

14

**SCNC BOARD**

- Barbara Monahan Burke
- Ezra Dweck
- Victor Helo
- Remy Kessler
- Michael McCue
- Ben Neumann
- Richard Niederberg
- Todd Royal
- Lisa Sarkin
- Jeremy Schwarz
- Gail Steinberg
- Ron Taylor
- Rita Villa
- John T. Walker



- PRESIDENT**  
Ben Neumann
- VICE PRESIDENT**  
John T. Walker

**TREASURER**  
Remy Kessler

**SECRETARY**  
Gail Steinberg

**CORRESPONDING SECRETARY**  
Lisa Sarkin

4024 Radford Ave.  
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6  
Studio City, CA 91604  
Phone (818) 655-5400  
[www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info)

# SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Sunday, May 10, 2009, 10:00am  
at

**CBS Studio Center, Building 8, MPR-3,  
4024 Radford, Studio City CA, 91604**

The public is requested to fill out a "Speaker Card" to address the Board on any item of the agenda prior to the Board taking action on an item. Comments from the public on Agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the Agenda that is within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction will be heard during the Public Comment period. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker, unless directed otherwise by the presiding officer of the Board. The agenda is posted for public review at: Studio City Neighborhood Council website ([www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info)); as well as CBS Studio Center, Radford and Colfax gates; the Studio City Library, 12511 Moorpark St.; the Studio City Recreation Center, 12621 Rye Ave. and at Carpenter Avenue Elementary School, 3909 Carpenter Avenue, Studio City, CA 91604. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the Neighborhood Council Project Coordinator (213) 473-5391 or by e-mail to [Thomas.Soong@lacity.org](mailto:Thomas.Soong@lacity.org). In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at our website by clicking on the following link: [www.scnc.info](http://www.scnc.info) or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact [office@scnc.info](mailto:office@scnc.info).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call. (2 min)
2. Comments by President. (1 min)
3. Public Comments on non-agenda items within the Board's jurisdiction. (5 min)
4. Response(s) to public comments by Board Members. (5 min)
5. Government Affairs Committee Report: Barbara Monahan Burke & Rita Villa (40 min).
  - a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports the addition of the following comments regarding the motions brought forward at the PLUM meeting on April 21, 2009, by Council members Weiss and Reyes to the SCNC Community Impact Statement on Council File number 08-2020.**

Date: 5-12-09  
 Submitted In: PLUM Committee  
 Council File No: 08-2020  
14  
 Deputy: B. GLAVES

Re: Council File 08-2020 / PLUM Committee meeting May 12, 2009  
Revisions to City Sign Code

We, the Studio City Neighborhood Council, submit the comments below to the City Planning Commission and City Council as an addition to our community impact statement on Council File 08-2020 regarding revisions to the proposed City sign ordinance that were brought forward on April 21, 2009 at the PLUM Committee meeting by Council members Weiss and Reyes and on April 29, 2009 by Councilmember Tom LaBonge through his letter of the same date.

MOTIONS - As submitted by Councilmember Jack Weiss on 4-21-09:

- We agree with motions number 1 through 6, 8 through 11, and 13 through 16
- We agree with motion number 7. However, no existing digital signs should operate or be used until the Federal and National research and findings are completed and only if they show that there is no detriment to public health, safety, the environment, or to historical buildings/sites.
- We request that you revise Councilmember Weiss' motion 12 to indicate that all signs that have been unlawfully erected without permits to date should be removed.

