee would like to present Clear Channel and its Latham & Watkins lobbyists an early holiday present?

The proposed relocation agreements under consideration are a particularly horrific and offensive addition to the many additions suggested by the PLUM Committee designed to weaken future sign regulations in Los Angeles. We are unequivocally opposed to them and the potential thousands of new billboards that could result -- billboards that could be located outside of Sign Districts nearly anywhere in the City. The proposed 2:1 takedown ratio is completely inadequate. It bears no resemblance to the value of digital signs compared to traditional billboards and will have little effect in ridding communities of long-standing blight.

This is bad policy. Other cities are adopting balanced and reasonable regulations of digital signage. Why must Los Angeles do anything less than Houston, Kansas City or Baltimore. With our city's physical beauty, our mountain vistas and beaches, year-round climate and so much to celebrate, why must our City consider a sign policy to bring blight to our neighborhoods. The outdoor advertising industry has only to gain from a lax and permissive ordinance. The City has so much to lose.

We request a minimum of 60 days notice of Sign Ordinance consideration by PLUM and Council. We do not have paid lobbyists plying the corridors of City Hall on our behalf. People care a great deal about this issue and want to have a voice. Meeting rooms filled with industry shells do not represent the will of the majority of Angelenos. There is no "pent up demand" for digital signage in our community or in the many represented by Neighborhood Councils, public health, child welfare and other community organizations.

We oppose the current proposals being considered by PLUM and request true community engagement before any proposed ordinances move forward to Council.

Thank you,

Barbara Broide
Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. HOA