



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

Arts Committee Sept 26 - Item No. 9, 18-0057

1 message

Jeanne Clark <jmclark628@gmail.com>

To: clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org

Cc: HHA <info@hollywoodland.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Sun, Sep 23, 2018 at 12:59 PM

Dear Arts and Entertainment Committee,

I am writing regarding Item No. 9, 18-0057 for the wednesday 9/26 meeting-re: continuing discussion on the proposed Dixon strategies. As a long term homeowner in Hollywoodland, (one of the two neighborhoods directly impacted by Hollywood Sign Tourism), I am outraged at what has been allowed to evolve in this R1 zoned community.

Hollywoodland, one of the City's oldest hillside neighborhoods, has extremely substandard road infrastructure, that is filled with blind curves, steep grades and dead ends. Hollywoodland also lacks sidewalks on almost all road ways. Infrastructure sufficient to meet the residential needs in 1920's -1990's is now challenged by residential demands from increased development on previously determined "unbuildable lots". Adding the explosive tourism demands creates not only quality of life issues but daily safety issues for both residents and visitors. With the severe limitations in infrastructure and few options for improvements, Dixon strategies for increased PPD's or citations would have little impact in managing the overwhelming traffic tourism creates near the Hollywood Sign.

Hollywoodland is also situated in a very high fire severity zone. Surrounded almost 80% by high fire brush wildland, flexibility for ingress and egress, and maintaining roadway flow is paramount. Recommendations for turning these serpentine streets to one-way have enormous implications for both residential needs and safety. Strategies that to facilitate tourism, such as one way streets, tourism shuttles, ride share vehicles and increased pedestrian visitor traffic in this fragile community are not just reckless but negligent.

The City Charter and General Plan make clear that conserving residential neighborhoods and protecting them from traffic intrusion are key elements. Yet many of the strategies proposed by Dixon target specific single family neighborhoods (Hollywoodland and Lake Hollywood Estates) for exploitation.

Regarding strategy 5.1 - temporary closure of streets, it is astonishing that LADOT and the CLA can make conclusions against such recommendations when there are examples throughout LA of temporary street closures (ie. Hollywood Bowl communities, the Greek Theater adjacent streets, etc). CVC Code 21101e specifically gives local authorities, for those highways under their jurisdiction, the ability to adopt rules and regulations by ordinance or resolution (as done previously by Councilman LaBonge- Dec '14 resolution)

"e) Temporarily closing a portion of any street for celebrations, parades, local special events, and other purposes when, in the opinion of local authorities having jurisdiction or a public officer or employee that the local authority designates by resolution, the closing is necessary for the safety and protection of persons who are to use that portion of the street during the temporary closing."

The key phrase being "for the safety and protection of persons who are to use that portion of the street". I cannot imagine that the safety issues presented by the Bowl or the Greek are any different or more severe than what Hollywoodland experiences every weekend and Holidays.

LA City's website states that City Council is tasked with proper solution of problems affecting lives and welfare of its residents including but not limited to traffic control, fire and police protection . However, rather than addressing the problem of mass tourism residential neighborhood wholly incapable of supporting the traffic volume, the Dixon strategies seek to alter our neighborhood for the benefit of tourism needs with little regard for residents. Routine road blocks, delayed emergency response, damage to private property, breakdown of historical walls/roads due to overload, trespassing, public urination/defecation-often on private property, unlawful smoking and increased crime are all issues currently impacting residents due to the unmitigated tourism. As these issues in Hollywoodland have been thoroughly and visually documented repeatedly to CD4 it is appalling that the welfare of residents be based on strategies developed by a third party that lacks even basic qualifications in transportation engineering and city planning. By supporting the Dixon strategies, CD4, the Arts Committee and the Council in general would demonstrate a complete abdication of their responsibilities to the constituents most affected by Sign tourism.

I implore this committee to reject the flawed Dixon Study and request a thorough evaluation and feasibility study be conducted by the bureau of engineering as well as planning and land use. In addition, request a full EIR regarding all aspects of tourism in the residential neighborhoods under the sign.