- We request that your revise Councilmember Weiss' motion 17 to state – "Clarify that the definition of "interior signs" are signs not visible from the public right of way or incidentally visible from public right of way"

MOTIONS - As submitted by Councilmember Ed P. Reyes on 4-21-09:

- We agree with motions number 2 through 4 and 7.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to report back on the feasibility of allowing for a less restrictive minimum acreage and/or square footage and eligible zones for the Comprehensive Sign Program. Studio City does not support the Comprehensive Sign Program as it is presently contemplated in the proposed ordinance. We do not support any decrease in the minimum acreage and/or square footage or any increase in the number of eligible zones.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to define a "Sign Impact Area" as it relates to the Sign Reduction Program. Councilmember Reyes inquired whether the impact area could be expanded. Studio City does not support such an expansion. We support the motion of Councilmember Weiss stated in his motion number 11 above.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Planning Department to discuss the inclusion of "grandfathered sign districts." He requested that the current ordinance include what was recommended in the original ordinance that was sent to CPC. Studio City does not support the inclusion of any "grandfathered sign districts" in addition to the two included in the proposed ordinance submitted to PLUM by the CPC. The filing of an application for a sign district which has not even begun the public hearing process should not be grandfathered. Neither the proposed Metro/Universal sign district nor the proposed Universal Evolution sign district should be grandfathered.
- Councilmember Reyes instructed the Department of Building and Safety with the assistance of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to determine what resources have been paid to the City for the sign inspection and enforcement program. He directed that the report should include who has paid, funding information that includes total current account balance, and purpose. In addition, the report should identify what resources are available, or may be available to the City to enforce the law. Studio City would like it to be noted that payments into this fund should not affect the standing of any party in the matter of citywide sign issues.

Studio City would like to express its gratitude to Councilmember Tom LaBonge for submitting his letter dated April 29, 2009. We support his position that Sign Districts should be limited to one specific geographical area of the City: the Downtown Center. Studio City further agrees with Councilmember Tom LaBonge that provision (b) from Section 9, paragraph B-1 should be removed from the Draft Sign Ordinance.

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports the addition of the following comments to the SCNC Community Impact Statement on Council File number 08-2020 regarding the draft sign ordinance send by the CPC to PLUM and which will be further considered at its meeting on May 12, 2009.**

Re: Council File 08-2020 and CPC's Draft Sign Ordinance - City Planning Case No. 2009-0008-CA

Revisions to City Sign Code

We, the Studio City Neighborhood Council, hereby ask the City Planning Commission and City Council to take the actions below regarding latest proposed ordinance to revise and amend the Los Angeles Municipal Code regulating signs.

1. Prohibit all super graphics. "Wall Signs," as they are now being called, are unacceptable. Otherwise we are concerned that buildings will be constructed with blank walls to accommodate them.
2. Neighborhood Councils ("NCs") should be notified of requests for appeal of Civil Penalties and of proposed Comprehensive Sign Districts. To have the "Code section be consistent," notify NCs of all proposed items effecting billboards and signage rather than cutting them out of the process. NCs represent all stakeholder and should be "at the

table" in accordance with the intent of the City charter to provide NC public oversight of City Government.

3. At the present time Digital signs should be prohibited everywhere in the City, even in Sign Districts.

The City Council voted to support state legislation AB 109 that is being proposed by Representative Mike Feuer for a two-year Moratorium on Digital Billboards. We request that the City Council incorporate the provisions of that legislation into the City's proposed ordinance. This will allow time for the completion of ongoing Federal and National Studies concerning the effects of digital billboards and signs on "public health and welfare," hazards to drivers, pedestrians, residents, property, and communities. Additional items that should be addressed in the proposed ordinance are limiting the effects on the environment and on historical buildings of digital signs and billboards.

4. NCs should be fully represented on the proposed taskforce that will meet in one year.
5. NCs should have the right of Private Action.
6. A discretionary deviation of 20% is too large. There should be no exceptions. Exceptions lead to more litigation.
7. The City of Los Angeles is not only an urban area. Significant portions of the City are suburban and rural.

Studio City is suburban. The two proposed Sign Districts, the Metro/Universal Sign District and the Universal Evolution Sign District are incompatible with the suburban character of Studio City. The proposed Metro/Universal Sign District is wholly in Studio City; The Universal Evolution Sign District is adjacent to Studio City in the County of Los Angeles. These Sign Districts are being proposed separately, however, their combined impact will have a significant detrimental effect which is unacceptable to Studio City Stakeholders.

