



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

---

## Council file number 18-0057

1 message

---

**Rochelle Steiner** <steiner.rochelle@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 7:39 AM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: HHA <info@hollywoodland.org>

I am writing regarding the Dixon Report for the Hollywood area. I am a resident on Deronda Drive, a street under great duress due to traffic impact (vehicular, pedestrian, etc) and other safety concerns. These issues have increased in the past 5 years due to heightened tourism, the encouragement by the city of ride share (uber, lyft, etc), the the encouragement of use of narrow, sub-par streets (ie without curbs, sidewalks, etc). This has brought about destruction of property, fire (due to smoking on streets despite signage), etc.

I am concerned about the Dixon Study for a number of reasons. First, the Dixon Study did not solicit any input from the residents. Those of us who live in the area were not contacted or surveyed by Dixon even though we are in the midst of the situation and offered our observations about what is occurring, what has helped and what has not. This means that the City and the Dixon Study seem not to be interested in the residents, the neighborhood, or input from those who are directly affected on a day-in and day-out basis.

Secondly, and of critical consequence, the actions the city is proposing from the Dixon Study is subject to CEQA regulations and requires an environmental impact study for adverse effects to the environment and neighborhood, which includes health and safety, land use, etc all aspects of an EIR. We are seeking detailed explanation on how the city plans to move forward without taking the required steps outlined by CEQA.

Thank you,

--

Rochelle Steiner

[3111 Deronda Drive / LA, CA 90068](#)

email: [steiner.rochelle@gmail.com](mailto:steiner.rochelle@gmail.com)

cell: +1 646 884 3244



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

---

## Council file number 18-0057

1 message

---

**Michael Zelniker** <aionpic@gmail.com>  
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 9:13 AM

I am writing again to register my outrage that among the solutions being considered, re-opening an entrance to Griffith Park off of Beachwood Canyon, is not among them. A small minority of noisy residents succeeded in getting the entrance at the top of Beachwood Canyon closed. This ruling is against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of residents of Beachwood Canyon, Bronson Canyon and all the other surrounding areas affected by the closure. This opinion is also held by the various stakeholder organizations like Friends of Griffith Park and the various homeowner associations in the affected areas. The fact that the city council and Councilman Ryu continue to ignore the wishes of the overwhelming majority of people affected by this decision is a flagrant violation of democratic principles.

We will not be silenced. We will continue to speak out until an entrance to Griffith Park is re-opened off of North Beachwood Canyon.

Thank you.

Michael Zelniker

--

Michael Zelniker  
323-851-5289 (office)  
323-481-3962 (cell)  
twitter: @michaelzelniker  
[michaelzelniker.wordpress.com](http://michaelzelniker.wordpress.com)



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

---

## To The Arts Committee regarding File Number 18-0057/Meeting on the Dixon Study with regard to Beachwood Drive:

2 messages

---

jamierubin@gmail.com <jamierubin@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 10:10 AM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, mike.n.feuer@lacity.org, controller.galperin@lacity.org, planning@lacity.org, ladbs.webmaster@lacity.org, adria.ybarra@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, lambert.giessinger@lacity.org, ethics.commission@lacity.org, LAFDrequest@lacity.org, fernando.campos@lacity.org, rap.commissioners@lacity.org, ladot@lacity.org, cory.palka@lapd.lacity.org, 40988@lapd.online, joe.salaices@lacity.org, michael.a.shull@lacity.org, aram.sahakian@lacity.org, steve.houchin@lacity.org, steven.cole@ladwp.com, michael.mcMenamin@ladwp.com, david.wright@ladwp.com, armando.hogan@lacity.org, michael.espinosa@lacity.org, john.white@lacity.org, clerk.artscommittee@lacity.org, ap.diaz@lacity.org, brian.walters@lacity.org, eric.villanueva@lacity.org, richard.williams@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org, lactd@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

To The Arts Committee regarding File Number 18-0057/Meeting on the Dixon Study with regard to Beachwood Drive:

I am a a resident of Beachwood Canyon living at 3030 N. Beachwood Drive. My husband and I have owned our home for 12 years and are raising our 10 and 5 year old daughters in this wonderful community. We were drawn to it because of its beauty and welcoming neighbors.

I tend to not get too involved in politics but it has come to my attention that you are considering the Dixon study and are looking into possibly implementing some of its recommendations on my street, right in front of my home. It's hard to not want to get involved in something that will affect me so directly. I wanted to come to the meeting in person but it was scheduled at a time when I have to pick up my children from school so I am unable to attend but I hope you will read this letter and add it to the chorus of voices in the meeting opposing the findings of the Dixon study.

I am concerned about the implications of the suggestions for this sweet neighborhood. Specifically, I am concerned about a recommendation to run trams up our street to the trailhead at Sunset Ranch. It feels like our residential neighborhood could be turned into a commercial space overnight if this plan is put into action. I am sure you can imagine what a horrifying prospect that would be if it happened on your street.

