



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file # 18-0057

1 message

Tom Beyer <mrtommyb@me.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Tue, Jun 19, 2018 at 12:34 PM

I attended the council meeting yesterday, and I want to thank everyone for all their hard work so far on this complicated issue.

I also want to give a couple of opinions:

Regarding Strategy 7.4 (Implementing a Hollywood Sign Art Program):

In my opinion, this idea is absolutely useless, and even laughable. NO tourist who has flown for hours to visit Hollywood is going to want to visit a FAKE Hollywood sign. I mean, it's just a ridiculous idea. And the internet will lambast the notion and shame Los Angeles for such a foolish ruse. Yelp will go crazy with its ridicule, and every website and travel blog will make a joke about any tourist who would even consider avoiding the REAL Hollywood sign in favor of a DUPLICATE. (Alternatively, from an ARTISTIC standpoint, I think it's a fun idea to honor the Hollywood sign with artistic re-interpretations of it in other popular tourist destinations, but again: NOT as a way to reduce traffic in Griffith Park.)

Regarding Strategy 7.5 (Replicate the Sign on the other side of the mountain):

Same as above. Ridiculous idea. I was relieved to see that this Strategy had been designated as NOT FEASIBLE.

General thoughts:

Honestly, I've never recovered from the bizarre judgement in favor of the Sunset Stables. I still don't understand how a single business has been allowed to co-opt exclusivity over an entrance to the jewel of L.A. hikers and tourists. I wish it were possible to create a huge parking lot up there that would be SHARED by the Stables and the Park. One side of the lot could lead to the stables, and another side of the lot could be a trail-head. I suppose that's not possible...?

My two cents.

Tom Beyer

[IMDB listing](#)

[WEBSITE:www.TomBeyerOnline.com](http://www.TomBeyerOnline.com)

[FB:Facebook.com/TomBeyerActor](https://www.facebook.com/TomBeyerActor)

[TWITTER: @TomBeyerActor](https://twitter.com/TomBeyerActor)



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Council file number 18-0057

1 message

Bob Adjemian <bob@vedanta.com>
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Tue, Jun 19, 2018 at 4:34 PM

The 65 page PDF covers a lot of material that is not easily commented on in an email, but a few points:

- 1) Building a second "Hollywood sign" may well be a waste of money. People want to take a picture of the sign in the context of the hill as they've seen on TV many times.
- 2) Building a sidewalk at the entrance of the park at the top of Canyon road is really unnecessary. There is ample space to walk on the dirt that is safe and stable. There is thus already a sidewalk, a hardened dirt sidewalk. Save your money.
- 3) A Gondola or other device will spoil the look of the sign for everyone else. Of course, it depends on the exact location of the ride and its route. Do we really want a tourist ride? Will there be enough people who ride it to pay for all the costs?
- 4) All the paid parking proposals are going to be expensive for locals who want to, say, walk around the Hollywood Reservoir. Consider the Observatory that now charges \$4/hour to park, even from locations that require a 20 minute walk to even get to the observatory. I estimate it cost over \$50,000 to put in the system. Not popular.
- 5) Shuttles can be good, but will people use them? Do they now? One used to go up the closed road near Mt. Hollywood. Wasn't that stopped due to limited customers? Check out the other shuttles have done before deciding to add another.
- 6) Finally, up near dog park by the reservoir, it would be good to put up rest room facilities.

Enough for now. I will watch this planning closely.

Robert Adjemian



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

Fwd: pls include in the public record item 18-0057 (we were just informed of this agenda item at 4:30 today!)

1 message

Christine OBrien <obrienmills@icloud.com>
To: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

Fri, Jun 15, 2018 at 6:22 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Christine OBrien <obrienmills@icloud.com>
Subject: **pls include in the public record item 18-0057 (we were just informed of this agenda item at 4:30 today!)**
Date: June 15, 2018 at 6:21:29 PM PDT
To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org> ,

Pls include this document in the public record for item 18-0057, agenda item 4

The following is my review of the Dixon study. I assumed these items would have been considered and fostered by my representative, Councilman Ryu. I am struggling to understand the democratic process in this whole marketing process. Pls include and share my very specific concerns with this objective and fair committee. I appreciate your time and respect of the process. Christine

2811 Westshire Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90068
January 29, 2018

Dear Councilman Ryu and Ms. Dixon:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Dixon Comprehensive Strategies Report.

