

DEPARTMENT OF  
CITY PLANNING

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801  
AND  
6262 VAN NUYS BLVD., SUITE 351  
VAN NUYS, CA 91401

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

WILLIAM ROSCHEN  
PRESIDENT  
REGINA M. FREER  
VICE-PRESIDENT

SEAN O. BURTON  
DIEGO CARDOSO  
ROBIN R. HUGHES  
FR. SPENCER T. KEZIOS  
RICARDO LARA

CINDY MONTAÑEZ  
MICHAEL K. WOO

JAMES WILLIAMS  
COMMISSION EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT  
(213) 978-1300

May 6, 2009

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA  
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

S. GAIL GOLDBERG, AICP  
DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1272

JOHN M. DUGAN, AICP  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1274

EVA YUAN-MCDANIEL  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
(213) 978-1273

FAX: (213) 978-1275

INFORMATION  
(213) 978-1270

www.planning.lacity.org

Council of the City of Los Angeles  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Report Back on Sign Ordinance Revisions  
Council File 08-2020 (Weiss, Garcetti, Greuel, Rosendahl, Wesson, and Reyes)

Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

On April 21, 2009, the Department of City Planning received direction from the Committee to review a number of potential revisions and clarifications to the sign ordinance that was recommended by the City Planning Commission on March 26, 2009. After careful review, staff now presents the recommendations outlined briefly below, and summarized in the following pages of this letter. An in-depth discussion of these recommendations is provided in Attachments 1 through 4.

## Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee instruct the City Attorney to amend the City Planning Commission's recommended sign ordinance to incorporate:

1. the recommended changes outlined in Attachment 1, based on 19 potential revisions that PLUM provided to staff at the April 21 hearing; and
2. the recommended Department of City Planning fees outlined in Attachment 2; and
3. the recommended technical refinements outlined in Attachment 3, based on the Council Rule 38 conference conducted on April 27, 2009 by the Department of City Planning, the Department of Building and Safety, and the Office of the City Attorney.

In addition, if PLUM decides to recommend “grandfathering” the pending sign districts and pending special signage areas listed in Attachment 4, instruct the City Attorney to amend Section 12 of the sign ordinance to read as follows:

“This ordinance shall also not apply to:

‘SN’ Sign Districts that have not been established, but were initiated or applied for before December 26, 2008, pursuant to Section 12.32 of the Code;

‘SN’ Sign Districts that have not been established, but for which precise boundaries were identified in a draft environmental impact report submitted to and accepted by the Department of City Planning before December 26, 2008; and

amendments to established ‘SN’ Sign Districts and adopted specific plans or other adopted land use ordinances that allow off-site signs or signs with digital displays, if the amendments were initiated or otherwise applied for, before December 26, 2008.”

### **Recommended Changes Introduced by PLUM (Attachment 1A)**

The recommended changes outlined below resulted from specific direction from members of the PLUM Committee, and are discussed in further detail in Attachment 1.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Potential Revision</b>	<b>Introduced by</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Sign Districts</b>	1. Westwood Village and Ventura Boulevard should not be eligible for sign districts, because existing specific plans prohibit off-site signs.	Weiss	The ordinance should specify that if a specific plan and a sign district regulate the same area, then the sign district's regulations cannot conflict with or supersede the specific plan's regulations. It is more legally defensible to clarify a citywide standard than to make a special exception for specific areas.
	2. Do not allow sign districts on or near ecological reserves.	Weiss	The ordinance should specify that sign districts cannot be established within 500 feet of an ecological reserve, as defined by California Fish & Game Code Section 1584.
<b>Enforcement &amp; Penalties</b>	3. Clarify that all responsible parties will be individually liable for civil penalties.	Weiss	Add language to clarify that each responsible party is individually liable.

Category	Potential Revision	Introduced by	Recommendation
<b>Wall Signs and Temporary Signs</b>	4. Specify in the "Intent" provision that supergraphics are to be regulated as wall signs.	Weiss	Include this clarification as specified.
	5. Set a square-footage maximum for wall signs and temporary signs.	Weiss	To prevent supergraphics, limit temporary signs displaying off-site messages to 250 square feet of sign area, with a minimum of 10 feet of spacing between signs. This standard is consistent with existing limits for signs on temporary construction walls. A square-footage limit for wall signs is not recommended, due to complications with sign spacing for multi-tenant properties. Supergraphics displaying on-site messages, which are relatively uncommon, will be prevented by the proposed sign area ratio of approximately 2.5:1.
	6. Specify that temporary signs cannot display off-site messages over a certain size.	Weiss	As stated in #5 above, limit temporary signs displaying off-site messages to 250 square feet of sign area, with 10 feet of spacing between signs.
	7. Specify that temporary signs cannot cover windows.	Weiss	Specify that temporary signs can only be placed on the interior of a window. (Temporary signs on the interior of windows are already limited to 10% window coverage.) The Dept. of Building & Safety has concurred with this revision.
	8. Require the display of an identification placard on any temporary construction wall that displays temporary signs.	Weiss	Include this revision as specified, to help ensure graffiti removal as required by the current code.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Potential Revision</b>	<b>Introduced by</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Other Provisions</b>	9. Reduce restrictions on minimum property size and zoning for Comprehensive Sign Programs.	Reyes	Retain the currently proposed minimum size of 5 acres and 100,000 sq ft of non-residential floor area. Allow in any zone, to account for sites with variances or conditional use permits.
	10. Delineate the distinction between interior and exterior signs.	Reyes / Weiss	Specify that the sign ordinance does not apply to signs that face an interior court bounded on all sides by one or more buildings, provided that no sign is higher than the surrounding building walls. Staff is further researching this issue and will report back on May 12.
	11. Clarify that the ordinance does not allow the full replacement of any nonconforming sign.	Weiss	Add language referring to existing code provisions that address the replacement of nonconforming signs.

