

Google Groups

PLUM Hearing NoHo West Sign District Ordinance Tuesday, 1/29/19

xehumph <xehumph@yahoo.com>

Jan 27, 2019 8:27 PM

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

I and many others, maybe most, of the people that live in our area are opposed to allowing any more concessions to the developer of NOHO West including no added signage, no reduction of required existing signage removal, and no extension of signage hours. I also request that you affirm the planning commission's recent action to reduce the allowable super-graphic signage reduction facing the 170 freeway. I request that your committee reject all of the developer's requests for exceptions to the planning commission's recent action. I live in the immediate neighborhood near this project. I and many others concluded some time ago that the developers of this project have already been granted too many exceptions from many code requirements. I'm including below my previous email texts to the planning commission regarding this issue. It's way past time to settle this.

This developer gets denied and just appeals it to the next level. Even if denied, this developer seems to never stop unless they get what they really want (they'll take less than their request) or have no further appeals available. Developers are well known to always request more than they'll accept hoping to only have to endure some tacit reduction that gets them what they want. They do this to give city officials a way to grant them something while the city officials can "look" like they're acting responsibly. For your committee to act responsibly, you must not deny the requests and not just reduce requests a little. To act responsibly I want you to reject the requests completely and support in whole, your planning commission's recent action as I've noted.

No more concessions.

Evan Humphreys
5841 Coretta Av
North Hollywood, CA 91607

I previously sent the following emails Mark Friedlander - City Planning

On Sat, Aug 11, 2018 at 1:58 PM, xehumph <xehumph@yahoo.com> wrote:

My previous email to you is below. I now understand that not only does this developer want to get the required existing signage removal greatly reduced as I opposed in my first email below, but additionally, this developer also requests to be permitted to add more new signage than allowed by the city's approved requirements.

I am opposed to the city allowing any increase in the allowable new signage that would be visible from the streets and freeway and reduction in the required removal of existing signage in North Hollywood in exchange for the allowable new signage at this project. This development already has approval for sufficient and probably too much new signage including the huge brightly lit signs. .

I request that the Planning Department and Commission disallow the developer's request to add their requested additional 800 and 1000 square feet of signage that would be visible

from Oxnard Street, the 170 freeway, Laurel Canyon Bl. or any other street outside this project.

I also am opposed to your department and commission agreeing to any reduced amount of increase. It's quite typical of developers to request more than they really expect to get and than successfully getting the reduced amount they expected to get. That should not happen here. The Planning Department and Commission must hold the developer and this project to the already stated limits with no increase, not a some lesser increase. There should be no increase allowed and not some lesser amount of addition like letting the developer add 400 and 500 square feet instead of 800 and 1000 square feet.

Please deny all of these developer requests for ANY changes (don't grant a lesser change either) that increase new visible (from surrounding streets and freeway) signage or that would reduce the required amount of removal of existing signage by any amount.

Also, I request that there be no increase in the approved hours of operation of signs visible from outside the project.

Evan Humphreys
5841 Coretta Av
North Hollywood 91607

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: xehumph <xehumph@yahoo.com>
To: "mark.friedlander@lacity.org" <mark.friedlander@lacity.org>
Cc: D. C. <laurelgroveneighborhood@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 8:43 PM
Subject: Request to Disallow any Signage Removal Reduction for Noho West - re-sent

Mark Friedlander, City Planner
Noho West Signage Requirements
Case # CPC-2018-3276-SP

I'm aware that there is a developer request to reduce the required existing signage to be removed in exchange for the Noho West project adding new signage. I'm opposed to the Planning Commission allowing any reduction.

This is to object to any of the developer-proposed changes to reduce the required removal of existing signage in exchange for adding new signage at the Noho West Project. The east valley is already blighted by too many eyesore signs along commercial streets in this area. These unattractive signs blanket streets including Lankershim, Laurel Canyon, Burbank Bl e/o Lankershim, Sherman Way, etc.

Hundreds of large existing garish billboards and signs intrude and destroy any remaining sanctity of our streets. The signage that exists is a cacophony of blaring and glaring shouts to buy this, use that, get a lawyer, or pay off debts.

The present new signage requirements for Noho West, will at least require some modest reduction in the visual blight of this glut of ugly signs that we all have to tolerate. This kind of effectively uncontrolled signage would not be allowed in any newer community or better-

governed city. The Noho West signage requirements are supposed to result in a slight reduction of this mess but now there's a devious move to chisel on this obligation. .

Now this developer wants to reduce the required removal square footage but keep the allowed number of new signs. That's not fair at all and our community has already been clobbered by the approval of a over-sized project that ignored most of the most important reductions that this community requested.

The present allowed number of signs (approved by City Council) exceeds even the Planning Commission's recommendations. I think the Planning Commission cannot now logically allow a further reduction in the removal square footage since their recommendation for new signage has already been exceeded. I, and I'm sure virtually everyone I know that lives here in this community expect the present signage removal requirements to be enforced.

The Planning Commission should not allow any reduction in the square footage of existing signs required to be removed.

Evan and Judy Humphreys
[5841 Coretta Av](#)
[North Hollywood 91607](#)