

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dan Silver

**Date Submitted:** 09/16/2025 01:05 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0778-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of downtown, I OPPOSE the proposed BLOC sign district. The location in the heart of the Financial District is utterly inappropriate for crass, commercial digital displays. These will destroy the quality of the public space with its many iconic historical buildings. As a compromise, I suggest removing all signs facing 7th St, which is the most historically significant frontage. In any case, this would be a terrible precedent for the rest of downtown.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara Broide

**Date Submitted:** 09/16/2025 12:20 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0778-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** It isn't hard to challenge the statements made by project representatives that this sign district will add to the area's aesthetics and safety when many people consider digital advertising signs to be a blight and intrusion into our shared visual environment. There are many U. S. and international traffic safety studies that document that changing digital messages -- even digital traffic safety messages -- cause driver distraction that results in accidents. In addition, studies have shown digital signage with its changing messages to be an urban stressor adding to the many urban elements that diminish mental health. The exchange of community benefit monies for distracting blight seems to miss the purpose of our City's 2002 Sign Ordinance which was to reduce new sign blight. We cannot allow the influence of contributions to community benefit funds to erode the purpose of the Sign Ordinance. As to the installation of a supergraphic as part of this sign district, the City fought back to ban supergraphic signs when Carmen Trutanich was City Attorney. While they may be allowed in Supplemental Sign Districts, that does not mean that they should be permitted. They should not. There is no good reason to allow signage affixed to the surface of a building that clings to the building and covers its windows and architectural features. There are plenty of signage opportunities in this sign district. The supergraphic should be removed. Additionally, the formula for takedowns does not appear to be adequate. The takedown calculation should reflect all the added off-site signage on site. There should also be an opportunity for community input as to which signs are removed so that there is true value and impact rather than removal of signs that are in locations that are rarely seen (and cheapest to remove without removing active blight).

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara Broide

**Date Submitted:** 09/16/2025 12:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0778-S1

**Comments for Public Posting:** While images for this Sign District show the placement of signage on the project, they fail to relate to the surroundings. The renderings do not reference any nearby historical buildings. They do not look at the environment beyond the building, the BLOCK itself. This is an oversight that should not be allowed. Context is critically important. How these signs will impact other buildings and their users is relevant. Digital sign impacts on neighbors who may be residents is also very important. While the BLOCK has a very overpowering presence on the pedestrians who will pass by it, there are others who will view the structure from different vantage points. These, especially when there are historic structures nearby, should be considered when evaluating sign installations.