

**From:** [Sara Hinkel](#)  
**To:** [PLUDCAplications](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on Proposed Signage at 1954 E. Washington  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 4:58:17 PM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Greetings Members,

I am a resident of the Emerson East neighborhood, living at 2026 E. Mifflin St. The Madison Development Corporation has proposed signage for their newly constructed building located on their property at 1954 E. Washington Ave. They have requested variance for a projecting sign that, to my understanding, is to be located at 1946 E. Washington Ave and projects out onto the E. Washington corridor. This agenda item will be discussed at the July 1st meeting.

I would like to offer comment on two specific elements of their proposal. First, the applicant has stated that a variance should be allowed because the site at 1954 E. Washington "does seem to act more like a commercial zoning." I ask that you completely reject such reasoning on the basis that the site is surrounded by a very compact residential neighborhood characterized almost exclusively by 1 and 2 story homes averaging 90 years old. Commercial zoning would be completely out of sync with the character of this neighborhood. Very recently neighbors strongly opposed rezoning this property to TR-U1; anticipating the exact problem as demonstrated by the applicant now claiming the property 'acts more commercial.' This is not a perspective shared or appreciated by neighbors who have already argued vigorously to keep the current residential feel of the neighborhood intact.

Second, the proposal states that elements of the sign "lend themselves well to the architecture of the building." I am not in agreement with that claim. Specifically, the motifs employed in abundance within the design of sign are distinctly Art Deco. I would expect the committee will readily observe the absence of similarly notable elements and character associated with Art Deco throughout the building's exterior. The difference is rather stark and therefore diminishes the appeal of both in my mind.

I do not oppose adding projecting signage - due to the unique constraints of this location and because of decisions already made that cannot be undone. I ask that the committee reject any underlying claims concerning 'acting commercial' and instead consider only the implications and constraints presented by controversial decisions that have already been made.

Thank you,  
Sara Hinkel