### **Changes Not Recommended on Items Introduced by PLUM (Attachment 1B)**

No change to the draft ordinance is recommended for the following items, which were introduced by members of the PLUM Committee at the April 21, 2009 hearing.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Potential Revision</b>	<b>Introduced by</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Sign Districts</b>	12. Clarify how a sign district's "sign impact area" is defined. Can it be extended, for example to impacted community plans or council districts?	Reyes / Weiss	No change recommended. The "sign impact area" would be defined by the ordinance establishing each sign district, and could extend as far as it could be reasonably shown that the impacts of the sign district's signage would extend. This will ensure that sign reduction benefits residents that are most impacted by the sign district.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Potential Revision</b>	<b>Introduced by</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Sign Districts (continued)</b>	13. Century City should not be eligible for a sign district, because it abuts single-family zoning.	Weiss	No change recommended. The draft ordinance specifies that sign districts cannot abut single-family zones. A citywide standard is more legally defensible than exceptions for specific areas.
<b>Enforcement &amp; Penalties</b>	14. Consider citing and penalizing advertisers for illegal signs.	Reyes / Weiss	No change recommended. This approach has only been attempted in isolated cases by two cities (Oakland and San Diego), through extensive legal proceedings. Citing sign owners and property owners would be a much more effective and efficient use of city resources.
	15. Clarify that all existing signs erected without permits must conform with the new sign ordinance.	Weiss	No change necessary. The Building Code states that signs erected without permits must conform to current code to be permitted.
<b>Wall Signs and Temporary Signs</b>	16. Specify that the total time limit of 90 days for temporary signs applies to the entire property.	Weiss	No change is recommended at this time. This potential revision could cause problems with multi-tenant properties, and should be carefully considered during the one-year review.
<b>Digital Displays</b>	17. Expressly ban the conversion or construction of off-site digital signs.	Weiss	No change necessary. The draft ordinance already accomplishes this, by specifically prohibiting new digital displays (including conversions) and stating the intent that this applies regardless of any settlement agreements to the contrary.
	18. Regulate existing digital displays in terms of brightness, hours of operation, etc.	Weiss	No change is recommended at this time. Staff will research operational regulations for existing digital signs as part of the one-year review.
<b>Other Provisions</b>	19. Work with DOT to define "hazard to traffic" as part of the one-year review	Reyes	No change is recommended at this time. Planning will work with DOT as specified, as part of the one-year review.

## Recommended Fees (Attachment 2)

In addition to the preceding recommendations, staff is also recommending revisions to the fees proposed for various processes within the sign ordinance. The revised fees are based upon current fees for comparable processes. The fees are briefly summarized in the table below and discussed in more detail in Attachment 2.

<b>Application Type</b>	<b>Recommended Base Fee</b>	<b>Comparable Process</b>
Sign Modification	\$5,879	Zone Variance
Comprehensive Sign Program	\$12,695	Zone Change
Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program	\$745	Plan Approval
Appeal of Code Violation Citation	\$5,879	Zone Variance
Appeal of any Sign Modification, Comprehensive Sign Program, or Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program	85% of original application fee, for appeal by applicant	Standard appeal fee percentage for most discretionary actions

## City Council “Rule 38” Technical Revisions (Attachment 3)

On April 27, 2009, the Office of the City Attorney, the Department of City Planning, and the Department of Building and Safety participated in a Council Rule 38 conference to review the Department of Building and Safety’s comments on the City Planning Commission’s recommended revisions to the sign regulations. As a result of this conference, Planning Department staff recommends that various revisions be incorporated into the proposed sign regulations. All of these recommended revisions are technical changes that clarify draft language and intent, and improve the Department of Building and Safety’s ability to enforce the new ordinance.

The proposed technical revisions address: wall and window sign definitions; sign regulations for parking zones and lots with multiple street frontages; measurement of sign height; maximum sign area for information, monument, projecting and illuminated architectural canopy signs; maximum number of signs allowed along a street frontage; wall sign coverage; sign area of high-rise identification signs; height of pole signs; maximum size of temporary signs allowed in the agricultural and residential zones; application of the sign modification procedure to comprehensive sign programs; appeals procedures for violations of the sign regulations; and accrual of civil penalties.

## **“Grandfathering” of Pending Sign Districts (Attachment 4)**

Councilmember Reyes introduced a potential revision (item #20) that the “grandfathering” of pending sign districts be extended to include a greater number of areas. The City Planning Commission recommended that only two pending sign districts previously approved by the Commission be “grandfathered”, or allowed to proceed through the review process under the existing regulations. In addition to these two, there are eight other pending sign districts and other areas for which special signage was requested prior to the effective date of the ICO (Dec. 26, 2008). These areas are detailed in Attachment 4.

Questions on these recommendations may be directed to Alan Bell of my staff at (213) 978-1322.

Sincerely,

S. GAIL GOLDBERG, AICP  
Director of Planning



MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE  
Chief Zoning Administrator

ML:AB:DM

cc: Sharon Siedorf Cardenas, Office of the City Attorney  
Hector Buitrago, Department of Building & Safety  
Jay Kim, Department of Transportation

### Attachments:

1. Further Discussion of Potential Sign Ordinance Revisions
  - A – Recommended Changes
  - B – Changes Not Recommended
2. Discussion of Recommended Fees
3. Council Rule 38 Technical Revisions
4. Pending Sign Districts and Special Signage Areas

# ATTACHMENT 1

## Further Discussion of Potential Sign Ordinance Revisions

This document contains further discussion of the potential ordinance revisions that members of the City Council's Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee introduced at the hearing of April 21, 2009. Six potential revisions were introduced by Councilmember Reyes, and seventeen potential revisions were introduced by Councilmember Weiss. This summary presents the recommended changes first, followed by the items for which no change to the draft ordinance is recommended or is necessary. The discussion of the items is organized into five categories: Sign Districts, Enforcement and Penalties, Wall Signs and Temporary Signs, Digital Displays, and Other Provisions.

### A. Recommended Changes

#### Sign Districts

1. (Weiss) Because the Westwood Village and Ventura Boulevard Specific Plans expressly prohibit off-site signs, those geographic areas should be eliminated from the list of eligible SUD areas.

In order to remain legally defensible, the ordinance must delineate clear and objective citywide standards and should not make special exceptions for specific areas. However, the concerns about existing specific plans point to a larger issue that should be addressed in the ordinance. Therefore, the ordinance should clarify that if a specific plan and a sign district regulate the same area, then the sign district's regulations cannot conflict with or supersede the specific plan's regulations. This clarification would not change existing regulations, but would re-state them more clearly.

2. (Weiss) SUDs (Sign Districts) should not be established on or near ecological preserves. Please clarify the appropriate restriction for SUD criteria to protect our city's ecological preserves.

Staff recommends that the ordinance specify that Sign Districts cannot be established within 500 feet of an ecological preserve, as defined by California Fish & Game Code Section 1584.

This issue arose in response to the identification of areas proposed to be eligible to apply for Sign District designation, which included all areas with Regional Center, Regional Commercial, or Downtown Center designation, and was first published in the staff report dated March 18, 2009. One of the areas included was described as "Ballona Wetlands (previously Playa Vista Phase III)", and was published with a caveat: "Property now protected by State of California". This land had been previously planned for inclusion in the Playa Vista development, but was removed due to its classification

as a state-protected ecological preserve, and is now protected from development by the state. To clear up the immediate confusion, this area has since been removed from the list of areas eligible to apply for Sign District designation. To address the larger issue of Sign Districts near ecological preserves, staff recommends a 500-foot buffer, as described above.

### **Enforcement and Penalties**

3. (Weiss) Clarify how civil penalties will be assessed and whether responsible parties will be individually liable.

Staff recommends that Section 14.4.23 B 1 be amended as follows (wording to be added is underlined): “The owner of the sign support structure on which a sign is located and the owner of the sign support structure are both responsible parties for complying with the sign regulations. In addition, both responsible parties are individually liable to pay the civil penalties authorized by this section.”

