

**Addendum to
Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council
Hollywood Community Plan Update 2
Response**

Area 3/Area 4/Housing/Parks & Open Space Committees

HCPU2 Element	Description	Proposed change to HCPU2 by HHWNC Area 3, Area 4 and Parks and Open Spaces Committees
Interactive Map zone	Proposed Zone changes.	In such that Franklin Avenue is reduced to two lanes between Highland and Cahuenga, bus service has been reduced because of lower ridership, emergency services are prevented by already existing traffic from getting to residents, and the 18 year use of the Redline has not proven to mitigate any of the above, including increased use of Hollywood Boulevard, the uses of which remove parking from residences - that the Area 3 / Area 4 / Housing committees of the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council (HHWNC) request that HHWNC request of the Planning Department to alter the following proposed changes of the Hollywood Community Plan Update, 2:1, 2:1A, 3:2, 3:2C, 3:3 and 3:4 in Area 3 and Area 4 be changed to 3:1A. (in accordance with P1.10)
Interactive Map Parks	Las Palmas Senior Center not added in Parks and Open Space section of Interactive Map. In Zimas as OSXL	Add Las Palmas Senior Center into the Interactive Map and the Hollywood Community Plan.
Land Use		
LU1.1	Neighborhood character. Maintain the distinguishing characteristics of Hollywood’s residential neighborhoods with respect to lot size, topography, housing scale and landscaping, to protect the character of existing stable neighborhoods from new, out-of-scale development.	The Plan needs to point out that areas earmarked for TOC conversion, or other conversion, also have neighborhood characteristics and policy should be the least damaging for “all” neighborhoods.
LU1.2	Adequate housing and services. Provide housing that accomodates households of all sizes, as well as integrates safe and convenient access to schools, parks, and other amenities and services.	Needs to have implmentation plan stated.
LU1.3	Neighborhood transitions. Assure smooth transitions in scale, form, and character, by regulating the setback, stepbacks, rear elevations, and backyard landscaping of new development where neighborhoods of differing housing type and density abut one another.	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.

LU1.4	Hillside development. Limit density in hillside areas. Notwithstanding any land use designation maps to the contrary, all projects with average natural slopes in excess of 15 percent, including both Tract Maps and Parcel Maps, shall be limited to the minimum density housing category for the purposes of enforcing the slope density formula of LAMC Section 17.05C and 17.50E.	Hillside ordinance. Wait for HHWNC to clarify.
LU2.5	Hillside neighborhood character. Consider the existing built character of distinctive hillside neighborhoods, including Outpost Estates and Hollywood Knolls, when reviewing discretionary development proposals.	Include Whitley Heights and Hollywood Heights POZs in the policy language.
LU3.1	Context-sensitive housing. Encourage multi-family housing development within neighborhoods designated for higher density multi-family residential (P&)	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.
LU3.2	Design for scale. Support design standards to achieve transition in scale where neighborhoods planned for multi-family residential uses abut neighborhoods planned for single-family residential uses.	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.
LU3.3	Compatibility with adjacent development. Seek a high degree of architectural compatibility and landscaping for new and infill development to protect the character and scale of existing multi-family residential neighborhoods.	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.
LU3.4	Design guidelines. Recommend that new multi-family residential development be designed in accordance with the adopted Citywide Residential Design Guidelines and provide amenities such as on-site open space, recreational, and community-serving facilities.	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.
LU4.1	Individual choice and affordability. Provide a variety of rental and	See Area 3, Area 4 comments on height limits in area.

	ownership housing opportunities for households of all income levels, sizes, and needs.	
LU4.2	Mixed-income neighborhoods. Promote the distribution of mixed-income housing opportunities throughout the Plan area to avoid the over-concentration of low-income housing.	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.
LU4.3	Affordable housing and transit. Encourage affordable housing near transit.	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.
LU4.4	Complementary development. Encourage clustering of homes (as allowed in the RD5 and RD6 zones, and small lots) that complement the existing neighborhood's scale and architecture.	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.
LU4.5	Permanent supportive housing. Encourage the construction of permanent supportive housing for the homeless through the master leasing of private apartment blocks, the purchase of for-profit single room occupancy hotels, and the conversion of short-term emergency shelter facilities.	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.
LU4.6	Maintain affordable housing. Encourage the replacement of demolished or converted affordable housing stock with new affordable housing opportunities while minimizing the displacement of residents, through programs that support development while meeting the relocation needs of existing residents.	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.
LU4.7	Architectural compatibility. Ensure that the new development of multi-family, duplex, small lot subdivisions or lower density units located in or adjacent to single-family neighborhoods of surrounding existing residential development.maintain the visual and physical character of single-family housing and is designed to respect	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.

