

FIX THE CITY

June 17, 2015

From: James O'Sullivan, Fix the City

Sharon Gin, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Spring Street, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

VIA EMAIL

RE: Tuesday, June 23, 2015

CPC-2014-3119-ZC-SN-COD-MCUP-ZV-ZAI-SPR

Dear Chairman Huizar, Councilmember Cedillo, and Councilmember Englander:

Fix The City's concerns relative to the proposed sign district include, but are not limited to:

- The proposed sign ordinance conflicts with the Transportation Element's requirements for scenic highways(Compliance with Sec 12.12.2 CR Zone sign limitations).
- Approval of the sign district as proposed would create a precedent for countless other property owners along any and all scenic highways to seek sign districts.
- The proposed sign district would create an inconsistency between the Land Use Element and the Transportation Element relating to placement of signage "within five hundred feet of the center line of a Scenic Highway."
- Placement of signs is not sufficiently described as ultimate sign locations are unknown and can be moved within 10 vertical and 50 horizontal feet.
- As the placement of signs is insufficiently described, the impact on scenic and historic elements is insufficiently described.
- To the extent that the sign district proposes to "encompass future technologies" which includes "electronic message display" signs, it directly conflicts with the prohibition against "electronic message display" signs in the Miracle Mile Community Design Overlay District.
- The proposed sign district does not "support the General Plan and Miracle Mile Community Design Overlay District goals, objectives, and policies related to the ongoing revitalization of the Miracle Mile District and preservation of historic structures" in that it violates the Transportation Element, violates the stated goals of the Miracle Mile Community Design Overlay District and will allow wholesale visual impacts on historic structures.
- The use of "Projected Image Signs" is inconsistent with the scenic highway designation.
- The language describing "Projected Image Signs" is inconsistent with the concept of limiting Total Sign Area.
- As the original Notice of Preparation did not include the proposed sign ordinance, notice and due process requirements were violated.
- The proposed sign ordinance does not disclose interactions with County easements.

- The sign ordinance appears to include park land designated under a County easement. Off-site outdoor advertising is prohibited in the public right-of-way of, and on publicly-owned land within five hundred feet of the center line of a Scenic Highway.

Sincerely,

James O'Sullivan
Vice President