### **Wall Signs and Temporary Signs**

4. (Weiss) Supergraphics: Include in the Intent provision of sign ordinance, that supergraphics will now be regulated as wall signs.

Staff recommends that this revision be included in the ordinance as specified above. Although the draft ordinance already merges the existing definition of “supergraphic sign” into the proposed definition of “wall sign”, it may be helpful to point out this fact specifically.

5. (Weiss) Clarify what an appropriate square footage maximum would be for wall signs and temporary signs.

The draft ordinance relies upon the reduced sign area ratio of approximately 2.5:1 to limit the size of all signs on a property, including wall signs. Temporary signs are limited by a separate ratio of 1:1. The desire to add an additional restriction is largely based on the concern that supergraphics bearing off-site messages could still be allowed to exist under the proposed regulations. To address this concern, staff recommends an additional restriction on temporary signs displaying off-site messages, limiting them to 250 square feet of sign area. In addition, a minimum required spacing of ten feet will ensure that temporary signs cannot be placed right next to each other, creating the combined visual effect of larger signage. The new recommended limits are consistent with the existing limits for temporary signs on temporary construction walls.

For permanent wall signs, however, the same sign area and spacing restrictions would create problems. For multi-tenant buildings with businesses right next to each other, spacing between wall identification signs may be limited by physical constraints to only a few inches. Without a meaningful spacing restriction, the sign area restriction itself is not meaningful, as wall signs could be easily combined to create the appearance of

larger signage. Regulating wall signs in terms of sign area ratio, rather than with strict square-footage limits, will allow for greater flexibility in the design and placement of needed identification signage. The proposed approximate 2.5:1 sign area ratio is restrictive enough to prevent oversized signage, such as supergraphics. Furthermore, the proposed ordinance restricts the content of wall signs to on-site and noncommercial messages, and this will further help to prevent the placement of supergraphics. Staff therefore recommends that wall sign area be controlled by the 2.5:1 sign area ratio, without an additional square-footage restriction.

6. (Weiss) Restrict temporary signs to only on-site signage or noncommercial signs over a certain size. Identify the appropriate size for which this restriction should apply.

As discussed in item #5 above, staff recommends that temporary signs displaying off-site messages be limited to 250 square feet of sign area, with a minimum of 10 feet of spacing between signs. This standard is consistent with the existing limits for temporary signs on temporary construction walls. Temporary signs displaying on-site messages would not have these limits, and would instead be controlled by the currently proposed sign area ratio of 1:1 for temporary signs.

7. (Weiss) Temporary signs should not cover windows or block access in an effort to promote fire life safety.

The draft ordinance specifies that the sign area of all temporary signs, when placed on the interior of a window, and any other window signs shall not exceed a maximum of 10% of the window area. This could be construed to mean that temporary signs that cover the exterior of a window would not be subject to the 10% limit. Per the advice of the Department of Building and Safety (DBS), staff therefore recommends adding a requirement that temporary signs on windows may only be placed on the interior of a window. This will act as a further control to prevent the installation of supergraphics. In addition, DBS has advised that the following language be included, to further address life safety concerns:

"No wall sign shall cross the perimeter of any opening of a building, including its windows, doors, and vents, at any point within 24 inches or less of the exterior building face measured perpendicularly to the surface of the opening. Under no circumstances shall a sign obstruct the free operation of a door or an openable window."

8. (Weiss) Temporary Construction Walls should include a public identification placard that includes the following information: (a) date erected or permitted, (b) contact info for current property owner, (c) graffiti hotline info / communication beautification office contact.

Staff recommends incorporating this language into the ordinance as specified, as it will better enable the implementation of the existing graffiti / nuisance abatement and permit revocation provisions of the regulations regarding temporary signs on temporary

construction walls. In addition, each placard should be limited to a maximum size of 20 square feet, which would be excluded from the total sign area allowance for a property.

**Other Provisions**

**9. (Reyes) Report back on the feasibility of allowing for a less restrictive minimum acreage and/or square footage and eligible zones for the Comprehensive Sign Program.**

Currently the ordinance sets forth a minimum of 5 acres and 100,000 square feet of non-residential floor area to be eligible for a Comprehensive Sign Program. The minimum requirement of 100,000 square feet of non-residential floor area is also necessary to help ensure that Comprehensive Sign Programs are reserved for larger developments that have greater signage needs. These needs may be due to larger setbacks from streets, larger market areas from which to draw customers, and other factors relating to larger scales of development. Comprehensive Sign Programs should not be made available to smaller developments, as this would defeat the purpose of this provision and would create an unworkable processing burden on the City.

The minimum acreage requirement is necessary to prevent an over-concentration of street-oriented signage on the lower floors of taller, narrower properties. In recommending the minimum requirement of 5 acres, staff researched the sizes of larger development sites, such as shopping centers and museums, and found that a 5 acre minimum would include most of these sites, as detailed in the below table.

<b>Site</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Area (square feet / acres)</b>
Home Depot	sunset and 101	267,399 sf / 6.1 acres
Atwater Village shopping center	los feliz blvd, east of 5	1,106,940 sf / 25.4 acres
Fry's	woodland hills / warner center	517,707 sf / 8.8 acres
Costco	roscoe/canoga park	433,066 sf / 9.9 acres
Costco	van nuys	623,359 sf / 14.3 acres
Target	rodeo and la cienega	517,707 sf / 11.9 acres
Kmart	northridge	391,735 sf / 9 acres
Kmart	3rd / ogden	293,239 sf / 6.7 acres
Home Depot	valley/warner center	424,650 sf / 9.8 acres
Home Depot	sherman way / lankershim	469,020 sf / 10.8 acres
Home Depot	wilshire / burlington	352,142 sf / 8.1 acres
Home Depot	figueroa / san fernando	341,179 sf / 7.8 acres
Best Buy	sawtelle blvd / pico blvd	136,413 sf / 14.3 acres
Best Buy and others	rinaldo / porter ranch	1,756,113 sf / 40.3 acres
Macy's (7th & Fig)	725 s. figueroa st	310,731 sf / 7.1 acres
Macy's Plaza	700 w. 7th st	225,464 sf / 5.2 acres
Beverly Center	la cienega / beverly	452,053 sf / 10.4 acres
LACMA campus	5905 wilshire blvd.	23.1 acres

<b>Site</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Area (square feet / acres)</b>
Autry Museum	4700 western heritage way	31.5 acres
Chandler Pavillion/ Ahmanson Theatre	135 S. grand ave.	7.1 acres
Getty	1200 getty center dr.	109.4 acres
Getty Villa	17985 pacific coast hwy	33.8 acres
Natural History (Expo. Park)	900 exposition blvd.	7.9 acres
California Science Center (Expo.Park)	700 state dr	7.4 acres
California African American (Expo. Park)	600 state dr	6 acres

Finally, staff recommends eliminating the requirement that Comprehensive Sign Programs may only be requested in certain zones. Staff has learned of numerous sites throughout the city that would be unnecessarily excluded by this requirement. For example, a shopping center built with an approved variance on agriculturally zoned land would be ineligible based on the zoning requirement.