	and complement the architectural and building	
LU5.2	Extended use hours. Encourage 24/7 or extended hour active commercial uses adjacent to Metro stations and major transit stops to create safe waiting environments for transit commuters. Discourage concentrations of commercial uses which have limited operating hours in areas with high pedestrian activity.	Change language that operating hours should be limited to the hours of Metro operation.
LU6	Picture included in HCPU2. Page 3-16	“Regional Center.” The Dream Hotel is not a “boutique hotel.” It counts 178 rooms. The travel industry discerns boutique hotels as 10 – 100 “intimate” rooms. HHWNC should encourage planning to change the picture to a more appropriately scaled depiction of a “boutique”. The 58 room “Redbury” on Vine and Hollywood would be a more appropriate depiction (closed July 2017).
LU5.13	Limit electronic signage. Discourage digital or electronic signage outside of the Hollywood Signage District. Ensure that the lighting of digital or electronic signage is not overly bright. (P11)	Need of clarification from HHWNC re: boundaries of District
LU6.1	Commercial and residential development. Provide opportunities for commercial office and residential development within the heart of Hollywood. (P12)	Area 3, Area 4 commented that commercial not be in these Historic neighborhoods
LU6.6	Rooftops. Ensure that discretionary commercial rooftop uses within 500 feet of residentially zoned areas mitigate noise levels, which may include any necessary noise analysis reports in order to identify feasible mitigation.	Change language from 500 ft to 1000 ft.
LU7.2	Affordable housing near transit. Encourage new affordable housing near transit in the Regional Center. (P16)	Needs an implementation plan. Needs to have a goal of 50% affordable. State has now given City's permission to write inclusionary process.

LU7.4	Alternative modes of transportation. Encourage projects that utilize Floor Area Ratio (FAR) incentives to incorporate uses and amenities that make it easier for residents to use alternative modes of transportation and minimize automobile trips. Encourage affordable housing near transit. Consider neighborhood-serving uses such as grocery stores, shared mobility options, bicycle parking, bicycle lockers, safe and secure bicycle storage, and/or other vehicle trip reducing features.	Do not decrease parking. IN DEIR, provide current studies on current buildings as to how effective implementation has been. Since 1999 the Red Line has been in operation. We should have studies that confirm whether or not the Red Line is working to achieve the State’s mandates on global warming mitigation and affordable housing or if the lack of parking is being detrimental to those goals by keeping cars in circulation.
LU11.1	Disaster preparedness. Improve preparedness for disasters, including those related to climate change. Coordinate with other City departments to assess preparedness for increased frequency of extreme weather events, such as heat waves, drought, wildfires, flooding, and sea level rise. (P19)	Include earthquakes in natural disaster language.
Preservation		
P1.9	Land use and zoning. Maintain appropriate General Plan Land Use designations and zoning in existing historic districts which are either listed in, or are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historical Resources. Promote infill development that matches the scale of historical resources within each district, including the following: height, massing, setbacks, stepbacks, and development pattern. (P39)	Condition should be requirements in Area 3, Area 4 since the areas have POZs and are on the anitonal registry.
P1.10	Height limits. Maintain height limitations on commercial zones that border designated or eligible historic neighborhoods. Encourage the design of new buildings that respect and complement the character of adjacent historic neighborhoods. (P40)	that the HHWNC support 1.10, Program number P40, but in the implementation on page include Hollywood Boulevard Historic Core
Parks/Public Realm		