This study was a marketing feasibility/ focus group developed for the purpose of promoting tourism, hiking and use in Griffith Park. There was little recognition of the property ownership/value issue. The traffic specifics, safety were not addressed qualitatively through a professional traffic engineer. In addition, there was no reference to the facts relative to study areas in Hollywoodland including:

- No legal park entrances (access) adjacent to the Hollywoodland, Lake Hollywood Estates and Hollywood Knolls residential neighborhoods.
- Neighborhood physical constraints including substandard width streets, SEA (Significant Ecological Area), VHFSZ(Very High Fire SeverityZone), steep elevation grades, the court order from Sunset Ranch vs. City of Los Angeles, historical landmarks, the main communication tower for the city, numerous private ingress/egress easements, trespassing of private property inside the park and the unauthorized, illegal alterations made in the park that created many of the traffic issues.
- There was little recognition of the Hollywood Community Plan or the zoning of these R-1 neighborhoods immersed and adjacent to the park open space.

Below are my specific concerns and questions about the study.

Page 4 Please define the term “wayfinding”. There was no correction of earlier concerns (earlier report) about the odd metrics and incomplete data collection in phase one of the study. Please explain.

Page 5 Please explain why there is a need to promote the Hollywood sign? Please clarify if parking revenue goes into the general fund or to respective council districts. I believe all parking meter money goes to respective council districts, is the reason for the suggestion of meters in the village and at Canyon Lake Drive?

Were stakeholders asked if they felt entry into the park was appropriate and safe if that entry was through unauthorized access points or through residential communities?

Please, also recognize your intercept surveys can not be considered statistically because your sample size is too small.

Page 6, Figure 2. Please note these are official, authorized accesses into the park: Canyon Drive, Fern Dell Drive, Vermont Drive and Commonwealth. Lake Hollywood/Wonderview, Lake Hollywood, Beachwood, Mulholland and Ledgewood/ Deronda are not official, legal entry points. I was happy to see you did not recognize upper Mulholland/Ledgewood as an entry point. The unsafe issues associated at those locations should be reviewed. It is a liability for the City to continue to promote trespassing through illegal entry points.

Page 7 Figure 3. To recognize your seven goals you must first acknowledge the facts:

- What are legal accesses?
- What is pedestrian safety, should there even be congestion if there are not legal entry points? Is this type of transit legal relative to the community plans?
- What about property rights?

Please clarify compliance regulations. Please define “project team”.

Most of these ideas have been discussed over the years and appear to be more “brainstroming” ideas rather than concrete, feasible solutions.

Page 8 Please share where “pull outs “are currently used in the city. What are their safety track record and what type of liability is there for the city? What is the safety criteria relative to national DOT standard for the bulb and the suggested traffic circle? How and who will regulate the “5 minute” rule? Would this suggestion muster the approval of a traffic safety engineer?

Page 10 Please restate Canyon Drive is in Bronson/Brush Canyon. Canyon Lake and Canyon Drive are often confused in this document.

Page 11 Please note in Canyon Drive (Brush Canyon) there is a walking shoulder bordering the roadway. There are comparative suggestions for Wailuka, Hawaii. Does this area have sidewalks and what is the street width or is this an *apple and orange* situation?

These suggestions benefit visitors, but really **do not benefit the voters and property owners** who live here.

Page 13/16 Please understand there was a quantifiable traffic study conducted for the Sunset Ranch lawsuit by a traffic engineer. Suggestions offered here will be refuted based on that data. In addition, under the past administration a public hearing was entertained at the city Council Transportation Committee. The idea of a tram traversing Beachwood Drive through the easement road was rejected. A legal opinion identifying reasons for rejection, was also offer by Luna and Guishon.

