



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

11-0923

2 messages

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 3:57 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Zahra Bejaune** <zahrabejaune@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 1:28 PM
Subject: Why is the 100ft height limit still in the mural ordinance?
To: Tom Rothmann <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>, Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org,
Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.gin@lacity.org

Greetings Council Members and Mr. Rothmann,

Can you please tell me why the 100 foot restriction is still in the mural ordinance?

The tallest mural in the world currently stands at 230 feet (see link). If this restriction is adopted then, sadly, LA will never be in the running for tallest mural in the world! After a decade long ban on murals we are going to need to go bigger and better to regain our place as Mural Capital of the World.

During numerous conversations at the Planning Commission and PLUM meetings regarding the Mural Ordinance, Mr. Rothmann and I discussed the 100 foot height restriction included in the current draft. I inquired about the reasoning for this restriction. He said there was no apparent reason, that it had likely been adapted from the Portland mural ordinance and that it would be removed. However, it has not been removed and exists in both versions of the drafts to be considered tomorrow by PLUM.

PLEASE RECOMMEND REMOVAL OF THE 100 FT HEIGHT LIMIT ON MURALS

<http://www.yatzer.com/Asia-Tallest-Mural-by-Hendrik-Beikirch>

Thank you,

Zahra Bejaune
Beautify LA
213.248.4583

—
Zahra Bejaune
Lead Artist
Beautify LA Project

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 3:57 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Zahra Bejaune** <zahrabejaune@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 2:23 PM

Subject: MURAL ORDINANCE Recommendations

To: Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org, Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.gin@lacity.org, Tanner Blackman <tanner.blackman@lacity.org>

Dear Council Members,

Please adopt "Version A" of the current mural ordinance drafts with the following recommendations.

Version A allows property owners of single family homes citywide to continue to have the freedom to paint murals on their property. This ordinance should provide a pathway for neighborhoods that prefer to restrict murals on R1 properties, but it is unfair to place this restriction on the entire city based on isolated incidents of murals deemed unwanted by the community. There are thousands of murals in LA, please don't let an uproar over 2 in the past few years lead to such a drastic restriction.

The R1 restriction severely restricts freedom of speech and undermines improvement and beautification efforts in low-income residential communities. If R1's are restricted, Residents and Community Beautification Organizations, such as the Green Alleys Program in South LA, that barely have the resources to sustain, will now be faced with the costly time consuming task of reversing the R1 prohibition in their districts in order to continue their work!

Why should everyone be restricted to accommodate the few?

Now, please consider the following modifications to both drafts A and B, should either be adopted:

1. Remove the 100 foot height restriction on murals.
2. Remove the problematic clause that allows new property owners to deregister a mural without informing the artist, which is in violation of the Visual Artists Rights Act and the California Art Preservation Act.
3. The DCA is already charged with administering mural permits. Why burden neighborhood councils with the duplicate task of "approving" murals? Some areas have no active NC. Artists should be allowed to continue the same Neighborhood Involvement Process of putting up flyers and hosting a community meeting, that was in place before the mural ban.
4. Remove any potential loopholes that could be abused by billboard and advertising companies. Prohibit property owners from receiving compensation for murals being painted on their walls: Advertisers buy walls, muralists do not. Remember how we got in this mess?

We have been working for 10 years to pass a fantastic new mural ordinance that will beautify our city and eliminate the possibility of a future mural ban. We are counting on you.

Thank you,

Zahra Bejaune
Lead Artist
Beautify LA Project



BRENTWOOD Community Council

149 S. Barrington Ave., Box 194, Los Angeles, CA 90049

www.brentwoodcommunitycouncil.org

July 19, 2013

Councilmember Jose Huizar, Chair

Planning Committee

City Hall, Room 395

200 North Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Sent Via Email: Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org

RE: Mural Ordinance CF 11-0923

Dear Councilmember Huizar,

The Brentwood Community Council ("BCC") is the broadest based Brentwood community organization.¹ We request that the ordinance be directed back to committee to consider the following:

1. The Ordinance originally excluded residential properties of fewer than 5 units. CPC reduced that to two or fewer units. There should be a carve out for residential (R1) properties that has now been included.
2. Should it be merely community input required to allow a mural, or should process have a place for a community veto? If 50% of homes on a block can stop a speed bump from going in, shouldn't they also be able to approve or stop a mural? This would call for discussion of persuasion by the artists and residents and make the result more meaningful.

The ordinance does not include a strong tool to keep the characteristics of neighborhoods in tact.

3. Murals in R1 might be considered if *not* visible from the prow.

¹The Brentwood Community Council represents approximately 50,000 stakeholders of the 90049 community. BCC includes homeowners associations, multi-family residential dwellers, business organizations, schools, religious groups, volunteer service groups, public safety and environmental organizations.