PR2.2	Public plaza and open space incentives. Support granting a Floor Area Bonus through a discretionary process in exchange for the provision of a public plaza or publicly accessible open space.	That the HHWNC request of the Planning to strike PR 2.2 as developers are already required to have open space per Zoning Code Section 12.21G2. PR 2.2 creates double-dipping. The solution should be at the design stage including rooftops and balcony and or Plaza. Plaza should not be incentivized.
PR3.10	Rooftops. Support the use of rooftops for Open Space, including running tracks, gardens and other recreational purposes, where public safety permits.	Because of Black Lung, prohibit rooftops within a freeway zone. Plan needs to be specific with as to what safety conditions are.
PR1.5	Rights-of-way for recreational uses. Improve available rights-of-way throughout the Plan Area with landscaping, benches, and walkways and bikeways for low-intensity recreational uses.	Not support 1.5. Needs clearer language on what is meant by "available."
PR 1.6	Public parking. Maintain public parking opportunities so that people can easily access restaurants and other entertainment uses. Discourage the siting of parking lots next to sidewalks that carry high volumes of people walking.	not support. Need to clarify the language of where parking is. Change language from restaurants and other entertainment uses to commercial uses.
PR 1.7	Preserve alleys. Preserve and maintain existing alleys at the rear of lots which front a Boulevard or Avenue to encourage rear access.	Preserve alleys by not transferring property in regional center to private businesses
PR 1.9	Access to large venues. Support improved pedestrian access to large entertainment venues, such as the Hollywood Bowl.	Don't support. No implementation plan and would require taking away land. Busses need to be routed off of Highland before stopping during heavy season.
PR 1.10., 1.11, 1.12	Visibility. Maintain streets that are well-lit and clean with safe, clearly marked street crossings.	Use metered signs at dangerous crosswalks, ie Las Palmas and Franklin.
PR 1.13	Studies for pedestrian and streetscape improvements. Support LADOT in the study of additional crosswalks, complete streets strategies, and streetscape improvements, especially for streets near schools. (P52)	Support. In P52, add Canyon School and Oaks. Please clarify implementation plan.
PR 1.14	Street lighting districts. Support the establishment of street lighting districts to restore character street lights and fixtures.	Support, but clarify what the design would be.

PR 1.15	Street design. Design streets that are safe, well landscaped, and are pleasant and appealing to pedestrians. Protect the open garden character of front yards. Discourage parking between the street and the front of the structure, on surfaces that are not part of required driveways. (P22, P23, P24, P25, P53)	Don't support. No distinction between commercial and residential. Is the plan saying no to strip malls?
PR 1.17	Street management. Encourage green space, landscaping and street management policies which reduce the energy costs, support the pedestrian environment, and improve the public realm. (P54, P55)	Support. Take out in implementation text P54 "Promote the" and start with "Plant viable, drought tolerant street Trees." Promote prioritize planting of street trees.
PR 1.18	Public access to streets and alleys. Maintain streets and alleys to be open and accessible for shared public use. Limit closures, vacations and gating for private use. Discourage the creation of "superblocks." Maintain alleys to provide commercial uses with opportunities for off-street loading and unloading and provide pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists with alternative routes of travel. (P26, P56, P57)	Support. Add "Make sure free of public obstruction and impediments.
PR2.1	Public plazas. Encourage the construction of public plazas, in addition to greenspaces.	Don't support granting "Open Space" that is not Public. It is privately owned. New York has had a lot of issues. Issues of enforcement. Needs a stronger implementation policy.
PR2.2	Public plaza and open space incentives. Support granting a Floor Area Bonus through a discretionary process in exchange for the provision of a public plaza or publicly accessible open space.	Don't support granting "Open Space" that is not Public. It is privately owned. New York has had a lot of issues. Issues of enforcement. Needs a stronger implementation policy. Need to include police for protecting tree canopy by requiring certain amount of trees per square foot on rooftop. In freeway zones, no rooftops due to black lung issues next to exhaust production.
PR2.3	Street closures. Support the consideration of limited and selective street closings for public plazas, when circulation and access is not adversely impacted. (P58)	Do not support Schraeder being closed. That street needs to be maintained for emergency purposes. (needed for traffic diversion for 6 month water main break repair).