10. (Reyes/Weiss) Delineate the physical distinction between interior and exterior signs.

This distinction is important so that signs that are located on the interior of larger properties, and that do not affect the visible attributes of the public realm, are not unnecessarily restricted. After consulting with the Department of Building and Safety (DBS), staff recommends adding a provision to specify that the sign ordinance does not apply to signs and sign support structures that face an interior court bounded on all sides by one or more buildings, provided that no sign is higher than the surrounding building walls. Additional controls may be necessary; staff is researching this issue and will report back with a full recommendation at the PLUM hearing on May 12, 2009.

11. (Weiss) Add the following language to LAMC 14.4.22, Continuation of nonconforming signs: "Nothing in this article shall be interpreted to allow the full replacement of any non-conforming sign."

After consulting with the Department of Building and Safety, staff recommends that this section of the sign ordinance specify that "the replacement of nonconforming signs is allowed as permitted by Section 16.03 or Section 12.23 A-4 of this Code, or when the work is required in order to comply with an order issued by the Department of Building and Safety to repair or remedy an unsafe or substandard condition." Section 16.03 defines regulations for the restoration of damaged or destroyed buildings, and Section 12.23 A-4 more specifically regulates the restoration of damaged nonconforming buildings. Both sections allow for the replacement of nonconforming structures in case of damage by earthquake, wind, flood, fire or other disaster. In order to ensure that the sign ordinance is legally defensible, the standards for nonconforming signs should be the same as for nonconforming buildings. Otherwise, it may be argued that the City is regulating permits involving speech more tightly than permits not involving speech.

## **B. No Change Recommended**

No change is recommended to the draft ordinance for the following items, which were introduced by members of the PLUM Committee at its hearing of April 21, 2009.

### **Sign Districts**

12. (Reyes/Weiss) How does the Planning Department define a "Sign Impact Area" as it relates to the Sign Reduction Program? Can the impact area be expanded, for example, to impacted community plans or even Council Districts?

The draft ordinance requires that any ordinance establishing a new Sign District must identify the precise boundaries of a "sign impact area" adjacent to the Sign District, where properties are most likely to be impacted by the Sign District's proposed new off-site signs or digital displays. The ordinance allows flexibility in the definition of the sign impact area, so that the unique attributes and impacts of each Sign District can be considered individually by the City Planning Commission and City Council in their review of any proposed Sign District. The sign impact area could extend as far as it could be reasonably and defensibly argued that the impacts of the proposed signage would extend. There would not necessarily be a clear nexus connecting the impacts of each sign district to the boundaries of an entire community plan area or Council District, as these areas can be quite expansive, and a proposed sign district could be located several miles from an applicable community plan area or Council District boundary.

As each sign district will be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed boundaries of the sign impact area can be reviewed during the public comment period for the environmental review for each proposed sign district. This will ensure public participation in identifying the potential impacts of proposed sign districts.

13. (Weiss) Because Century City abuts single family homes and does not meet the SUD (sign district) criteria as proposed in the staff report, Century City should be eliminated from the list of eligible SUD areas.

The draft ordinance already provides that sign districts cannot abut single-family zones. In order for the sign ordinance to be legally defensible, an even-handed citywide standard is more advisable than allowing exceptions for specific areas.

### **Enforcement and Penalties**

14. (Reyes/Weiss) Research which cities have held advertisers liable for illegal signage.

Staff has only found two cities – Oakland and San Diego – that have attempted to hold an advertiser for a single billboard liable for illegal signage. However, in both cases an extensive legal proceeding was necessary. A protracted legal process would not be an efficient method of enforcement, particularly in a city as large and as fraught with sign

litigation as Los Angeles. Therefore, staff does not recommend that the City attempt to hold advertisers liable for illegal signage at this time.

15. (Weiss) Clarify that all signs that have been unlawfully erected without permits to date should come into conformance with new regulations given that they have no vested right under California law.

Staff recommends no change in this regard. The City Attorney's office advises that the Building Code already states that signs erected without permits must conform to current code. LAMC Section 91.6216.3 states that "every existing sign and/or support structure or portion of a sign and/or support structure constructed without a valid building permit shall be made to conform to the current provisions of this Code or shall be demolished and removed. Any use of an existing sign constructed without a valid building permit shall be discontinued."

### **Wall Signs and Temporary Signs**

16. (Weiss) The installation of temporary signs shall not exceed a total of 90 days in any calendar year for the ENTIRE property.

Staff does not recommend changing this provision of the sign ordinance at this time. Limiting temporary signs to a total of three installations not to exceed 90 days for an entire property would create problems for multi-tenant properties. For example, if a shopping center with twelve tenants has four tenants that vacate at different times during the course of a year, then only three "for lease" signs could be displayed for three of the tenant spaces during that year. Limiting temporary signage per tenant could also be problematic, as it would be difficult to define and keep track of all the tenant spaces in the city. This matter should be considered again during the one-year review of the sign ordinance.

### **Digital Displays**

17. (Weiss) The conversion or construction of off-site digital signs should be expressly banned as proposed in the staff report.

The draft ordinance already accomplishes this, by including digital displays among the signs specifically prohibited in Section 1, Paragraph 14.4.4-C; and by specifying in Section 14 that the intent of the ordinance is to prohibit digital displays regardless of any settlement agreements to the contrary.

18. (Weiss) Existing digital signs should be subject to greater regulatory standards as to brightness, standards of illumination, flashing, and hours of operation.

Staff has begun to look into the regulation of digital displays, and has found that this is a complex matter that will require additional research and analysis. As part of the one-

year review, standards will be proposed to include brightness / illumination, flashing, and hours of operation.

### **Other Provisions**

19. (Reyes) Work with DOT to develop, as part of the one-year review, specific guidelines to ensure that new signs do not create a hazard to traffic.

Staff discussed this matter with representatives of the Department of Transportation. Staff will include in the one-year review a proposal to define what constitutes a hazard to traffic, to create guidelines for the review of new sign permit applications to ensure that new signs will not create such hazards.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Discussion of Recommended Fees

As part of the revised sign ordinance, a new Subsection Z shall be added to Section 19.01 of Article 9 of Chapter 1 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code that sets forth sign regulation fees. To determine the recommended sign regulation fees, staff reviewed current processes for different kinds of applications and chose the one with the closest match of actions performed and amount of work required to the actions and work anticipated for the sign regulation procedures. The recommended fees to be charged for the new sign procedures mirror the fees for the comparable applications. The recommended fees are summarized in the following table:

Application Type	Recommended Base Fee	Fee for Additional Blocks
Sign Modification	\$5,879	\$1,451
Comprehensive Sign Program	\$12,695	\$2,615
Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program	\$745	N/A
Appeal of Code Violation Citation	\$ 5,879	N/A
Appeal of any Sign Modification, Comprehensive Sign Program, or Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program	85% of original application fee, for appeal by applicant	N/A

The following pages detail the procedures that would be followed in processing each of the above applications, as compared to the comparable application process for each.

