



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

---

## Council file number 18-0057 Pls include in the public record

1 message

---

'Christine OBrien' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Fri, Sep 14, 2018 at 12:47 PM

Reply-To: Christine OBrien <obrienmills@icloud.com>

To: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

Cc: HHA <info@hollywoodland.org>

---

 **Dixon rd 2, 9:14:2018.pdf**  
37K

## Memo

To: Mr. Shull, Ms Tso, LA City Council Arts and  
Entertainment Committee  
From: Christine Mills O'Brien

September 14, 2018

Subject: **CF 18-0057, September 26, 2018 hearing**

Discussion points from Shull/Tso Feasibility of Dixon Study Pedestrian and vehicle issues relating to the Hollywood sign/viewing

***Please include these points in the public record file.***

Regarding Round Two of the Dixon discussion, a continuation from July 2018. I attended the July meeting and shared my fact based viewpoints. I have included these concerns once again for your review.

This study must not be limited to just this committee. It adversely affects the very core of single family living, traffic, safety, property values, environment and transportation, yet is selectively heard in an isolated, tainted vacuum. Please expand the oversight and consideration of the Dixon report to these council committees: Energy Climate and Environmental Justice, Planning and Land Use, Public Safety, Trade, Travel and Tourism and Transportation. To not view this serious matter in an expanded committee format would be neglecting your charge.

The Mayor and Mr. Shull ignored key facts that should have been considered before they spend time and tax payer money on this report. These facts include the negative impacts of the private property being affected by the promotion and marketing of the sign as well as the safety, quality of life and environmental effects that are also negatively impacted. The real fact is there are NO official openings into the park. It is disappointing to see public officials with such disregard for the good, honest tax paying property owners who are vital for a healthy productive city. Why don't we count?

It was very odd that a majority of these recommendations were not under RAP's jurisdiction. It is my understanding RAP can only act on issues in the park so why did they involve themselves in many other departments and call the shots? I think this study was actually initiated by the mayor and RAP became the cover for him! Is there something I am not getting in the city charter?

Where and when does RAP's jurisdiction start?

1.1 OOJ (out of Jurisdiction)

1.2 OOJ, RAP can not give direction to DOT

1.3 Define "wayfinding" throughout Griffith Park, does that only include GP proper? You have no jurisdiction outside of it. What is your criteria to measure effectiveness of the illogical signs DOT put up? (I can not really expect an answer from you since DOT is not your jurisdiction, but pls have the city family provide me with one.

Page 4 "Define accurately directs visitors to appropriate locations". Is this referencing park proper? Reminder there are NO OFFICIAL SAFE PROPER openings into GP from Hollywoodland residential. Also, the gate at Deronda is owned by a private citizen and we are negotiating specific rights to Hollywoodlanders.

page 5 Why is there a need for signs when there are no official openings? Also OOJ

1.4 A Bingo here! You have jurisdiction over Canyon and yes, pls consider this. You have an official, safe opening into the Hollywoodland Gifted park section of Griffith Park. a sidewalk is essential.

## Memo

2.1 OOJ, there is no official opening and by promoting this you are causing damages to property owners by lowering their values. Canyon is an official and proper opening. In addition this is a violation of the Hollywood Community Plan and the General Framework Plan.

Page 6 2.2 What is AEPR Committee?

Canyon is an official opening. What is the criteria defining a safe pedestrian access?  
page 7, 2.3 OOJ

3.1 Please define Hollywood sign viewing areas under your jurisdiction. Again, this is a violation of the Hollywood Community Plan and General Framework Plan.

The reference to Toyon is inaccurate, pls reread city documents discussing this in 2008. OOJ since sanitation and the EPA probably have criteria for use and non use.

Comment regarding the shuttles to the Observatory: windows without a view! How insensitive, pls give the people riding the courtesy of a view that is half the fun of going to the Observatory. Do not treat your guests like prisoners!

Page 8, 3.1 OOJ. Please define "view vistas" and communicate where they exist. As a post script research shows both "vistas" off Mulholland and Canyon Lake are illegal.

