

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan McCorry

**Date Submitted:** 12/06/2023 08:36 AM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do. To allow more billboards to blight our beautiful city!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dr. Dydia DeLyser

**Date Submitted:** 12/06/2023 06:28 AM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** Esteemed members of our City Council, I am a scholar of electric signs and signage and write to urge you NOT to approve Metro's proposed TCN which would allow overwhelmingly bright LED billboards to overwhelm our historic and natural landscapes. Ever since First Lady Lady Bird Johnson secured the passage of the Highway Beautification Act more than fifty years ago Americans have understood that the proliferation of large billboards is inappropriate in dense cities, historic areas, and natural landscapes. Since then, decades of careful urban planning have shown us how we can regulate signs and signage to ensure that our city landscapes can include appropriate signs to guide people toward our businesses, while not desecrating our landscapes. Metro's proposed TCN with its overwhelmingly bright LED billboards would undo more than fifty years of landscape preservation and urban planning efforts! Some of our most unique and important landmarks, like Angels Flight, would be visually obliterated by these signs. This is not appropriate twenty-first century planning. It is a regressive effort that would return us to the urban and billboard blight of the 1960s. Our beloved City of the Angels deserves our care so that we can share our beautiful historic and natural landscapes with the tens of millions who live here, who visit as tourists, and who pass through on our legendary freeways. We owe it to them, and to us all to protect the visual experiences of our landscapes by saying No to Metro's proposed TCN. Dr. Dydia DeLyser

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles

**Date Submitted:** 12/06/2023 07:59 AM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers, As the attached LA Times article, published this morning, states: just say "NO THANKS." Please be smart and discharge your duties today IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. As the attached article states, this scheme does not serve the public! As the attached articles states, your support of this program will cause a major increase in electric signage in this city, in virtually every corner of L.A. As the article states, be clear-eyed about what your vote to allow dozens more light-polluting digital billboards will mean for the quality of life in L.A. As the articles states, to support this project would be a choice to sacrifice street safety and the visual landscape for a modest funding stream, and potentially opening the door to more of these bright and distracting billboards. It's not a good trade-off.

## OPINION

## EDITORIALS

## More bright digital billboards?

No thanks. But it looks as though L.A. officials will approve them anyway to bring in revenue.

**M**AYOR KAREN BASS and the City Council are ready to gut Los Angeles' billboard ban and unleash dozens of new bright, blinking electronic billboards next to freeways and in neighborhoods across the city.

Under a plan expected to be approved by the City Council, the city will allow 75 billboard-size digital signs on land owned by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority. There is still time for council members to reject this expansion and protect L.A.'s visual landscape and street safety.

And they should because Los Angeles is already an extraordinarily dangerous place for pedestrians and bicyclists, with rising numbers of people severely injured and killed by cars. City leaders have failed to make streets safer yet now they are eager to put up electronic signs that are specifically designed to catch drivers' attention and likely to increase the risk of a crash.

Why? For the money, of course. Metro and city officials have asserted that the billboards will be a public service, providing

commuters with information about road conditions and transit alternatives. But seven out of every eight messages will show ads — and the messages will change every eight seconds.

This is a scheme to generate revenue, not to serve the public. Advertising is projected to pay up to \$500 million over 20 years, split between Metro and the city. Both have promised to spend the money on transportation-related projects, which could include pedestrian and bicyclist safety improvements.

Metro originally proposed 93 billboards. The city's Planning Commission and some council members whittled the number down to 75 in an attempt to reduce community impact. The plan also requires the removal of about 300 non-electric billboards. Even with the reduction, that's still a major increase in electronic signage even as the city begins installing about 700 bus shelters that will have digital advertising screens. Get ready to be bombarded with electronic advertisements in virtually every corner of L.A.

To be sure, it seems as though there is never enough money to do everything that the public needs or wants government agencies to do. There is a constant search for new revenue, and city leaders have been eyeing digital billboards as a potential cash cow for for years. City law currently bans

new billboards outside of sign districts, such as in downtown near Crypto.com Arena. Outdoor advertising companies have also been pushing the city to relax its restrictions. The Metro plan is backed by Bass and council President Paul Krekorian, who both sit on Metro's governing board.

Council members need to be clear-eyed about what their vote to allow dozens more light-polluting digital billboards will mean for the quality of life in L.A. They're choosing to sacrifice street safety and the visual landscape for a modest funding stream, and potentially opening the door to more of these bright and distracting billboards. It's not a good trade-off.



JAY L. CLENDENIN Los Angeles Times

**A HOUSE** in the Comstock Hills neighborhood of L.A. has a glow cast onto it from a digital billboard.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Em Allyn

**Date Submitted:** 12/06/2023 01:14 AM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** In regards to item 13, I publicly express my opinion as a Los Angeles resident. I have seen the digital on-building advertisements in West Hollywood and have witnessed the chaotic atmosphere they create. These changing, blinking, signs are incredibly distracting for drivers. The proposed implementation of electronic signs and billboards is not only a poor idea in general but also has been made even worse by including a refresh rate UNAPPROVED by use-studies conducted by competent authorities. I URGE THIS COUNCIL TO VOTE NOT TO ALLOW THESE SIGNS TO CREATE UGLINESS AND DANGER IN OUR BEAUTIFUL CITY. There are enough advertisements already! Nothing about these new signs is worth the damage they will cause for the citizens whom YOU represent.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Renee Saifer

**Date Submitted:** 12/06/2023 02:46 AM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** We really oppose Electronic bill bords in Studio City. They are distracting and dangerous and really change the tone of our wonderful, community. Please oppose the installation of these billboards and represent the residents of Studio City