**Sign Modification:** The proposed fee for a sign modification is the same as the fee for a variance, because the procedures and amount of work anticipated to process a sign modification are equivalent to those required to process a variance. Section 14.4.20 of the proposed ordinance states that the procedures for considering applications for a sign modification shall be the same as the procedures for a variance. Those procedures are detailed in the below chart:

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Variance	Sign Modification
1. Application	a. Application is submitted at Public Counter b. Counter staff logs application in Case Tracking System (CTS) and assigns a case number	Yes	Yes

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Variance	Sign Modification
2. File Complete?	<p>c. Public Counter City Planner reviews contents of case file to determine if it is complete. When deemed complete, the case file is transmitted to the Office of Zoning Administration</p> <p>d. If the file is deemed incomplete, the application is suspended until errors or missing components are provided by the applicant.</p>	Yes	Yes
3. Preliminary Processing	<p>a. Clerical Unit logs in the case, assembles materials in the case file, and adds data to PCTS as needed</p> <p>b. Zoning Administrator reviews case file and provides written guidance for Zoning Analyst to consider in preparing staff report</p>	Yes	Yes
4. Public Hearing	Determined at discretion of Chief Zoning Administrator	Yes	Mandatory
5. Public Hearing Notice	<p>a. Zoning Research and Analysis Unit Supervisor reviews case file, writes Hearing Notice, and assigns staff analyst to research and write staff report (if required)</p> <p>b. Clerical Unit staff prepares Hearing Notice and delivers to BTC mailing contractor for mailing</p>	As Required	Yes
6. Zoning Investigator Report	Prepared by Zoning Research and Analysis Unit staff and reviewed by supervisor	Yes	Yes
7. Zoning Administrator Public Hearing	<p>a. Zoning Administrator is assigned by Chief Zoning Administrator</p> <p>b. Assigned Zoning Administrator conducts the public hearing</p>	As Required	Yes
8. Determination Issued	<p>a. Zoning Administrator prepares the written determination.</p> <p>b. Clerical Unit staff produces written Determination, and upon signature of the Determination by the Zoning Administrator, duplicates and mails it to interested parties</p>	Yes - 5 Findings	Yes - 3 Findings
9. Appeal?	<p>Was an Appeal filed within 15 days? (10 working days for coastal cases)</p> <p><i>If <u>NO</u> Appeal</i> - Zoning Administrator's Determination becomes final. Clerical staff update CTS and transmit the case file to Automated Records</p>	Yes	Yes

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Variance	Sign Modification
10. APC Hearing and Determination	<p>- <i>If Appealed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clerical staff update CTS and transmit the case file to the Commission Secretariat</li> <li>b. APC Secretary schedules the Hearing and delivers hearing notice to BTC mailing contractor for mailing</li> <li>c. APC Hearing held and decision rendered</li> <li>d. APC Secretary writes Determination and mails to appellant, applicant and Council office; attaches to case file</li> <li>e. APC Secretary delivers case file to Automated Records</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
11. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Appeal?	<p>Was an Appeal filed within 15 days? (10 working days for coastal cases)</p> <p><i>If NO Appeal</i> - APC's determination becomes final. Clerical staff update CTS and transmit the case file to Automated Records</p>	Yes	Yes
12. Council Hearing & Determination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clerical staff update PCTS and transmit the case file to the Commission Secretariat</li> <li>b. Commission Secretariat transmits to the City Clerk</li> <li>c. City Clerk schedules PLUM Hearing and mails notice to mailing list in ZA case file</li> <li>d. PLUM Hearing and recommendation (presentation by Zoning Administrator)</li> <li>e. City Clerk writes PLUM recommendation report and schedules Hearing for City Council</li> <li>f. City Council Hearing and action. The City Council action is final</li> <li>g. City Clerk writes City Council action and attaches to ZA case file and Council file</li> <li>h. City Clerk delivers ZA case file to Planning Department Automated Records</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes

**Comprehensive Sign Program:** The filing fee for a comprehensive sign program is based on the fees for processing a zone change. The cases are comparable in that they consider a larger area than most discretionary determinations and involve multiple considerations. Both kinds of cases require a 500-foot radius hearing notification, and both are processed by the Community Planning Bureau. Staff anticipates that the activities and staff work required to process the cases will be virtually the same.

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Zone Change	Comprehensive Sign Program
1. Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Application is submitted at a Planning Public Counter</li> <li>b. Counter clerical staff logs application in Case Tracking System (CTS) and establishes a case number</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
2. File Complete?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If complete, Hearing Coordinator checks status of environmental clearance:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) If issued, deems case complete and schedules hearing</li> <li>2) If not issued, enters in "pending" log, and places file in hold area until environmental clearance</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Suspend Application <i>if NOT complete</i> - Hearing Coordinator calls applicant or representative to request missing material, issues suspension letter and places case file in hold area until missing material is submitted</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
3. Preliminary Processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hearing Coordinator prepares Hearing Notice, assigns case to a Hearing Officer, schedules Commission date, distributes Hearing Notice and assignment sheet to Commission Office and Case Management Unit Supervisor, and delivers Hearing Notice to BTC</li> <li>b. Clerical staff sends Notice for newspaper publication, calls BTC for pick-up, updates Case Tracking System, posts notice on Department's Web page, and mails notice to Council Offices and homeowner associations</li> <li>c. Hearing Officer conducts background research on the application and visits site</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Zone Change	Comprehensive Sign Program
4. Public Hearing?	Hearing Officer conducts Public Hearing	Yes	Yes
5. Hearing Officer Staff Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hearing Officer writes recommendation report</li> <li>b. Principal Planner reviews and signs recommendation report 15 days prior to Commission meeting date</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
6. Determination Issued	Clerical staff duplicates report and delivers to Commission Secretariat no less than 10 days prior to Commission meeting date, and mails to interested parties who signed notification list and Council Offices.	Yes	Yes
7. CPC Hearing & Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. CPC holds Hearing (Hearing Officer presents report) and makes recommendation</li> <li>b. Hearing Officer prepares &amp; delivers revised conditions &amp; findings (with CPC revisions) to CPC Secretary</li> <li>c. CPC Secretary prepares Commission Determination and updates Case Tracking System</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
8. Council Hearing & Action / Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Commission Secretariat requests Ordinance map from Geographic Information Systems.</li> <li>b. Commission Secretariat transmits APC or CPC case file to the City Clerk</li> <li>c. City Clerk schedules PLUM Hearing and mails notice to mailing list in APC or CPC case file</li> <li>d. PLUM Hearing and recommendation (presentation by Hearing Officer or Principal Planner)</li> <li>e. City Clerk writes PLUM recommendation report and schedules Hearing for City Council</li> <li>f. City Council Hearing and Action (presentation by Hearing Officer or Principal Planner)</li> <li>g. City Clerk writes City Council action and sends to Mayor for signature</li> <li>h. City Clerk attaches action to APC or CPC case file plus Council file and delivers APC / CPC file to Records</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes

**Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program:** The fee to file an amendment to a sign program is based on the fee for processing a plan approval, as defined in L.A.M.C. Section 12.24-M. The cases are processed in similar fashions and in both the decision maker reviews conformance to conditions. Both a plan approval and a comprehensive sign program often include proposed amendments or changes to the initial discretionary approval.