PR3.1	Preserve open space. Maintain, preserve, and enhance open space, and recreational facilities, and park space within the Hollywood Community Plan Area. Encourage the retention of passive open space which provides a balance to the urban development of the Community Plan Area.	Support, but clarify that the view to open space is part of the definition of preserving open space. Needs policy to implement.
PR3.2	Green space and plazas. Develop new public green spaces and public plazas where possible. (P27)	PR 3.2 Support. (Private parks not to be implemented through P27 - Q fees.)
PR3.3	Site remediation. Pursue resources to clean up land, especially brownfields, that could safely be used for public recreation or open space.	Support. Need the policy.
PR3.9	Access to open space. Maintain and improve access to existing open space and new open space including walking, hiking, and equestrian trails. Maintain and improve bicycle access to open space. Support the connection of existing walking, hiking and equestrian trail segments in the Plan Area, including the Rim of the Valley trails corridor, where feasible. (P61, P62)	Include in language public transportation options to and from Runyon in implementation. Safe pedestrian access through the Chaugenga Pass where there is none now.
PR3.10	Rooftops. Support the use of rooftops for Open Space, including running tracks, gardens and other recreational purposes, where public safety permits.	Implementation needs to include sound studies in Hillside residences as they live above the soundscape and sound travels up. Mitigation radius needs to be increased.
PR3.11	Rivers and streams. Maintain and expand public green space around rivers and streams.	Support. Map the rivers that are now subterranean
PR3.14	101 Cap Park. Support the proposal to cap subterranean portions of the 101 Freeway for the purposes of creating parkland. (P64)	Not support. Not clear of private and public relationship in the park. Text makes it appear as public.
PR4.1	Adequate parks and recreational facilities. Provide adequate park and recreation facilities that meet the recreational needs of existing and new residents for all age-groups in the community.	Support. Map the in that are now subterranean

PR4.2	Parks and recreational spaces. Conserve, maintain and better utilize recreational facilities and park spaces.	Support. Map the and that are now subterranean
PR4.4	Parking at community facilities. Allow community-serving facilities to utilize alternative means of providing required parking.	Support: Prioritize public transportation to and from in the implementation program. Should be defined as access points. Clarify what is alternative. Coordinate city owned lots with access to urban recreation centers
PR4.6	Lands for funeral services. Support the provision of adequate lands for funeral services.	Support, with contingency that private owners allow access to City to create open space or access on land that they own.
PR5.3	Connect neighborhoods to parks. Support the connection of neighborhoods to regional parks with public transit and well maintained pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Support, add language for Runyon Canyon in implementation. Designated Ride Share access points.
PR5.4	Joint use agreements. Support the establishment of joint-use agreements with other public and private entities to increase recreational opportunities in Hollywood, including shared use of land owned by public agencies and private property owners. (P63)	Don't support. Need clarification between public and private. If it's specifically for LAUSD Where are the private properties? Is LAUSD Private or Public?

Outpost Estates Homeowners



September 12, 2017

Conni Pallini-Tipton
Los Angeles Department of City Planning
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Comments on Proposed Hollywood Community Plan

Dear Ms. Pallini-Tipton

The Outpost Homeowners Association represents the 475 homes in Outpost Canyon in the area between the Hollywood Bowl and Runyon Canyon Park. The integrity of our historic neighborhood is of utmost importance to our homeowners association board of directors. We are significantly impacted by the development in Hollywood and hope that the city will adopt an updated Hollywood Community Plan that protects hillside neighborhoods like Outpost Estates.

We have the following comments on the Draft Community Plan currently circulating for public comment:

Policy M1.7 High volume special events. This policy should be modified to not just “manage traffic and circulation needs”, it should also strive to “Reduce the number and frequency of Hollywood Boulevard Street closures.”

Policy M1.9 Residential neighborhoods. This policy should be expanded to include, “Pursue legislation that would make it illegal for navigation systems/apps to direct traffic onto Local streets from arterial streets.”

Policy M1.10 Neighborhood traffic management. Don’t just “consider” NTMPs. Change this policy to say, “Establish neighborhood traffic management plans as part of the implementation program for the Hollywood Community Plan, as well as including NTMPs as a potential mitigation, upon approving a major development project.”

Add Policy: Incompatible Vehicles on Local Streets. Pursue legislation to ban tour buses of all types on local residential streets.

Add Policy: Hollywood Sign Visitors. Create a viewing location for the Hollywood sign that would not require visitors to use residential streets to reach the viewing location.