Beachwood Drive dead-ends into the easement road. This is not an official entrance into the park. That unauthorized entry point was bootlegged by the previous councilman along with the 20 space parking lot and the switchback commencing from the easement road cresting to the Hollyridge bridle path. Any endorsed use would be met with environmental challenges.

One safety issue identified in the Sunset Ranch versus city legal is the collection of people in this narrow canyon (non-paved pathway/roadway) that would create a fire trap for visitors.

In addition, promotion and opening of this area would constitute a zone change and violation of the Hollywood Community Plan.

Page 18 Wonderview Drive is not a legal opening into the park. By funneling people through this narrow street you are creating a fire trap. It is also a violation of zoning.

Page 22 Brush Canyon , Canyon Drive has always been the official opening into the Sherman Gift. This 444 acres (in tract 6450) was given to the city of Los Angeles in 1944. It surrounds 85% of the perimeter of the Hollywoodland community. The official entrance originally included train tracks that shipped gravel from the quarry to the base of Franklin. That rock, gravel was used from Sherman's electric streetcar system and many of the roadways in early Hollywood. There are fascinating, interesting historical stories to be told about Bronson Canyon and the Sherman enterprises, including a rifle range, ranch, etc. This is a perfect setting for accessing the park trails and legal to boot!

Page 24 You are ignoring zoning and community plan criteria. This type of activity constitutes commercial use in a residentially zoned community.

This is a mechanism for funding revenues for the city, while ignoring property rights of homeowners.

Page 25 No zone change, no ride sharing in Hollywoodland.

Page 27, Yes, to a circulation system, but keep it in the legal, original entrances into the park.

Page 27 Suggestion to seek photos opportunities has been discussed since 1988, please review historical documents in RAP commission hearing files. See Chuck Welch write up and RAP commission submission.

Page 31 The vista and the pathways along Mulholland Hwy were developed without RAP commission approval , public comments and proper environmental clearance.

Page 33 Yes, please replant the illegal vista and the adjacent pathways with native plants per Tomas O'Grady landscape plan, era 2014 (4 years ago)!

Also, pls consider opening Mt. Hollywood Drive to generate a north south roadway use and flow. This is an existing, wide park road with fire hydrants and **no** paper work to legally close it. It was an arbitrary department decision. Historically, the road has been opened (officially) longer than it has been closed (unofficially).

Page 34 Signage is inaccurate and misleading. The Hollywood Chamber and Sign Trust have tried this in the past and it only caused ill will, as well as a violation of zoning. The city must take the revenue source away from the Chamber or at the very least, request a concessioner's agreement.

Page 35 Please do not burden residential communities with more traffic.

Page 37. Yes, please consider. If very liberal San Francisco can do this certainly LA could too!

Page 38 One problem with the one way narrow streets is the configuration of the historic retaining walls that inhibit an adequate safe swing/radius into garages and driveways. Each household's garage entry point would have to be cleared through engineers for appropriate safe, entry.

Page 40 Why are the property owners being imposed on so the city can continue to promote tourism. Please manage it so it is outside of residential communities!

Page 49 . Your chart is misleading. We do not know how many citations are given in each area, only locations, pls clarify or did I miss something?

Page 51 Again, please deal with facts! Recognize where there are official access points.

Page 54 Take all the revenue from the sign service mark and use it to assist in developing a visitor center in Hollywood or at Toyon.

Page 56 Mt. Hollywood is perfectly legal! Yes!

Page 57 My memo to the previous councilman suggested opening Mt. Hollywood and having a kiosk with sign history. Replicate the letter H in scale and size allow people to touch, climb it etc. Make something interactive

outside residential neighborhoods through official access points.

Page 58. The current sign is **not** historic. It has nothing to do with the original sign except it consists of 9 new letters and with footings on the approximate spot of the original historic HOLLYWOODLAND sign. It is questionable how it even mustered approval for historic designation. This should really be challenged. The 1978 version of the 9 letters and the land are owned by the city, but the Chamber and the Sign Trust retain all the revenue from the service mark. There is no concessionaire's agreement and the city is looking foolish! Handing over CASH to a private entity! Pls think out of the box on this!