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Plan Approval	Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program
1. Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Pre-application review by Unit planning staff for conformance with approved Commission Guidelines</li> <li>b. Application filed at a Planning Public Counter</li> <li>c. Counter clerical staff logs application in Case Tracking System</li> <li>d. Counter City Planner reviews and delivers case file to Plan Approvals Unit supervisor</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
2. File Complete?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Public Counter City Planner reviews contents of case file to determine if it is complete. When deemed complete, the case file is transmitted to the Office of Zoning Administration</li> <li>b. If the file is deemed incomplete, the application is suspended until errors or missing components are provided by the applicant.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
3. Preliminary Processing	<p>Unit clerical staff processes case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Logs planning staff assignment and any omitted information in Case Tracking System</li> <li>b. Distributes application to City agencies, Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and Council office</li> <li>c. Assembles case file and delivers to assigned planning staff</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
4. Public Hearing?	Determined at discretion of Chief Zoning Administrator whether request will be a CPC delegated Director's Determination or will go to the CPC for a Public Hearing and Determination.	Yes	Mandatory

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Plan Approval	Amendment to a Comprehensive Sign Program
5. Director's Determination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Planning staff researches and writes Determination report</li> <li>b. Unit Supervisor reviews, edits and approves report</li> <li>c. Report is signed by planning staff, Unit supervisor and Principal City Planner; attached to case file</li> <li>d. BTC mails written Determination report to applicant, property owners within 100 feet and Council office</li> <li>e. CPC Secretary delivers case file to Automated Records</li> </ul>	As Required	Yes
6. CPC Hearing & Determination	<p>- - <i>If a CPC delegated Director's Determination:</i> Prepared by Zoning Research and Analysis Unit staff and reviewed by supervisor</p> <p>- <i>If a Public Hearing and CPC Determination:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Planning staff researches and writes Determination report</li> <li>b. Unit supervisor schedules Public Hearing</li> <li>c. Planning staff completes notification requirements (mail hearing notice and publish newspaper notice)</li> <li>d. Unit supervisor reviews, edits and approves report</li> <li>e. Report is signed by planning staff, Unit supervisor and Principal City Planner; attached to case file</li> <li>f. BTC mails written Determination report to applicant, abutting property owners and Council office</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes

**Appeal of Code Violation Citation:** The fee to file an appeal of the Department of Building and Safety's order to comply of this Code is based on the fee for a variance. The processing for a variance, an appeal of a Building and Safety determination and an appeal of a code citation are basically the same, with the exception that a variance is appealed to the APC and can be further appealed to the City Council, an appeal of Building and Safety orders is heard by a Zoning Administrator whose decision can be

appealed to the City Planning Commission, and the appeal of a code violation for signs is heard by a Zoning Administrator who is assigned to act as the final decision maker.

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Appeal of a Building and Safety Citation	Sign Modification
1. Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Application is submitted at a Planning Public Counter</li> <li>b. Counter clerical staff logs application in Case Tracking System (CTS) and establishes a case number</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
2. File Complete?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Public Counter City Planner reviews contents of case file to determine if it is complete. When deemed complete, the case file is transmitted to the Office of Zoning Administration</li> <li>b. If the file is deemed incomplete, the application is suspended until errors or missing components are provided by the applicant.</li> <li>c. Public Counter City Planner has notification list prepared from City Clerk ownership records.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
3. Preliminary Processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clerical Unit logs in the case, assembles materials in the case file, and adds data to PCTS as needed</li> <li>b. Zoning Administrator reviews case file and provides written guidance for Zoning Analyst to consider in preparing staff report</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes
4. Public Hearing?	Determined at discretion of Chief Zoning Administrator	Yes	Mandatory
5. Public Hearing Notice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Zoning Research and Analysis Unit Supervisor reviews case file, writes Hearing Notice, and assigns staff analyst to research and write staff report</li> <li>b. Clerical Unit staff prepares Hearing Notice and delivers to BTC mailing contractor for mailing</li> </ul>	As Required	Yes
6. Zoning Investigator Report	Prepared by Zoning Research and Analysis Unit staff and reviewed by supervisor	Yes	Yes

Step Number	Action	Application Type	
		Appeal of a Building and Safety Citation	Sign Modification
7. Zoning Administrator Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Zoning Administrator is assigned by Chief Zoning Administrator</li> <li>b. Assigned Zoning Administrator conducts the public hearing</li> </ul>	As Required	Yes
8. Determination Issued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Zoning Administrator prepares the written determination.</li> <li>b. Clerical Unit staff produces written Determination, and upon signature of the Determination by the Zoning Administrator, duplicates and mails it to interested parties</li> </ul>	Yes - 5 Findings	Yes - 3 Findings
9. Appeal?	<p>Was an Appeal filed within 15 days? (10 working days for coastal cases)</p> <p><i>If <u>NO</u> Appeal</i> - Zoning Administrator's Determination becomes final. Clerical staff update CTS and transmit the case file to Automated Records</p>	Yes	Yes
10. APC or CPC Hearing & Determination	<p>- <i>If Appealed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clerical staff update CTS and transmit the case file to the Commission Secretariat</li> <li>b. Secretary schedules the Hearing and delivers hearing notice to BTC mailing contractor for mailing</li> <li>c. Hearing held and decision rendered</li> <li>d. Secretary writes Determination and mails to appellant, applicant and Council office; attaches to case file</li> <li>e. Secretary delivers case file to Automated Records</li> </ul>	Appealed to the Area Planning Commission City Planning Commission if Citywide impact, or to the Area Planning Commission if not a citywide impact	Appealed to City Planning Commission

## Attachment 3

### Council Rule 38 Technical Revisions

The following recommended technical revisions are based on the City Council Rule 38 Conference that took place on April 27, 2009 with the Office of the City Attorney, the Department of City Planning, and the Department of Building and Safety.

1. Definition of "Wall." The following proposed new definition of "wall" should be deleted from the proposed ordinance: ~~"Wall. An upright structure serving to enclose, divide or protect an area."~~ The suggested new definition is confusing and does not assist in interpreting the definition of a "wall sign." This revision merely restores existing provisions of the current sign ordinance.