3.2 OOJ Those passenger drops do not meet DOT national standards. They are rezoning a residential community making this proposal a violation of R1 zoning, the Hollywood Community Plan and General Framework Plan. Please explain how you will compensate property owners for loss of value through this zone change.

3.2 See above

3.3 This proposal must be environmentally sensitive and must protect private property in Lake Hollywood, Hollywoodland and the Hollywood Knolls. These facts must be considered: no official openings from any of these neighborhoods, R-1 needs to be protected, noise needs consideration, Mt. Lee must be protected. There could be significant advantages depending on the proposal.

Page 10, 4.1 This is in your jurisdiction! Bingo! This proposal was developed and plant specific to the Hollywoodland Gifted Park original Theodore Payne plantings. A landscape architect donated his talents through a relationship with a council candidate. It was all doable and it is an embarrassment that this took 4 years to act on. It clearly shows the power of politics. Shameful! YES please implement!

4.2 Please define "wayfinding streets", OOJ

4.3 OOJ How?

6.5 OOJ

4.4 Why wasn't this done 3 years ago?

5.1 OOJ

Page 5.2 OOJ, violation of the Hollywoodland Specific Plan, Hollywood Community Plan, General Framework Plan

6.1 OOJ

Page 12 6.2 Good Idea, but OOJ

6.3 NO! see 5.2 Define "popular tourist location" where are these located? In the park? please understand "damages" to property owners loss of property values.

This zone change would be illegal.

page 13, 6.4 OOJ

7.1 OOJ define "safe Hollywood sign view". What is the department's criteria/ How do you define "safe" explain costs criteria impact of hiker rescue. Who's budget is that from? Please describe the impact on Mt. Lee.

7.1, 20 Clarify "improve" how do you measure effectiveness, what is your criteria?

7.2 You will need a release from the Chamber who controls this. OOJ This should be out of residential neighborhoods.

page 14 7.3 Interesting that Mr. Shull refers to GPAB regarding their input and ignores homeowners who are directly affected with a loss of value to their property. Your intrusive promotion and marketing has created real damages. Please describe the criteria for a Hollywood sign viewing platform and outline the negative effects on private property.

7.3 22 What about damages relative to lower property values?

## Memo

page 14 7.3 Please recognize access must be through legal openings

7.4 OOJ

7.4 24 Please explain benefit

page 15 7.6 Please include facts regarding the Sherman Company's large land donation to the city. You are dismissing history.

7.7 Please understand the significant liability the city is creating by devaluing private property.

page 16 How will the park be accessed? How will property owners be compensated for their devalued property?

7.8 Yes in Brush Canyon, a proper and safe opening.

7.8 28 Because there are no official openings from Hollywoodland there is no need for bathrooms. Save taxpayer money! Think logically!



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

---

## Council file number 18-0057

1 message

---

'Dan Kihiczak' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Fri, Sep 14, 2018 at 6:44 PM

Reply-To: Dan Kihiczak <dkihiczak@yahoo.com>

To: "Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Please find different access to the trails instead of Wonder View Drive; this is a very narrow and winding street without a pedestrian walk which has scene a very large increase in pedestrian traffic, including large groups of people, along with vehicular traffic on this dead end street to the trail

Not only is this a safety issue for pedestrians, it's also a fire safety issue, with the increase in discarded cigarette butts.

Trash and loitering has also increased.

Thank you for your time.

Dan Kihiczak

---



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)



Eric (Roderico) Villanueva <eric.villanueva@lacity.org>

---

## Council file number 18-0057

1 message

---

'Dan Kihiczak' via Clerk Arts Committee <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Fri, Sep 14, 2018 at 6:44 PM

Reply-To: Dan Kihiczak <dkihiczak@yahoo.com>

To: "Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org" <Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org>

Please find different access to the trails instead of Wonder View Drive; this is a very narrow and winding street without a pedestrian walk which has scene a very large increase in pedestrian traffic, including large groups of people, along with vehicular traffic on this dead end street to the trail

Not only is this a safety issue for pedestrians, it's also a fire safety issue, with the increase in discarded cigarette butts.

Trash and loitering has also increased.

Thank you for your time.

Dan Kihiczak



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)