Page 62 No rest rooms in Lake Hollywood Park.



dixon comments doc,2.docx

14K

2811 Westshire Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90068
January 29, 2018

Dear Councilman Ryu and Ms. Dixon:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Dixon Comprehensive Strategies Report.

This study was a marketing feasibility/ focus group developed for the purpose of promoting tourism, hiking and use in Griffith Park. There was little recognition of the property ownership/value issue. The traffic specifics, safety were not addressed qualitatively through a professional traffic engineer. In addition, there was no reference to the facts relative to study areas in Hollywoodland including:

- No legal park entrances (access) adjacent to the Hollywoodland, Lake Hollywood Estates and Hollywood Knolls residential neighborhoods.
- Neighborhood physical constraints including substandard width streets, SEA (Significant Ecological Area), VHFSZ(Very High Fire SeverityZone), steep elevation grades, the court order from Sunset Ranch vs. City of Los Angeles, historical landmarks, the main communication tower for the city, numerous private ingress/egress easements, trespassing of private property inside the park and the unauthorized, illegal alterations made in the park that created many of the traffic issues.
- There was little recognition of the Hollywood Community Plan or the zoning of these R-1 neighborhoods immersed and adjacent to the park open space.

Below are my specific concerns and questions about the study.

Page 4 Please define the term “wayfinding”. There was no correction of earlier concerns (earlier report) about the odd metrics and incomplete data collection in phase one of the study. Please explain.

Page 5 Please explain why there is a need to promote the Hollywood sign? Please clarify if parking revenue goes into the general fund or to respective council districts. I believe all parking meter money goes to respective council districts, is the reason for the suggestion of meters in the village and at Canyon Lake Drive?

Were stakeholders asked if they felt entry into the park was appropriate and safe if that entry was through unauthorized access points or through residential communities?

Please, also recognize your intercept surveys can not be considered statistically because your sample size is too small.

Page 6, Figure 2. Please note these are official, authorized accesses into the park: Canyon Drive, Fern Dell Drive, Vermont Drive and Commonwealth. Lake Hollywood/Wonderview, Lake Hollywood, Beachwood, Mulholland and Ledge wood/ Deronda are not official, legal entry points. I was happy to see you did not recognize upper Mulholland/Ledge wood as an entry point. The unsafe issues associated at those locations should be reviewed. It is a liability for the City to continue to promote trespassing through illegal entry points.

Page 7 Figure 3. To recognize your seven goals you must first acknowledge the facts:

- What are legal accesses?
- What is pedestrian safety, should there even be congestion if there are not legal entry points? Is this type of transit legal relative to the community plans?
- What about property rights?

Please clarify compliance regulations. Please define “project team”.

Most of these ideas have been discussed over the years and appear to be more “brainstroming” ideas rather than concrete, feasible solutions.

Page 8 Please share where “pull outs” are currently used in the city. What are their safety track record and what type of liability is there for the city? What is the safety criteria relative to national DOT standard for the bulb and the suggested traffic circle? How and who will regulate the “5 minute” rule? Would this suggestion muster the approval of a traffic safety engineer?

Page 10 Please restate Canyon Drive is in Bronson/Brush Canyon. Canyon Lake and Canyon Drive are often confused in this document.

Page 11 Please note in Canyon Drive (Brush Canyon) there is a walking shoulder bordering the roadway. There are comparative suggestions for Wailuka, Hawaii. Does this area have sidewalks and what is the street width or is this an *apple and orange* situation?

These suggestions benefit visitors, but really **do not benefit the voters and property owners** who live here.

Page 13/16 Please understand there was a quantifiable traffic study conducted for the Sunset Ranch lawsuit by a traffic engineer. Suggestions offered here will be refuted based on that data. In addition, under the past administration a public hearing was entertained at the city Council Transportation Committee. The idea of a tram traversing Beachwood Drive through the easement road was rejected. A legal opinion identifying reasons for rejection, was also offer by Luna and Guishon.

