

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ
CAROLINE CHOE

RENEE DAKE WILSON
KAREN MACK

MARC MITCHELL
VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
DANA M. PERLMAN

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

TRICIA KEANE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

January 25, 2019

Los Angeles City Council
c/o Office of the City Clerk
City Hall, Room 395
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: PLUM Committee

Dear Honorable Members:

MODIFICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION; CF 18-0634-S1

The NoHo West Sign District includes a comprehensive set of signage regulations in conjunction with the NoHo West project, a 1.3 million square-foot mixed-use development on a 25-acre site, located at 6150 Laurel Canyon Blvd. and 12001 W. Oxnard St. in North Hollywood. On November 6, 2018, the City Planning Commission (CPC) took actions on proposed amendments to the Sign District (Case Nos. CPC-2018-3276-SN and ENV-2015-888-EIR).

The CPC found that the project was adequately assessed in the previously certified EIR and Addendum and that no subsequent EIR or addendum is required, approved in part and denied in part an amendment to the NoHo West Sign District, and recommended that the City Council approve the amendment as modified by the Commission. The approved amendments included the relocation of three supergraphic signs to the interior of the site and the removal of one supergraphic sign. The CPC also denied proposed amendments to reduce the take-down ratio of the sign reduction program and reduce the refresh rate of digital displays, and further modified the Sign District by removing two exterior-facing digital displays from the site.

On November 20, 2018, an appeal of the City Planning Commission's actions was filed by the project applicant, MGP-XI-GPI Laurel Plaza, LLC, claiming to be aggrieved by the action. The appeal requested that the denied amendments of the City Planning Commission's determination be overturned, and that the two digital displays be reinstated.

Technical Modifications:

In review of the Sign District ordinance, Staff has identified a number of technical corrections, not related to the appeal points. The corrections are intended to reconcile the text in the Ordinance with the approved signage and Ordinance Exhibits. The following technical modifications are submitted for review and consideration:

[ADD the Commercial Building H multi-tenant wall sign to Section 7.C.4, which defines allowable locations of wall signs, as the sign was approved and shown on the Ordinance Exhibits, and inadvertently omitted in this Ordinance section]

SECTION 7.C. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Wall Signs.

4. Location.

Maximum Number of Wall Signs	Maximum
Commercial Zone: tenant Wall Signs	Each tenant is allowed either one Wall Sign or one Architectural Canopy Sign per building elevation
Commercial Zone: multi-tenant Wall Signs	One (1) each on Commercial Buildings <u>A, H, and</u> ; one (1) on Commercial Building J ; four (4) on the Parking Structure
Residential Zone: residential Wall Signs	Four (4) per building elevation

[CLARIFY that the Commercial Building H cinema tenant is allowed both a wall sign and architectural canopy sign in Section 7.G.4, which defines the maximum number of architectural canopy signs, as the sign was approved and shown on the Ordinance Exhibits, and inadvertently omitted in this Ordinance section.]

SECTION 7.G. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Architectural Canopy Signs.

4. Location. Architectural Canopy Signs are prohibited in the Residential Zone.

Zone	Maximum Number of Architectural Canopy Signs
Commercial Zone	Each tenant is allowed either one Wall Sign or one Architectural Canopy Sign per building elevation, <u>except that one tenant in Building H is allowed both a wall sign and an Architectural Canopy Sign to identify a single tenancy.</u>

[CLARIFY that Supergraphic Signs may be lit from either below or above in Section 7.H.6, which defines the illumination standards for Supergraphic Signs, as the sign was approved and shown on the Ordinance Exhibits, and can only be lit from below (with a shielded light source) rather than from above due to the building design.]

SECTION 7.H. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Supergraphic Signs.

6. Illumination. Supergraphic Signs shall be non-illuminated or **externally** illuminated ~~from above~~ with the light source shielded from view.

[CLARIFY the standard for sign height for consistency throughout the Ordinance and to match the approved Ordinance Exhibits. Sections 7.C.3.b., 7.H.3, and 7.I.3., which define sign height standards for Wall Signs, Supergraphic Signs, and Digital Displays should be corrected to match the approved signage.]

SECTION 7.C. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Wall Signs.

3. Height.

- a. Tenant Wall Signs and residential Wall Signs shall not extend above the top of the wall of the building.
- b. Multi-tenant Wall Signs are permitted to extend above the **top of the building wall** ~~building roofline~~ by a maximum of **35%** ~~20%~~ of the Wall Sign height.

SECTION 7.H. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Supergraphic Signs.

3. Height. Supergraphic Signs **are permitted to extend above the top of the building wall by a maximum of 20% of the Supergraphic Sign height** ~~shall not extend above the top of the wall of a building.~~

SECTION 7.I. STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF SIGNS. Digital Displays.

3. Height. Digital Displays **are permitted to extend above the top of the building wall by a maximum of 30% of the Digital Display height** ~~shall not extend above the top of the wall of a building.~~

These clarifications and corrections do not involve any substantive changes to the project, do not present new information of substantial importance to the project, do not result in changes to the conclusions or analysis undertaken by the Environmental Impact Report, and do not change the findings of approval for the project.

Therefore, Planning staff respectfully recommends incorporating the above clarifications and corrections by approving in part and denying in part the appeals for the proposed project (CPC-2018-3276-SN) and associated environmental clearance (ENV-2015-888-EIR).

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning



Milena Zasadzien
City Planner

VPB:HB:mz