



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

---

**FW: Sign Ordinance - Council File: 11-1705, Related files: 08-2020, 11-0724, 12-1611**

1 message

---

**Barbara Broide** <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Tue, Apr 5, 2016 at 6:00 AM

To: Patrice Lattimore - LA City <patrice.lattimore@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Mayor Garcetti <mayor@lacity.org>

Cc: Paul Koretz - cd 5 <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Faisal Alserri <faisal.alserri@lacity.org>, Noah Muhlstein <noah.muhlstein@lacity.org>, Philip Bennett <philip.bennett@lacity.org>, Mike Bonin <mike.bonin@lacity.org>, Tricia Keane - CD 11 planning <tricia.keane@lacity.org>

As the Sign Ordinance returns to the PLUM Committee, it is time to look back upon its long path that brings us to the present time. That pathway is illuminated by overwhelming public opinion as to the need to reign in billboards that blight our city once and for all. That pathway has traversed many courtrooms at significant expense to the City but with a clear outcome as to the City's right to regulate signage and its responsibility to do so in a manner that is defensible in the eyes of the courts. That pathway is riddled with the efforts of industry representatives to weaken the ordinance and leave it vulnerable to legal challenge.

The proposed ordinance as recommended by the City Planning Commission (version B+) represents a balanced approach to sign regulation. It is not as strong as the 2002 ban on new billboards and the industry should be quite thrilled that the new ordinance provides sign districts as a mechanism that will allow for the erection of new billboards. Community representatives are not happy to see these new sign districts but we have compromised greatly so that an effective set of guidelines can be implemented and so that we can get a law on the books that can be enforced. It is time for the Council to halt efforts to shill for the industry. It is time to pass the sign ordinance as recommended by the City Planning Commission and without PLUM's alterations passed last year that were resoundingly opposed by the City Planning Commission.

It is time to move forward and give the citizens of this City, current and future, a sign ordinance that is respectful of the visual landscape, that protects the safety of those on the street by limiting digital billboards to sign districts (where there will no doubt be plenty of digital billboards), and allows our City Attorney's office to focus their resources and efforts on other pressing legal issues affecting the City and its inhabitants.

Please support Version B+ of the ordinance and oppose PLUM's Version B. I urge you to:

- a) Disapprove any AMNESTY for billboards that lack permits or have been altered in violation of their permits.
- b) Disapprove the "grandfathering" of 14 sign districts that have been added to the ordinance since it was reviewed by CPC in 2009. Grandfathering weakens the City's offsite sign ban and creates a confusing and unmanageable patchwork for enforcement. (If the Council moves to grandfather any Sign Districts they should be subject to all requirements of the new regulations adopted.)
- c) Disapprove any new process, including a Conditional Use Permit process to authorize construction or operation of digital offsite signs outside of sign districts. No digital signs outside of sign districts.
- d) Increase the takedown ratio of existing billboards in exchange for any new offsite signs in sign districts. Takedown should be no less than 5 square feet removed for every 1 square foot of TRADITIONAL billboards erected AND no less than 10 square feet removed of traditional billboards for every 1 square foot of new digital billboards. Community benefits to be offered IN ADDITIONAL to required takedowns, not instead of sign removal.
- e) Request that the City Attorney review all existing signs without permits and those altered in violation of their permits for enforcement action and compliance.

Barbara Broide  
Council District 5 Resident