Beachwood Drive dead-ends into the easement road. This is not an official entrance into the park. That unauthorized entry point was bootlegged by the previous councilman along with the 20 space parking lot and the switchback commencing from the easement road cresting to the Hollyridge bridle path. Any endorsed use would be met with environmental challenges.

One safety issue identified in the Sunset Ranch versus city legal is the collection of people in this narrow canyon (non-paved pathway/roadway) that would create a fire trap for visitors.

In addition, promotion and opening of this area would constitute a zone change and violation of the Hollywood Community Plan.

Page 18 Wonderview Drive is not a legal opening into the park. By funneling people through this narrow street you are creating a fire trap. It is also a violation of zoning.

Page 22 Brush Canyon , Canyon Drive has always been the official opening into the Sherman Gift. This 444 acres (in tract 6450) was given to the city of Los Angeles in 1944. It surrounds 85% of the perimeter of the Hollywoodland community. The official entrance originally included train tracks that shipped gravel from the quarry to the base of Franklin. That rock, gravel was used from Sherman’s electric street-car system and many of the roadways in early Hollywood. There are fascinating, interesting historical stories to be told about Bronson Canyon and the Sherman enterprises, including a rifle range, ranch,etc. This is a perfect setting for accessing the park trails and legal to boot!

Page 24 You are ignoring zoning and community plan criteria. This type of activity constitutes commercial use in a residentially zoned community.

This is a mechanism for funding revenues for the city, while ignoring property rights of homeowners.

Page 25 No zone change, no ride sharing in Hollywoodland.

Page 27, Yes, to a circulation system, but keep it in the legal, original entrances into the park.

Page 27 Suggestion to seek photos opportunities has been discussed since 1988, please review historical documents in RAP commission hearing files. See Chuck Welch write up and RAP commission submission.

Page 31 The vista and the pathways along Mulholland Hwy were developed without RAP commission approval, public comments and proper environmental clearance.

Page 33 Yes, please replant the illegal vista and the adjacent pathways with native plants per Tomas O'Grady landscape plan, era 2014 (4 years ago)!

Also, pls consider opening Mt. Hollywood Drive to generate a north south roadway use and flow. This is an existing, wide park road with fire hydrants and **no** paper work to legally close it. It was an arbitrary department decision. Historically, the road has been opened (officially) longer than it has been closed (unofficially).

Page 34 Signage is inaccurate and misleading. The Hollywood Chamber and Sign Trust have tried this in the past and it only caused ill will, as well as a violation of zoning. The city must take the revenue source away from the Chamber or at the very least, request a concessioner's agreement.

Page 35 Please do not burden residential communities with more traffic.

Page 37. Yes, please consider. If very liberal San Francisco can do this certainly LA could too!

Page 38 One problem with the one way narrow streets is the configuration of the historic retaining walls that inhibit an adequate safe swing/radius into garages and driveways. Each household's garage entry point would have to be cleared through engineers for appropriate safe, entry.

Page 40 Why are the property owners being imposed on so the city can continue to promote tourism. Please manage it so it is outside of residential communities!

Page 49. Your chart is misleading. We do not know how many citations are given in each area, only locations, pls clarify or did I miss something?

Page 51 Again, please deal with facts! Recognize where there are official access points.

Page 54 Take all the revenue from the sign service mark and use it to assist in developing a visitor center in Hollywood or at Toyon.

Page 56 Mt. Hollywood is perfectly legal! Yes!

Page 57 My memo to the previous councilman suggested opening Mt. Hollywood and having a kiosk with sign history. Replicate the letter H in scale and size allow people to touch, climb it etc. Make something interactive outside residential neighborhoods through official access points.

Page 58. The current sign is **not** historic. It has nothing to do with the original sign except it consists of 9 new letters and with footings on the approximate spot of the original historic HOLLYWOODLAND sign. It is questionable how it even mustered approval for historic designation. This should really be challenged. The 1978 version of the 9 letters and the land are owned by the city, but the Chamber and the Sign Trust retain all the revenue from the service mark. There is no concessionaire's agreement and the city is looking foolish! Handing over CASH to a private entity! Pls think out of the box on this!

Page 62 No rest rooms in Lake Hollywood Park.