I understand the Hollywood Sign has been and always will be a draw for tourists. I enjoy living in a place people want to visit; I have met hundreds of kind and interesting people from all over the world who walk our streets desperate for a great shot in front of the sign. It's one of the perks of living here. I believe the streets are open to all and I think tourists have a right to visit. I do not, however, believe that they have a right to expect to park up here, or demand that buses accommodate them to take them through this quiet, residential community to get where they are going. We already have a DASH bus that stops in the middle of the village allowing people to take a picture of the sign from a few steps below or wander north through our neighborhood on foot. I ride the DASH often and it is never crowded; it's often empty. I do not think we need another large noisy bus running up and down our street when the one we have isn't being fully utilized.

The DASH bus stops around 2700 N. Beachwood but tram service you are considering will go further north and will run right past my windows.

These are thin window panes original to our home which was built in 1948. Our bedroom window faces the street. The same single pane windows are in my dining room where I work during the day, also facing the street. Buses running up and down the hill all day would cause increased traffic, noise, and likely an ugliness to a community that is quite the opposite. Tourists strolling the street on foot looking for exercise or a photo are lovely. Loud buses full of them on a regular schedule are anything but. I don't think these trams are necessary and I think they will ruin a community that is one of the last few spaces in LA offering residents some peace and quiet in this big city. I believe there are many alternatives to moving people around this city to get a good view of the sign. I don't think their right to a photo trumps our right to a peaceful existence in our homes.

I want to reiterate that I do not have my head in the sand about the appeal of the Hollywood sign. I understand that people will want to come here no matter what but I don't think that making us an official tourist destination by running buses through this neighborhood is the answer. I think it will only make the problem exponentially worse. When I go to other parts of the world to visit historic landmarks and sights, I do not expect to do so by whizzing by quiet neighborhoods. I hope the committee will consider alternatives that involve roads and areas that were built to be public spaces, like the trailheads that begin in Griffith Park which take advantage of wider streets, room for parking, and don't single handedly upend the bucolic nature of a residential neighborhood that has been known for its natural beauty for decades.

Please put yourselves in our shoes. We have been peacefully coexisting with tourists for years. We are not asking you to prevent them from coming into our neighborhood but instead, to try to find a balance that preserves the quaintness of our spaces and gives tourists a proper viewing point for their coveted photos. Making Beachwood Drive an official viewing spot for the Hollywood sign would cause harm to everyone in this community and would not even be providing visitors with the best access or experience to see the sign. Trams running through the neighborhood will only cause more traffic and more chaos and confusion for people following them by car looking for a parking lot and official entrance to the park that doesn't exist. It will also make it more difficult to walk our streets. We don't have any sidewalks so neighbors walk their dogs and children in the street. Dodging cars is simple, dodging a tram is much more difficult and unpleasant. This neighborhood simply wasn't built for commercial tourism and it doesn't look like there is a way to retrofit it to make it work.

I urge you to try to manage the situation we have and not create one that will make the problem worse for everyone involved. Please don't ruin Beachwood Canyon for the hundreds of residents who call it home. Please find another way.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my position.

Sincerely,  
Jamie Rubin

--

Jamie Rubin  
[jamierubin@gmail.com](mailto:jamierubin@gmail.com)  
917.974.9344

9/25/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - To The Arts Committee regarding File Number 18-0057/Meeting on the Dixon Study with regard to Beachwood...

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]



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

---

## Beachwood Canyon Bulb File # 18-0057

1 message

---

**pam meyer** <deuelmeyer@att.net>  
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org  
Cc: info@hollywoodland.org

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 10:26 AM

[Clerk.Artscommittee@LACity.org](mailto:Clerk.Artscommittee@LACity.org)

cc: Hollywood Homeowners Association

To: Arts & Parks Committee, LA City Council

FILE #: 18-0057

Re: BUILDING A SIDEWALK BULB ON BEACHWOOD DRIVE WILL NOT WORK

Dear Councilmembers:

My letter addresses only one issue:

**Building a sidewalk bulb on Beachwood Drive for pedestrians will not work.** It is totally unrealistic. I oppose this idea.

It is based on a false assumption, that tourists will obediently use this location to take their group selfie photos with the sign.

They will not! They are too excited about their photo to care about anyone else.

I have asked a couple of traffic officers what they think about this idea, and they said it won't work. They know it won't solve the problem.

Tourists looking for the sign are so excited that they pay no attention to the traffic or anyone else while they take their photos.

They are in such an excited state of mind that they do not realize traffic is passing by. Many of them come from countries where traffic is badly regulated, so obeying laws or signs means nothing to them. Many do not speak English, are not familiar with our organized American traffic practices. Many are immature teenagers whose brains and judgement are still developing.

So for the Dixon report to assume that they will obediently use a wider sidewalk is based on a false assumption can lead only to more congestion.

IT WILL MERELY PUSH THE PROBLEM FURTHER DOWN BEACHWOOD DRIVE. I oppose building a sidewalk bulb on Beachwood Drive.

Sincerely,

9/25/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Beachwood Canyon Bulb File # 18-0057

Pam Meyer

[2702 Westshire Drive](#)

Beachwood Canyon resident since 1992



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

---

## Council File 18-0057

1 message

---

**Colette Schamet** <cgschamet@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 11:50 AM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: cd4.issues@lacity.org

Dear Clerk and Councilmember David Ryu's CD4 district,

This email is to voice my concern and opposition to the suggested "Bump Out" for tourist parking to take pictures of the "infamous" Hollywood Sign.