Thank you,
Jeanne Clark

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

Re: Dixon Study - Council file number 18-0057

1 message

Jim Van Dusen <wjvd@roadrunner.com>

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>

Sun, Sep 23, 2018 at 9:31 PM

City of Los Angeles, Arts, Entertainment, Parks, & River Committee

Re: Dixon Study - Council file number 18-0057

The fundamental issue as the management of Rec and Parks and Councilmember Rue have repeatedly stated is that the park cannot handle the crowds that it is currently having to accommodate as they are overwhelming the natural foliage and driving out the wildlife. The Griffith Trust explicitly states that this is to be a wildlife preserve as well as a park for the people. We need to be looking for ways to restrict entry while allowing entry on the order of how Yosemite Park is managed. Opening and expanding neighborhood access to the park defeats the above and will get worse over time as tourism continues to increase.

The Dixon study was limited in scope. In particular, it is striking that the Dixon study was performed from only the perspective of increasing visitors and traffic into the park through residential neighborhoods that were not designed nor able to sustain access to the park of the magnitude being contemplated by this committee. I would urge you to listen to the suggestions presented by the hillside and canyon residents and try to understand the perspective of the neighborhoods and their concerns as they are not outlined in any significant detail in the Dixon study or RAP report.

Jim Van Dusen

Long time resident of Beachwood Canyon



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

RE: Re: Dixon Study - Council file number 18-0057 - Comments on Strategies

1 message

Jim Van Dusen <wjvd@roadrunner.com>

Sun, Sep 23, 2018 at 10:24 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Shannon Prior <shannon.prior@lacity.org>, Joe Salaices <joe.salaices@lacity.org>

City of Los Angeles, Arts, Entertainment, Parks, & River Committee

Re: Dixon Study – Council File Number 18-0057

Dixon Study issues that need to be addressed:

Strategy 1.1: The bulb-out along North Beachwood Drive.

The proposed bulb-out will affect the key traffic artery into and out of the Hollywood Hills as it is the main route for entering and exiting the area. It is therefore important that all the neighborhood residents north of the proposed bulb-out up to the Griffith Park and city land boundaries be included in any discussions regarding it as the safety of their persons, families and property could be negatively impacted by this proposed change.

Strategy 2.1: Electric shuttle from the Red Line to upper Beachwood Canyon

Per the Dixon study, 7,000 cars pass through North Beachwood Drive between Belden and Westshire each day on weekends which could also apply to upper North Beachwood Drive. Anecdotally I can state that summer weekdays can sometimes reach that number. There is an average of 3 people per car which translates into about 21,000 people per day that can exit their cars. This does not count the number of people walking in the streets who came up by DASH or Uber. It will take a shuttle about 20 to 30 minutes to make a one-way run and if the shuttle holds 10 people, it will take 20 or 30 shuttles running continuously up and down North Beachwood Drive to move any appreciable number of people. Shuttles would have to replace cars and I'm not sure people will pay to ride the shuttle when they can drive and park for free.

Basically, it would have to be cars or shuttles. It cannot be cars and shuttles as the roadway cannot handle both. There is nothing in the strategy as to how to restrict cars from entering the area used by shuttles nor how to manage the shuttle traffic, breakdowns, etc. Adding electric shuttles to North Beachwood Drive will increase the already significant dangers facing visitors and residents alike.

The more realistic approach is to implement a DASH bus up Canyon Drive to the Bronson Canyon Park. The streets are wide and flat, there are sidewalks on almost the entire stretch of road, there are already speed bumps installed to moderate traffic speeds, the small parking lot at the end of the park next to the trailhead can accommodate a DASH bus turn around, there are picnic tables, a porta-potty, children's playground, a large parking lot, trails into the park and to the Hollywood Sign and the park is a city-sanctioned and installed park. No such park or park facilities exist at the top of Beachwood Drive nor is there space to accommodate one. A DASH bus would also decrease visitor car traffic on Canyon Drive and Bronson Drive with the hikers contained in the park and not on the streets trying to get to or from the park.

Jim Van Dusen

Long time resident of Hollywood