2. Definition of "Window Sign." Language should be included in the definition that a window sign is placed within six feet of the "interior surface" of a window or door. The proposed new definition would therefore read as follows: "Window Sign. A sign that is attached to, affixed to, leaning against, or otherwise placed within six feet of the interior surface of a window or door." This clarifies that a window sign by definition shall not be placed on the exterior of a window or a door.

3. Zones. The following language should be added clarifying that signs in the parking ("P") and parking building ("PB") zones are subject to existing sign provisions set forth in Section 12.12.1 of the zoning code: "Signs are permitted in the P and PB zones, provided that these signs comply with the provisions of Section 12.12.1 of this Code." This will remove a conflict between the proposed new provisions of the sign ordinance and existing sign provisions applicable to the "P" and "PB" zones.

4. Lots with Multiple Street Frontages. Under the current code, the sign area allowed for one street frontage may only be used along that frontage, and cannot be transferred to another frontage, if the lot is a corner lot or a through lot. The new ordinance allows transferring, capping the total sign area allowed on any one frontage to no more than two-thirds of the total sign area allowed. This new language could have the unintended consequence of allowing much larger signs on particular street frontages than was otherwise intended. Consequently, staff recommends restoring existing code provisions. The provision concerning maximum sign area should therefore be revised to read as follows: "The maximum sign area allowed on a ~~lot~~ street frontage shall be one square foot of sign area for every linear foot of street frontage and 1.5 square feet of sign area for every linear foot of building frontage. This sign area may be ~~located anywhere on the building or the lot~~ or aggregated on one sign or multiple signs, provided that each sign complies with all applicable provisions of this article." In addition, the following language should be deleted as no longer necessary, since under the suggested revision sign area cannot be transferred from one street frontage to another street frontage on the same lot: ~~"If a lot is a corner lot or other lot with two or more frontages, no more than two thirds of the maximum sign area allowed under Subsection K above shall be located along any one street frontage."~~

5. Maximum Number of Signs. Consistent with the above recommendation disallowing the transfer of sign area from one street frontage to another street frontage on the same lot, the new proposed ordinance's provisions concerning a maximum number of signs should be revised. Specifically, a maximum number of signs should be established not for each lot but for each street frontage, consistent with current code provisions. The following revision to Section 14.4.4 M is therefore recommended: "M. Maximum Number of Signs. ~~Each lot shall be subject~~ A maximum number of monument signs, projecting signs, and pole signs based on street frontage shall be established, as shown in the chart below. There is no maximum number of information signs, wall signs, illuminated architectural canopy signs, window signs, marquee signs, and awning signs permitted ~~on a lot.~~" In addition, the heading in the chart contained in Section 14.4.4 M should be revised to read: "Street frontage ~~on a lot.~~"

6. Sign Height. The proposed new language should be clarified to specify that height shall be measured "above grade", consistent with existing Department of Building and Safety practice. This provision would therefore read as follows: "The height of all signs permitted by this article shall be measured as the distance in a straight vertical line from the top of the sign to the sidewalk grade or edge of roadway grade nearest the sign. No sign may be located at a height that exceeds the height limit above grade established by any land use ordinance, including the height limit established for the underlying zone or height district."

7. Information Signs. The proposed new language could be interpreted as allowing only half of what is currently allowed, which was not the intent of the Planning Department's recommendation as approved by the City Planning Commission. Therefore, the following existing language concerning the area of information signs should be restored, as follows: "Information signs shall not exceed 25 square feet in area. The maximum area of any one information sign shall not exceed a total of 25 square feet for all the sign faces." As currently recommended, the area of information signs would continue to be excluded from the maximum sign area cap of 2.5:1.

8. Monument Signs. The proposed new language could be interpreted as allowing only half of the sign area recommended by the Planning Department for double-sided signs, and approved by the City Planning Commission. Therefore, the proposed new language should be revised to read as follows: "The maximum sign area of any one monument sign shall not exceed a total of ~~60~~ 120 square feet for all the sign faces, and no single sign face shall exceed 60 square feet." The total area for monument signs would continue to be regulated by the maximum sign area cap of 2:5:1.

9. Projecting Signs. The proposed new language could be interpreted as allowing only half of the sign area recommended by the Planning Department for double-sided signs, and approved by the City Planning Commission. Therefore, the proposed new language should be revised to read as follows: "The maximum sign area of any one projecting sign shall not exceed a total of ~~50~~ 100 square feet for all the sign faces, and

no single sign face shall exceed 50 square feet.” The total area for projecting signs would continue to be regulated by the maximum sign area cap of 2:5:1.

10. Wall Sign Coverage. Existing language disallowing walls signs from crossing the perimeter of any opening of a building, including its windows, doors and vents, should be clarified as follows: “No wall sign shall cross the perimeter of any opening of a building, including its windows, doors, and vents at any point ~~within~~ 24 inches or less of the exterior building face measured perpendicularly to the surface of the opening. Under no circumstances shall a sign obstruct the free operation of a door.”

11. Identification Signs Located at 100 Feet or More in Height. One provision of the ordinance excludes the sign height of identification signs located at a height of 100 feet or more from maximum sign area. To insure that the ordinance is internally consistent, language should be added to the ordinance’s maximum sign area provisions, specifically excluding the sign area of identification signs located at 100 feet or more in height. Currently, the maximum sign area provisions only exclude the area of information signs and temporary signs. In addition, existing code language restricting wall signs located at a height of 100 feet or more to identification only should be restored.

The exception under maximum sign area should therefore be revised to read as follows: “EXCEPTION: Temporary signs, identification signs located at a height of 100 feet or more, and information signs shall not be subject to the maximum sign area limitation imposed by this subsection.” In addition, the following provisions concerning identification signs should be revised to read as follows: “Walls signs located at a height of 100 feet or more shall be limited to identification only.”

12. Height of Pole Signs. The current language is confusing and not consistent with the intent of the ordinance as adopted by the City Planning Commission. The proposed language should be revised as follows: “The maximum height of any one pole sign shall not exceed the ~~maximum~~ sign area ~~permitted~~ for a single sign face divided by four.”

13. Illuminated Architectural Canopy Signs. The proposed new language could be interpreted as allowing only half the sign area for double-sided signs, as recommended by the Planning Department and approved by the City Planning Commission. Therefore, the proposed new language should be revised to read as follows: “The maximum sign area of any one illuminated architectural canopy sign shall not exceed a total of ~~50~~ 100 square feet for all the sign faces, and no single sign face shall exceed 50 square feet.” The total area for illuminated architectural canopy signs would continue to be regulated by the maximum sign area cap of 2:5:1.