Ever Since Google put us on the map, the traffic more than tripled, day and night.

We live near that suggested Bump Out spot and it will unequivocally make our traffic worse and our lives a living hell on and around that location, including the noise, car congestion, honking horns, etc. Currently mid-Beachwood Drive is littered with tourists all over with double parking, how will this tiny spot resolve the issue.

Instead of this suggested Bump Out, the City should post a "No Hollywood Sign Access" at the bottom of Beachwood and Franklin entrance and on several intersections along the way up. All tourists should be diverted to the Observatory for sign viewing, not on tiny residential roads.

The City gets no financial benefit from this Bump Out, Beachwood Canyon is a residential (not commercial) neighborhood, why make our lives miserable?!

Please, if it's not too much trouble, please update me on this issue going forward.

Thank you.

Colette Schamet

2549 N Beachwood Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90068

323-646-6767

[cgschamet@gmail.com](mailto:cgschamet@gmail.com)



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

---

## COUNCIL FILE 18-0057

1 message

---

**Meg George** <meggeorg@gmail.com>  
To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 12:12 PM

I have reviewed the Dixon Report. While their suggestions seem well considered for the scenario of keeping the Hollywood sign atop Mount Lee, it is limited to that. This approach only considers accommodating those who want a "photo opportunity" with THE HOLLYWOOD SIGN. It does not consider the impact on the Griffith Park habitat, Griffith Park wilderness, Griffith Park wildlife or the residents of the adjacent neighborhoods. The Dixon Report did not even consider the value of removing the sign from Mount Lee and putting it somewhere accessible to the Hollywood sign fans. The advantages of this (removing the sign from Mount Lee and putting somewhere accessible to the Hollywood sign fans) approach are multi-fold. For example:

1. It will help preserve and support the wilderness aspect, habitat and wildlife of Griffith Park
2. It will better protect the integrity of the residential neighborhoods
3. It will give the fans what they want access to the real sign in a safe, all access way.

By removing the sign from Mount Lee and placing it somewhere, perhaps on a flatter location, it would become more accessible to all the HOLLYWOOD SIGN FANS. A site along the LA River (on the Hollywood side in conjunction with the river restoration), or on the park area that is planned above the Hollywood Freeway, or near the Hollywood Bowl for example, should seriously be evaluated. The HOLLYWOOD SIGN could then be offered up, for a fee, for events, e.g. a wedding with the betrothed taking vows on the cross bar of the "H" or in the cradle of the "O" for example, post Oscar Party venues, a Luxury hotel in the "Ls", a cafe in the W. A viewing platform photo opportunity set up could be offered on both sides, indeed people could touch the sign!-- While the timeline for this is much longer, the Dixon Report proposals could provide some safety adjustments in the interim. Alternatively, in a manner similar to the temporary closing the Observatory for several years, the Hollywood sign could be temporarily housed somewhere with access and photo opportunities until its new permanent home is ready or even mothballed for a few years until the big reveal.

For me the price of diminishing the wilderness aspects of Griffith Park to accommodate photo opportunities of fans with the SIGN as a backdrop is too high. It is after all simply a Real Estate Sign that has evolved into a worldwide recognized ICON. Make no mistake the wilderness aspects of Griffith Park will be diminished while the signs fans NEED to have the photos bombed by it and it remains atop Mount LEE. The cost is too high, there is no value in the destruction of wilderness, wildlife, and habitat for the photo opportunity with the sign. In my opinion Griffith Park's wilderness, the largest urban Wilderness Park in the USA, should not be sacrificed to accommodate Hollywood Sign fans.

Sincerely,

*Meg George*



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

---

## Council File #18-0057: "NO" ON DIXON STRATEGY 2.1

1 message

---

cheryl.veltri@gmail.com <cheryl.veltri@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 1:25 PM

To: Clerk.ArtsCommittee@lacity.org

Cc: Councilmember.Ryu@lacity.org, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, shannon.prior@lacity.org, Catherine Landers <catherine.landern@lacity.org>, info@hollywoodland.org

Please include in the Council File #18-0057

**We are OPPOSED to the implementation of Dixon Strategies 2.1.**

The Beachwood Gate was closed by court order due to volume of pedestrians and vehicles blocking Sunset Ranch's business and also creating unsafe conditions.

**Implementing 2.1 will recreate conditions that have already been ruled against in a court of law.**

Electric (or otherwise) shuttles through the court ordered closed gate at dead end top of Beachwood Drive will only bring many more tourists into an area that is in an extreme fire hazard area. It is also surrounded on three sides with sensitive environmental area with wildlife populations.

Hollywoodland is in an R-1 residential area and not zoned to be a city supported Disneyland type of tourist destination.

**In addition to already established court order closing of the Beachwood Gate, Hollywoodland does not have the zoning or adequate infrastructure to support the expansion of tourism that Dixon Strategies #2.1 proposes.**

Sincerely,  
Cheryl and Gabriel Veltri