Sign Districts are one massive loophole in the proposed ordinance. The property owners within the Sign District appear to be allowed to make the decisions about the sign districts. The Community does not have any say. A "Times Square" West will be erected in Studio City, an area that currently has a village atmosphere. This result would be disastrous.

It is insufficient to cite a problem only with single-family residences around any proposed Sign Districts. Residences that are zoned up to R-3 should also be given consideration.

No one needs the glare, noise and onslaught of visual clutter all day and night with the attendant traffic and parking nightmare that Sign Districts create. Sign Districts represent an unwarranted intrusion upon our lives which is, in fact, life altering for the worse.

8. Enforcement and penalties are essential if the ordinance is to be taken seriously.
9. There should be no exception to the requirement that there must be a 660 foot buffer between the freeway and signs unless otherwise permitted by California Codes.
10. (Page C-2) "Signs should not dominate the visual character of an area. The easily enforceable time/place/manner restrictions City wide are to protect neighborhoods." Therefore, again we request that you act to prohibit Digital Signs everywhere even in Sign Districts.
11. Allow only Fine Art Murals to be installed on private property and then only when approved by the Department of Cultural Affairs. Supergraphics should not be permitted under the guise that they are Fine Art Murals.
12. The proposed ordinance would permit Sign Districts to include Supergraphics, Digital, off-site and rooftop signs. Such signage would not comply with the code because they

would dominate the visual appearance of the area. Section 14.4.1 Purpose.E. indicates "That adequacy of message opportunity will be available to sign users without dominating the visual appearance of the area."

13. We now have R-3 or more restrictively zoned residences 30 or more feet away from illuminated signs that interfere with the lives of tenants/owners of residences. There should be a strict "shut-off" time for illumination, preferably when the business closes or, at the latest, midnight.
14. (C-21) Two years is too long for temporary signs on temporary construction walls. These often end up being super graphics. Additionally, they are a target for graffiti.
15. (C-31) The draft ordinance states "Comprehensive Sign Programs within 500' of a residentially zoned lot is to be "Compatible" with residential uses." Please provide a definition of "compatible." The number of possible comprehensive Sign Program properties in the City of Los Angeles should be stated. CPCs will be excessive exceptions to the proposed ordinance.
16. (C-40, Section 2.K.) We applaud that Specific Plans are allowed to be the same or more restrictive than the proposed ordinance.
17. We foresee that Sign Districts will be detrimental to Studio City, both at Metro/Universal and at the Universal/Evolution sites. (C-45.4.(c)) states "The proposed special sign regulations shall not constitute a hazard to the safe and efficient operation of vehicles upon a street or a freeway or create a condition that endangers the safety of persons, pedestrians, or property"; and section (d) states "the proposed special sign regulations will not create light pollution or other negative environmental effects that will be materially detrimental to the character of development in the immediate neighborhood outside the proposed district,..." The impact of both the proposed sign districts noted above would clearly violate the intent of these provisions of the proposed ordinance. The unmitigatable impacts of such districts will destroy the character and quality of life of the community of Studio City.
18. There should be vigorous enforcement of the provisions of the law once it is in place.

- c) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council opposes the amendment to Ordinance No. 172,465 which currently regulates signage for Staples Center ("Arena"). We oppose instillation of electronic signage visible from the Freeway on the Convention Center South Hall, Convention Center West Hall, Convention Center Concourse, and Arena Buildings.**

**Case No.'s CPC-2008-3374-MS and  
ENV: Addendum to EIR SCH #96091061**

6. Comments from Board Members on subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction (5 min).
7. Adjournment (1 min).