14. Temporary Signs in A and R Zones. The proposed draft language restricts the sign area of all temporary signs to no more than six square feet for all the sign faces. This is unduly restrictive, and could prohibit such common temporary signs as “for sale signs.” Accordingly, staff recommends increasing this from six to 20 square feet, consistent with Section 91.101.5 of the building code, which exempts signs of less than

20 square feet from requiring a building permit. The proposed new language would therefore read as follows: "The sign area of all temporary signs on a lot shall ~~not exceed six square feet~~ be less than 20 square feet for all the sign faces."

15. Comprehensive Sign Program. Language should be added to clarify that no sign modification shall be granted for an approved comprehensive sign program. The following language should be added to the ordinance: "The Zoning Administrator shall not grant a sign modification pursuant to Section 12.4.20 of this article for a development site governed by an approved comprehensive sign program."

16. Violations of the Sign Regulations. Language should be added clarifying that no appeals of an order to comply with the sign regulations, as issued by the Department of Building and Safety, shall be accepted under Section 12.26 K of the zoning code. Instead, all appeals of orders to comply, including appeals of any administrative civil penalties the Department of Building and Safety may impose, should be processed under Article 4.4 of the zoning Code. Without this clarification, appeals under both provisions could be filed with the Department of City Planning.

17. Accrual of Civil Penalties. Existing language should be clarified concerning when civil penalties shall accrue, as follows: "Civil penalties shall accrue until the responsible parties complete all actions required by the order to comply, notify the Department of Building and Safety and request an inspection to verify compliance, and pay all of the civil penalties due."

## ATTACHMENT 4

### Pending Sign Districts and Special Signage Areas

At the PLUM hearing on April 21, 2009, Councilmember Reyes introduced a potential revision (item #20) as follows:

*Discuss the inclusion of "grandfathered sign districts". What was recommended in the original ordinance that was sent to CPC? Ask to include in current ordinance.*

The Planning Department's recommendation of February 19, 2009 was that any sign district initiated or applied for before Dec. 26, 2008 (the ICO's effective date) would be "grandfathered". "Grandfathering" does not mean that each sign district would necessarily be approved, but does mean that each pending application would be allowed to continue through the review process under the existing sign regulations. Staff's initial recommendation included seven pending sign districts: five that were initiated by private property owners' applications, and two initiated by the City Council.

The City Planning Commission approved the grandfathering of only those requested sign districts that the CPC had already approved, as of March 26, 2009 (the date the CPC approved the proposed sign ordinance). These two requested sign districts were the Figueroa and Olympic Sign District (approved by CPC on 12/11/2008), and the Seward addition to the Hollywood Sign District (approved by CPC on 2/24/2009).

In addition to the five pending sign districts initiated by private property owners' applications and two pending sign districts initiated by City Council motions, there are also three other areas that could potentially be "grandfathered". Two are areas for which an existing specific plan or special ordinance is requested to be amended to change the signage allowed. In addition, the Department of City Planning has received a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) proposing precise boundaries for a project containing special signage. If all ten of these pending actions were to be grandfathered, then the "grandfathering" list would include all of the areas summarized in the below tables. These areas have reached the stages of review as specified below, prior to the effective date of the ICO (Dec. 26, 2008).

#### Five Pending Sign Districts Initiated by Private Property Owners' Applications:

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Council District</i>	<i>Case #</i>	<i>Date of Application</i>	<i>Status</i>
Metro Universal	West side of Lankershim between the 101 & Valley Hear Dr; both sides of Campo De Cahuenga between the 101 & Lankershim	4	CPC-2008-3512-GPA-ZC-HD-BL-SN-CUB-CUW-CU-ZAD-SPR	8/22/08	Pending review by Planning Department
Metropolis	Bounded by the 110 to the west, 110 offramp to the south, Francisco St to the east, and 8th St to the North	9	CPC-2008-4557-SN	11/10/08	Pending review by Planning Department

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Council District</i>	<i>Case #</i>	<i>Date of Application</i>	<i>Status</i>
Mid-Town Crossing	San Vicente & Pico to San Vicente & Venice	10	CPC-2008-2614-SN	6/26/08	CPC hearing on 5/14/09
Figueroa and Olympic	Block bounded by 9th St to the north, Flower to the east, Olympic to the south, and Figueroa to the west	9	CPC-2007-842-SN	2/16/07	CPC approved on 12/11/08; PLUM approved on 2/10/09; awaiting CCL hearing
Seward addition to Hollywood Sign Dist.	West side of Seward bounded by Romaine to the north & Barton to the south	4	CPC-2008-756-VZC-VCU-CU-CUB-ZV-ZAA-SPR	2/27/08	Approved in part by CPC on 02/24/09; awaiting CCL hearing

**Two Pending Sign Districts Initiated by City Council Motions:**

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Council District</i>	<i>Council File #</i>	<i>Mover and Date of Motion</i>	<i>Status</i>
City West	Bounded by 1st St to the north, Boylston to the west, 3rd St to the south, and Beaudry to the east	1	CF# 08-0509	Councilmember Reyes, 3/04/08	Pending with Planning Department
Koreatown	Bounded generally by 6th St to the north, St. Andrews Pl to the west, Olympic Bl to the south, and Shatto Pl to the east	10	CF# 08-0936	Councilmember Wesson, 4/15/08	Pending with Planning Department

**Two areas that have an existing Specific Plan or special ordinance that is requested to be amended to change the signage allowed:**

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Council District</i>	<i>Signage Allowed by</i>	<i>Case Number</i>	<i>Status</i>
Coliseum	3911 S. Figueroa St. and 3843 S. Grand Ave.	8	Coliseum District Specific Plan	CPC-2006-3082-SP-DA	Approved by CPC on 3/12/09
Convention Center	Bounded generally by 9 <sup>th</sup> St to the north, Flower St to the east, Venice Bl to the south, and the 110 to the west	9	Ordinance No. 172465	CPC-2008-3374	To be heard by hearing officer on 5/29/09 (tentative)

**One area for which the City has received a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) proposing precise boundaries for a project containing special signage:**

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Council District</i>	<i>Case Number</i>	<i>Date Received</i>	<i>Status</i>
Panorama Place	14665 W. Roscoe Blvd.	7	ENV-2006-2133-EIR	9/05/08	Staff is processing Final EIR

If all of the preceding areas were to be “grandfathered”, then Section 12 of the sign ordinance would need to be amended to include the following language:

“This ordinance shall also not apply to:

‘SN’ Sign Districts that have not been established, but were initiated or applied for before December 26, 2008, pursuant to Section 12.32 of the Code;

‘SN’ Sign Districts that have not been established, but for which precise boundaries were identified in a draft environmental impact report submitted to and accepted by the Department of City Planning before December 26, 2008; and

amendments to established ‘SN’ Sign Districts and adopted specific plans or other adopted land use ordinances that allow off-site signs or signs with digital displays, if the amendments were initiated or otherwise applied for, before December 26, 2008.”