There are inconsistencies and unacceptable proposals in the discussion of the bicycle network. Figure 6-3 “**Bicycle Network**” is not discussed in the text to describe what Tier 1 – Tier 3 bicycle lanes are. The lanes on Fairfax

7007 Macapa Drive Los Angeles, CA 90068



Avenue are Existing. The lanes on Cahuenga East and West in the Cahuenga Pass are infeasible and should be removed. Policies M5.10 and M5.11 mention 11 bicycle facilities, which are reasonable. Implementation Program P92 lists 36 bicycle facilities to be studied, many of which are infeasible, including the aforementioned Cahuenga East and West lanes. They should be deleted from this list.

Figure 6-1 "**Circulation System**" list Outpost Drive as a Modified Local street. There is no definition for a Modified Local. Outpost Drive should just be designated as a Local street. Why are the streets within Griffith Park not designated Scenic Highways. Even if they are designated as such in the Griffith Park Master Plan, a plan that can be modified, the Hollywood Community Plan should designate them as Scenic Highways to reinforce that as a policy priority.

Figure 6-4 "**Vision Zero and Safe Routes to School**" only shows schools that are designated as the most vulnerable by LAUSD, whatever that means. Gardner Street Elementary, Valley View Elementary, Cheremoya Elementary and others should be added to the figure. Safe routes to ALL schools should be a priority for the City.

Please clarify the number of stories of construction that would be feasible in the 30 foot and 45 foot height districts. We support the lower 30 foot height limit in zone 3:1D as those parcels about the single family homes on the 1800 block of Outpost Drive. We question the advisability of allowing developments to 45 feet in areas 3:1A and 3:1B along Franklin Avenue, as Franklin is already operating at Level of Service F (gridlock) throughout much of the day.

The plan should include some policies designed to discourage party houses and vacation rental houses, particularly in hillside areas where noise travels in canyons.

Add Policy LU 2.6 Protect hillside streets. Discourage the use of hillside streets as cut through routes between the flat areas of the city to the south and the San Fernando Valley to the north.

We understand that a nexus study is being conducted to potentially support the implementation of a traffic impact fee on new developments in Hollywood. We strongly encourage the city to include neighborhood traffic management measure as part of the list of mitigation measures to be funded by such a fee. The impacts of development throughout the Hollywood Community Plan area have direct and secondary impacts on traffic cutting through residential neighborhoods as the arterial streets become overloaded.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments of the Outpost Homeowners Association Board.

Sincerely,

Outpost HOA
Tom Davila, President
CC: David Ryu, CD4

7007 Macapa Drive Los Angeles, CA 90068

Area 5 Committee

Policy M1.7 High volume special events. This policy should be modified to not just “manage traffic and circulation needs”, it should also strive to “Reduce the number and frequency of Hollywood Boulevard Street closures.” Agree. Stakeholders wanted to know if city revenue from these events can be used to pay for extra traffic police to help smooth traffic flow when these closures occur.

Policy M1.9 Residential neighborhoods. This policy should be expanded to include, “Pursue legislation that would make it illegal for navigation systems/apps to direct traffic onto Local streets from arterial streets.” Agree but is such legislation feasible? If not, and since the traffic using Outpost Drive as a cut through street is only going to get worse, should we consider a ‘no right turn’ from Outpost Drive onto Mulholland during rush hour (e.g. weekdays 5-7pm).

Policy M1.10 Neighborhood traffic management. Don’t just “consider” NTMPs. Change this policy to say, “Establish neighborhood traffic management plans as part of the implementation program for the Hollywood Community Plan, as well as including NTMPs as a potential mitigation, upon approving a major development project.” Agree

Add Policy: Incompatible Vehicles on Local Streets. Pursue legislation to ban tour buses of all types on local residential streets. Agree. Does this mean local streets or designated ‘Local’ streets? Stakeholders would like to reduce the number of tour bus licenses that the city issues to ensure passenger safety as well as minimize nuisance and invasion of privacy (is there a limit in place to how many buses can be licensed in each area or do all valid applicants succeed if they fulfill criteria?) If it’s impossible to limit numbers, could licenses be made more expensive?

Add Policy: Hollywood Sign Visitors. Create a viewing location for the Hollywood sign that would not require visitors to use residential streets to reach the viewing location. Agree

Since this is one of (if not the) most popular tourist destinations in the city, we really need to find a solution that makes it easy for tourists to visit without inconveniencing or overwhelming local residents. Other ideas floated in meeting were a gondola or shuttle buses taking people from a designated location (as the Getty Museum does).