Phone: 310-472-9775

Fax: 310-471-7478

Email: GJF165@gmail.com

4. Illumination of murals is of concern particularly near residential zones.
5. Enforcement must be considered the key to a successful program. If it is not done, there is no control and communities have the burden of enforcement.

BCC supported the Mural Ordinance before changes were made. It is crucial that there be a carve out for R1. True, some neighborhoods are content with the added R1 space, but others would not be and should be afforded an opportunity to opt out, or modify where they would like murals to be done in their own communities.

Please bring this ordinance back to committee to have a dialogue with community in put. The moratorium has been hard on those who make a living doing murals and it needs to be resolved in due time. But, it must not be rushed, the latest changes must be revisited, and it must satisfy all communities to the extent that it possibly can to be a lasting document to service all Angelenos.

We thank you for the work you do for The City of Los Angeles.

Regards,



Nancy Freedman
Chair, Brentwood Community Council
GJF165@gmail.com

Cc: Councilmember Mike Bonin
Norman Kulla, Senior Council, CD11
Councilmember Gilbert A. Cedillo
Councilmember Mitchell Englander

¹The Brentwood Community Council represents approximately 50,000 stakeholders of the 90049 community. BCC includes homeowners associations, multi-family residential dwellers, business organizations, schools, religious groups, volunteer service groups, public safety and environmental organizations.

Phone: 310-472-9775 Fax: 310-471-7478 Email: GJF165@gmail.com



PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL

June 20, 2013

Los Angeles City Council
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attn: Hon. Herb Wesson, Council President
Ms. June Lagmay, City Clerk, Rm. 360

**Re: CF 11-0923 - Mural Ordinance
Request Ordinance Return to Committee for Further Consideration (Review/Input)**

Dear President Wesson and all Los Angeles City Council Members:

Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC) has been the voice of the Pacific Palisades for more than 40 years. The Pacific Palisades community supports the arts and is proud of existing murals which have long graced several of our public spaces. PPCC has been generally supportive of the concept of an ordinance which would allow murals under certain circumstances. We have previously expressed concerns to the Planning Department about some aspects of earlier versions of the proposed Mural Ordinance.

We have now learned that the Director of Planning has disapproved the revised Ordinance as directed by PLUM and the City Attorney has expressed concerns about the revised Ordinance and submitted two versions, Version A and Version B, for consideration by the Council.

In light of these developments, we believe strongly that the Mural Ordinance should be referred back to committee and reconsidered for further review and community input. PPCC and other community and neighborhood councils have had insufficient time to thoroughly review and consider the proposed revisions. However, based on an initial review we have numerous concerns about the revised Mural Ordinance, including without limitation the following eleven (11) concerns:

1. Whether murals should be prohibited in R1, on single-family homes or any other dwellings, and/or in all other residential zones;
2. Whether murals on any dwellings in residential zones should be limited to areas that are not visible from the public right of way (e.g., back yard fences, rear walls no higher than one-story);
3. Whether communities that wish to have murals should be required to enact specific plans to *allow* murals on single-family homes (Version B) or on other dwellings in residential zones, and not the other way around (Version A);

4. Whether a 90-day waiting period before the Ordinance becomes operative would be sufficient time for enactment of specific plans either to allow or disallow murals on single-family homes or other dwellings in residential zones;
5. Whether illumination of murals should be allowed at all and in particular on any dwellings in or near residential zones;
6. Whether the ordinance's definition of a "commercial message" is clear, adequate and/or sufficient;
7. Whether the ordinance's definition of "digitally printed image" is clear, adequate and/or sufficient, and whether the definition of "Original Art Mural" should include "digitally printed" images;
8. Whether the "administrative rules" governing the "Neighborhood Involvement Requirement" should be adopted and set forth in the Ordinance prior to its enactment, and whether the provisions for notice and community involvement are adequate;
9. Whether existing murals are or should be clearly grandfathered under the Ordinance, and under what circumstances;
10. Whether any aspects of the Ordinance may impact public safety and/or quiet enjoyment of residential property, including the height and illumination provisions;
11. Whether there will be sufficient enforcement of the Ordinance provisions.

PPCC submits that there is no need for the Council to enact this Ordinance without thorough consideration and input by all affected constituencies. A measured and deliberate approach going forward is especially appropriate due to the Planning Director's disapproval and the City Attorney's expression of concerns and submittal of two alternative versions of the Ordinance.

