

Public Comments Not Uploaded April 6 PLUM MEETING - Comprehensive Fee Update / Temporary Wall Sign Ordinance

1 message

Barbara Broide <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Thu, Apr 8, 2021 at 3:44 PM

Reply-To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

To: Paul Koretz - cd 5 <paul.koretz@lacity.org>

Cc: Debbie Dyer Harris - CD 11 <debbie.dyerharris@lacity.org>, Angel Izard <angel.izard@lacity.org>, "Vince Bertoni - Planning Dept." <vince.bertoni@lacity.org>, Kevin Keller <kevin.keller@lacity.org>, "clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org" <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>, Daniel Skolnick <daniel.skolnick@lacity.org>

As you may be aware, the April 6 PLUM meeting was adjourned not long after it was called to order due to problems with the ability of callers from the valley to connect with the meeting. Those who were successful in connecting on the other City phone lines were unable to provide testimony on any of the items. This was particularly disappointing to those community members who were waiting to speak on two issues of importance to our community: Items 10 and 11 on that day's agenda (Comprehensive Fee Update and Temporary Wall Sign program amendments).

At the close of the meeting, Chair Harris-Dawson announced that the meeting would need to be rescheduled as a "Special" meeting. While there may be some items that were on that day's agenda that must be heard in the near future and which might necessitate a meeting to be called with short notice, to the community placement of an item on the agenda of a "special" meeting means that we will receive but 24-hours notice of that meeting.

In the case of the Comprehensive Fee Update item that could greatly increase the appeal fee established by the City, the consideration of this item on short notice would be a grave error and an injustice to community members who wish to express their response to the CAO's recommendation to greatly increase the fee.

The Temporary Wall Sign/Vacant Lot sign issue is one of interest to communities across the City and inspection of the council file demonstrates that the public is engaged on this topic with strong interest to halt the proliferation of these gray walls and advertisements particularly when placed on properties with businesses in operation. Revisions have been pending since 2017 when the Council File was first opened. To now attempt to rush it through in a meeting with but 24-hour notice sends a message to the community that the PLUM Committee does not wish to have our participation. It is difficult enough to get the word out about a scheduled meeting with 72-hours notice. It is nearly impossible to circulate notice and assume that people who have job and family responsibilities can re-configure their time to carve out the time to speak on such short notice.

We request that you communicate to Chair Harris-Dawson and the PLUM Committee the need to provide a minimum of 72-hours public notice before either of these two important measures are heard and considered.

Thank you,

Barbara

Barbara Broide