There are inconsistencies and unacceptable proposals in the discussion of the bicycle network. Figure 6-3 “**Bicycle Network**” is not discussed in the text to describe what Tier 1 – Tier 3 bicycle lanes are. The lanes on Fairfax Avenue are Existing. The lanes on Cahuenga East and West in the Cahuenga Pass are infeasible and should be removed. Policies M5.10 and M5.11 mention 11 bicycle facilities, which are reasonable. Implementation Program P92 lists 36 bicycle facilities to be studied, many of which are infeasible, including the aforementioned Cahuenga East and West lanes. They should be deleted from this list. Agree

Figure 6-1 “**Circulation System**” list Outpost Drive as a Modified Local street. There is no definition for a Modified Local. Outpost Drive should just be designated as a Local street. Why are the streets within Griffith Park not designated Scenic Highways. Even if they are designated as such in the Griffith Park Master Plan, a plan that can be modified, the Hollywood Community Plan should designate them as Scenic Highways to reinforce that as a policy priority. Agree. Question from stakeholder - it looks as if Griffith Park is designated 'private streets' now. Is that correct? And is it best to have it designated Scenic Highways?

Figure 6-4 “Vision Zero and Safe Routes to School” only shows schools that are designated as the most vulnerable by LAUSD, whatever that means. Gardner Street Elementary, Valley View Elementary, Cheremoya Elementary and others should be added to the figure. Safe routes to ALL schools should be a priority for the City. **Agree**

Please clarify the number of stories of construction that would be feasible in the 30 foot and 45 foot height districts. We support the lower 30 foot height limit in zone 3:1D as those parcels abut the single family homes on the 1800 block of Outpost Drive. We question the advisability of allowing developments to 45 feet in areas 3:1A and 3:1B along Franklin Avenue, as Franklin is already operating at Level of Service F (gridlock) throughout much of the day. **Agree. This is very important to Area 5 stakeholders who have to suffer with the gridlock along Franklin Avenue between La Brea and Highland. Area 5 does not support the increased height of 45 ft in areas 3:1A and 3:1B along Franklin. Increasing the number of motorists exiting and entering these larger buildings will only exacerbate the current gridlock. With the increasingly frequent Hollywood Blvd closures (apparently no event requests are refused?) Franklin Avenue traffic is too often at a standstill. There is also concern that ‘incentives’ mentioned in the plan could add even more height to the 30’ (or proposed 45’) zones along Franklin Avenue.**

The plan should include some policies designed to discourage party houses and vacation rental houses, particularly in hillside areas where noise travels in canyons. **Agree. Tricky to enforce. Can we come up with some suggestions?**

Add Policy LU 2.6 Protect hillside streets. Discourage the use of hillside streets as cut through routes between the flat areas of the city to the south and the San Fernando Valley to the north. **Agree. Consider putting obstructions (such as no right turn onto Mulholland at Outpost during 5-7pm - with signage also at the bottom of Outpost to warn commuters). Also what happened to the suggestions for traffic improvements that Michael Meyer/OHA submitted to LADOT? Do we know if they were ever evaluated?**

We understand that a nexus study is being conducted to potentially support the implementation of a traffic impact fee on new developments in Hollywood. We strongly encourage the city to include neighborhood traffic management measure as part of the list of mitigation measures to be funded by such a fee. The impacts of development throughout the Hollywood Community Plan area have direct and secondary impacts on traffic cutting through residential neighborhoods as the arterial streets become overloaded.

Proposed Motion: Area 5 and Transportation recommend to HHWNC that HHWNC include these comments **(with amendments where appropriate)** in HHWNC’s recommendations to LA Dept of City Planning. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

4) Comments from the public on HCPU2

- **How are the diagonal crosswalks at Hollywood and Highland working? Is it slowing traffic down or making traffic move more efficiently? Has a study been done?**

- City needs to ENFORCE its rules with fines that can help pay for such enforcement.
- Certain residential streets between La Brea and Fuller are designated 'no parking' streets and one barely ever sees a car parked anywhere on these streets. It is unfair to residents of unrestricted neighboring streets which then are burdened with overflow and parking is very congested.
- There is concern that 'incentives' mentioned in the plan could add even more height to the 30' (or proposed 45') zones along Franklin Avenue. The gridlock along Franklin Ave is a MAJOR issue for Area 5 stakeholders.