SCNC BOARD MEETING – SPECIAL MEETING - MAY 10, 2009

1. Ben Neumann, John Walker, Rita Villa, Barbara Monahan Burke, Lisa Sarkin (secy), Michael McCue, Richard Niederberg, Ron Taylor, Victor Helo (10:16) 8 present – quorum met - all others excused.

2. - 4

5. a) Rita Villa – background on this Planning Dept. is asking the CPC and City Council to change the sign restrictions.

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben – amending the current SCNC CIS – Lisa – it is an amendment to the SCNC current CIS. Ron – what about Sunset Blvd. Richard – Sunset Blvd. is in West Hollywood.

VOTE: 8-0-0

5. b) Rita Villa – background continuation to way in on the sign ordinance. Weiss and Reyes put forth motions to add or change the CPC sign ordinance. LaBonge sent a letter too. The GAC agrees with some of these changes but disagrees with others. This is the reason for this motion

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben. Michael – supports this having worked with the committee.

VOTE: 8-0-0

5. c) Rita Villa – explains study of digital billboards along freeways. Contacted the NC in the area. They were not up to speed and will bring it up at their next meeting. He did not object to our weighing in at this time.

MOTION: SEE AGENDA – read by Ben. Ben – raised as a point with Rita we should only weigh in within

Studio City unless we are asked. That is why I wanted Rita and Barbara to contact the other NC. John – Should we really weigh in on this? Barbara – citywide issue because it is the convention center. The council only attacked this to make money. Nobody lives near it. Rita – nobody lives within 500 feet.

Ben – not really citywide issue. One particular building in one particular area – Ron – suggest one area

Downtown. Concerned about traffic safety and maybe is premature to pass this. Give us back some of our budget, worry about taking this position. Lisa – an exception to the ordinance can cause problems in the future. At Dodger Stadium you can see the lights now. Richard – how can you treat people differently. Barbara - Caltrans says that you cannot have these signs within 660 feet of a state highway. Met with Jim Dantona about the state law, so we do have a right to pass this information. Ben – it has to be particular to the city. It is a slippery slope that we go down here. What if other NCs around Metro/Universal supported it. If the local NC would ask us for support, it would be different.

Understand all the motivations, playing in somebody's sandbox. Michael – I agree with the president, however, our board is more on top of things, the city did get things past us until we were looking for it. I

also support that the president wanted contact with this NC. Ben – no official position. Rita – James De\_\_\_\_\_. Who NC is was? DONE couldn't help us. I had to find it out myself. Downtown NC is the NC, so I contacted them. I went through their list of contacts, bad numbers – until I got to the secondary Contact. He is member of the NC board and LUC. Did not receive notice because nobody lives within 500 feet. There was no other way in the short time. We said go ahead and read to him the motion. My real concern is what this proposal is of putting electric signage to the existing signage ordinance. It is presenident setting, it will make a down hill path. They may sneak this in before the PLUM meeting. I feel so strongly that we must weigh in now because they are trying to squeeze in. Its Mother's Day and it is appalling. Michael – encourage the board to remember that we have done what the president asked and we may have to be a watchdog.

Friendly motion - Ron – we are in danger of holding their place while they are

Getting this together. One of my problems is that we write this motion, I oppose this motion because we are not nimby. Prefer a motion that said that the process has not “The Board of the SCNC opposes adoption of the amendment to ordinance 172465 by the City Planning Department on May 11, 2009. The amendment has not been addressed by other government agencies , including but not limited to NCs, who have jurisdiction over laws governing signage. The CPD shall take no action until the city council adopts a new signage ordinance.” Second Michael

Richard – we want the 660 firmly and would take a lot off our backs. Maybe it is not our business, maybe we are nimby, so these signs cannot be in SC. Ben – it is less the issue of the sign ordinance, is it a slap on the wrist, because it is the way you are doing it. This is how the motion reads to me. Barbara – on this motion, we should put someplace in there that NC are not included. John – I'm a little unclear where signage is allowed, not allowed VOTE: 9-0-0

Ron – rita second