PPCC urges the City Council to return the Mural Ordinance to committee for further input and consideration. PPCC requests that our letter be included in the record and filed in CF 11-0923.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kohn
President, PPCC

cc:

Michael J. Logrande, Director of Planning
Hon. Ed P. Reyes, President Pro Tempore
Hon. Tom LaBonge, Assistant President Pro Tempore
Hon. Bill Rosendahl
Hon. Richard Alarcon
Hon. Joe Buscaino
Hon. Mitchell Englander
Hon. Eric Garcetti
Hon. Jose Huizar
Hon. Hon. Paul Koretz
Hon. Bernard Parks
Hon. Jan Perry
Hon. Dennis Zine

-2-

P.O. Box 27404
Los Angeles, CA 90027
323-663-1031
president@hillsidefederation.org
www.hillsidefederation.org



PRESIDENT
Marian Dodge
CHAIRMAN
Charley Mims
VICE PRESIDENTS
Mark Stratton
Wendy-Sue Rosen
SECRETARY
Donna Messinger
TREASURER
Don Andres

Planning Committee
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

July 28, 2013

Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood
Bel Air Knolls Property Owners
Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners
Bel Air Ridge Association
Benedict Canyon Association
Brentwood Hills Homeowners
Brentwood Residents Coalition
Cahuenga Pass Property Owners
Canyon Back Alliance
Crests Neighborhood Assn.
Franklin Ave./Hollywood Bl. West
Franklin Hills Residents Assn.
Highlands Owners Assn.
Hollywood Dell Civic Assn.
Hollywood Heights Assn.
Hollywoodland Homeowners
Holmby Hills Homeowners Assn.
Kagel Canyon Civic Assn.
Lake Hollywood HOA
Laurel Canyon Assn.
Lookout Mountain Alliance
Los Feliz Improvement Assn.
Mt. Olympus Property Owners
Mt. Washington Homeowners All.
Nichols Canyon Assn.
N. Beverly Dr./Franklin Canyon
Oak Forest Canyon Assn.
Oaks Homeowners Assn.
Outpost Estates Homeowners
Pacific Palisades Residents Assn.
Residents of Beverly Glen
Roscomare Valley Assn.
Shadow Hills Property Owners
Sherman Oaks HO Assn.
Studio City Residents Assn.
Sunset Hills Homeowners Assn.
Tarzana Property Owners Assn.
Torreyson Flynn Assn.
Upper Mandeville Canyon
Upper Nichols Canyon NA
Whitley Heights Civic Assn.

Re: CF# 11- 0923
Original Art Mural Ordinance, hearing July 30

Honorable Councilmembers Huizar, Cedillo, and Englander:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc. represents 41 resident and homeowner associations spanning the Santa Monica Mountains and their 200,000 constituents. The mission of the Hillside Federation is to protect the property and the quality of life for residents of the hillside areas. The Federation supports policies and programs that best preserve the natural topography and wildlife of the mountains and hillsides for the benefit of all the people of Los Angeles. In accordance with that mission, the Federation has consistently opposed the placement of commercial signage within the Santa Monica Mountains, other hillside areas, scenic corridors, and public parks.

The Federation is concerned that the current draft of the Mural Ordinance fails to provide sufficient protection against the commercial use of murals, particularly in hillside areas where such commercialization would degrade the natural character of the hillsides. The Federation asks that the draft ordinance and especially the proposed definition of "commercial message" be clarified to assure that murals permitted under the proposed ordinance do not function as or otherwise contain commercial advertising.

Sincerely,

Marian Dodge

Marian Dodge

CHAIRPERSONS EMERITUS
Shirley Cohen
Jerome C. Daniel
Patricia Bell Hearst
Alan Kishbaugh
Gordon Murley
Steve Twining
Polly Ward

CHAIRMAN IN MEMORIAM
Brian Moore

PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS EDWARD R. ROYBAL HEARING ROOM 350 - 2:30
PM
200 NORTH SPRING STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

MEMBERS:
COUNCILMEMBER JOSE HUIZAR, CHAIR
COUNCILMEMBER GILBERT A. CEDILLO
COUNCILMEMBER MITCHELL ENGLANDER

July 30, 2013

Reference: Council File 11-0923

Dear Sirs,

I am a board member of the Reseda Neighborhood Council, and was in the minority voting against the Mural Ordinance. The reason I voted against the ordinance is that I could find nothing in the ordinance concerning the content of the mural prohibiting offensive material, including but not limited to images or words that are derogatory, distasteful, pornographic, hate speech, or any content that would be irritating or condescending to groups or individuals living in the area.

Murals being openly viewed in public are a quality of life issue which should be beautiful and pleasant works of artistic value that convey positive emotions to the viewer, with scenes of peaceful tranquility. It is better to have no murals than to allow murals that are offensive, hateful or in poor taste. We should be able to live together harmoniously in communities which must be respectful of each other and to prohibit seeds of discontent.

As part of the Mural Ordinance, I would like to see included a section on content, stipulating that offensive material, including but not limited to images or words that are derogatory, distasteful, pornographic, hate speech, or any content that would be irritating or condescending to groups or individuals, be prohibited.

Respectfully,

John Mika
Reseda NC Board Member