

Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
re Item No. 18-0634-S1, CD 2  
Submitted by Walter Hall, 12301 Debby Street, North Hollywood

**Proposed NoHo West Sign Ordinance**  
**ENV-2015-888-EIR, CPC-2018-3276-SN**

From the outset of the planning for development of the old Laurel Plaza site, its residential neighbors have made clear that no signage for the project would be welcome should it be visible from their surrounding residences. The developer seemed to agree to this very reasonable request, at least verbally. Now we have a sign ordinance proposed for NoHo West that includes two digital signs that will grossly intrude on its residential neighbors, especially those living south of Oxnard Street, its southerly boundary. A promise made will be broken if the proposed ordinance is approved including the digital signs. Remove the digital signs from this latest proposed sign ordinance, an ordinance sweetened from the previous one approved because the developer didn't feel that one was sweet enough. Disallow the proposed digital signs and help keep a promise made.



These signs' impact on the 170 Freeway must additionally be considered. The famous silent movie, ***Safety Last***, tells the story of a guy risking his individual safety to make a fast buck. By scaling a big city building (downtown Los Angeles is the setting) he gains the publicity sought by a retailer and earns his cash. Here the story is reversed. The digital signs in the proposed ordinance will put public safety at risk so that a sign owner can make a fast buck. Southbound traffic on the 170 Freeway curves to the southeast just as the proposed northerly digital will come smack **frontal** into view. At the same location **to the right**, on-traffic from Victory Boulevard must negotiate with off-traffic to Oxnard Street using a very short weaving lane of less than 700 ft. This entry/exit stretch is a chronic accident location. Additionally, the soundwall now under construction on the 170 from the 134 to Sherman Way will span this entire stretch except the east side of the freeway from Victory to Oxnard. Thus southbound traffic, in addition to the chaos described above, will enjoy the additional distraction of having the soundwall **to the left** disappearing at the same time. Distractions cause accidents, and the proposed digital signs will make an already otherwise bad situation much worse! The Planning Commission has twice thoughtfully recognized the safety detriment associated with these signs and disallowed them. The PLUM Committee should likewise thoughtfully do the same.



Isabel Onate &lt;isabel.onate@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Case # CPC-2018-3276-SN - Council File #CF18-0634-S1 - NoHo West Sign District Ordinance**

---

Vega, Ruth M. <Rvega@winston.com>  
To: "clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org" <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Wed, Feb 27, 2019 at 4:30 PM

Dear Ms. Dickinson:

I am sending my concerns with respect to the developers attempt to make amendments to the NoHo West Sign District Ordinance. The decision on the signs has previously been negotiated and approved. It is clear that developers went into this project with the full intent of returning to renegotiate an already approved decision on the signage for this development. It is unfair that the developers can continue to voice changes after negotiations have been made and have been ongoing since 2016.

I would like to voice my concern about the danger of large digital signs distracting drivers both on the freeway and in the neighborhood. Also this is not the aesthetic of the neighborhood. We are not wanting to turn the neighborhood into a mini Citadel looking shopping center. It's ridiculous to entertain the developers in this last minute appeal to make changes. Please take this into consideration when making any decisions on the developer's request.

Thank you.

Concerned Neighbor

/s

Ruth Vega

[6248 Gentry Avenue](#)

---

The contents of this message may be privileged and confidential. If this message has been received in error, please delete it without reading it. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege. Please do not disseminate this message without the permission of the author. Any tax advice contained in this email was not intended to be used, and cannot be used, by you (or any other taxpayer) to avoid penalties under applicable tax laws and regulations.