

- 5.1 Case No. **TXT23-00002 (Title 18 Sign Code)** – Initial review of Reno Municipal Code Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Chapter 18.02 (Zoning Districts), Chapter 18.05 (Signs) and Chapter 18.09 (Rules of Construction and Definitions); together with matters which pertain to or are necessarily connected therewith. [**Ward 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5**]

**PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

Date: October 16, 2024

To: Reno City Planning Commission

Subject: Case No. TXT23-00002 (Title 18 Sign Code) – Initial review of Reno Municipal Code Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Chapter 18.02 (Zoning Districts), Chapter 18.05 (Signs) and Chapter 18.09 (Rules of Construction and Definitions); together with matters which pertain to or are necessarily connected therewith.

From: Angela Fuss, Assistant Director of Development Services

Ward #: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

Case No.: TXT23-00002

Applicant: City of Reno

APN: N/A

Request: Review and provide input on the Sign Standards proposed amendments of the Reno Municipal Code Title 18 Annexation and Land Development, Chapter 18.02 (Zoning Districts), Chapter 18.05 (Signs) and Chapter 18.09 (Rules of Construction and Definitions).

Location: City-wide

Proposed Motion: Staff recommends Planning Commission review the proposed changes and provide feedback.

Summary: In June of 2022, City Council initiated several text amendments to the Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Code, including one to address the sign standards. Draft amendments to the sign standards have been developed and reviewed through a technical advisory committee and through a series of stakeholder and public outreach meetings. Review of the proposed changes by the Planning Commission is being requested, prior to review by the City Council. This initial round of meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council is for input and feedback only. The final draft ordinance will be reviewed in the 2025 timeframe. The proposed changes are identified in redline excerpts from the Development Code document provided as **Attachment A –Sign Standards Draft Amendments** to this staff report.

Background: Council adopted a new Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Code (i.e. Zoning Code RENOVation) on January 13, 2021. The key objectives of the update were to implement the Master Plan, make the code more user-friendly, and establish a more predictable and transparent review process. Following adoption of this code, staff has been undertaking a larger Code Clean-up, as well as several subject specific text amendments, at the direction of City Council.

Initially, staff had assumed a full rewrite of the Sign Code would be necessary, due to the complexity of regulating signage, and has been working with a consultant to help guide the development of new regulations. After stakeholder meetings and input from the sign community in 2023, it was determined that a full rewrite was unnecessary; however, there are specific amendments and insertions needed, particularly to *Table 5-1 Sign Regulations by Zoning District*.

Discussion: Staff initially worked with a consultant to review the current sign standards found in Title 18, assuming a full Sign Code rewrite. Through stakeholder meetings, it was determined that the sign standards in *Table 5-1* needed to be simplified. Additionally, there were a number of inconsistencies and implementation issues that needed to be addressed. Staff has been hosting technical advisory committee and public stakeholder meetings to garner feedback on proposed changes.

Proposed redline changes found in **Attachment A –Sign Standards Draft Amendments** are generally summarized below:

Overall Changes

- There were a variety of inconsistencies, formatting issues, and unclear language that needed to be addressed to better implement code. Also, district naming (Urban District and Employment District) was made consistent with the larger Code Clean-up.
- Requirements for a Conditional Use Permit were changed to a Major Site Plan Review, as this entitlement type is more applicable to signage. The usage of a Major Site Plan Review is also intended to help ensure that site specific characteristics relating to the sign, such as height, size, and illumination are reviewed for impacts to neighboring developments, which attempts to better ensure content neutrality in the signage review. The Major Site Plan Review process still requires public noticing, a public hearing, and review by the Planning Commission in the same manner as a Conditional Use Permit. In some instances, Minor Site Plan Review requirements were amended to a Major Site Plan Review for consistency in signage review types.
- A statement of content neutrality and substitution was included to address federal law relating to freedom of speech as it relates to signage.

- The definition of a “monument sign” was included, and definitions relating to “freestanding sign” and associated sign types were clarified.

Gaming Sign Standards

- Prior to the Development Code rewrite in 2021, the Downtown Entertainment District was allowed very liberal sign standards. This included all parcels within the District and were not limited to just casinos. In the 2021 Development Code rewrite, the Gaming Overlay was created and established sign standards that allow what was previously permitted in the Downtown Entertainment District code but implemented throughout the full overlay area. The larger Gaming Overlay sign standards were applied to all parcels within the overlay, unintentionally allowing much more area than before. Amending the standards as proposed will align with the initial intent of allowing more liberal sign standards for the Downtown Entertainment District and for casinos. It should be noted that all parcels within the Downtown Entertainment District have been allowed the unlimited sign regulations since 2005. The draft redlines propose to maintain the signage within the Downtown Entertainment boundary and remove the unlimited signage from the broader Gaming Overlay, resulting in an overall reduction of unlimited signs.
- Legally established nonrestricted gaming operations are proposed to still maintain the same larger sign standard allowance as well, which is also currently allowed by code.

Sign Regulations by Zoning District Table

- The sign regulation table was amended for overall clarity, as well as consistency in measurement types and standards. For example, many of the different districts had different items that were regulated as part of the standards, like letter height, copy area, sign length, linear frontage, etc. Many of these were removed, in favor of more consistent standards throughout each district.
- To further simplify the table, many of the footnotes were worked into the appropriate standards within the table. The sign regulation table currently has 13 footnotes and is proposed to be reduced to four footnotes.
- Regulations were simplified where there were multiple standards or ambiguity, such as different size allowances for arterial street adjacency, nearby roadway speed, or parcel size.
- Certain zoning district standards were made consistent if they were similar in terms of intensity, such as Neighborhood Commercial (NC) and Professional Office (PO), or the Employment Districts (Industrial (I), Industrial Commercial (IC), Mixed Employment (ME) and Mixed-Use Airport).
- The Mixed-Use Airport (MA), Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS), and Unincorporated Transition (UT) districts did not have sign standards, which were added to the table.

Areas that Were Not Changed

- No changes were made to off-premise sign (i.e. billboard) regulations.
- No changes were made to digital/animated sign regulations.
- No changes were made to digital/animated sign brightness levels (i.e. nits).

Feedback garnered through the technical advisory committee, public stakeholder meetings, and emailed correspondence indicate concern regarding the allowance of the large signage standards found in the Gaming Overlay. The Gaming Overlay encompasses an area of almost 2,000 acres. Staff is recommending that the unlimited signage be reduced from the Gaming Overlay boundary and revert to just the Downtown Entertainment core area, a boundary of approximately 136 acres that has had the unlimited signage allowance for the past 20 years. As noted, and discussed, staff is attempting to reduce the area that the larger signage is allowed and maintain what has been in the Sign Code for two decades. Additionally, some commenters indicated that the other standards as proposed were acceptable and offered minor amendments. Written public feedback received can be found at **Attachment B** to this staff report.

Staff is bringing this item forward to Planning Commission and City Council for input. Based on input received, it is anticipated that an ordinance will be drafted and move through the approval process in early 2025.

Analysis: This staff report provides a general overview of the proposed changes to the Sign Standards in Section 18.05 and the standards specific to the Gaming Overlay in Section 18.02 of the Development Code. Specific redlines with annotations explaining the changes in more detail are provided in **Attachment A – Sign Standards Draft Amendments**.

Recommendation: Staff recommends Planning Commission review the proposed changes and provide feedback.

Findings: *General Review Criteria:* The decision-making body shall review all development applications for compliance with the applicable general review criteria stated below.

- 1) Consistency with the Reno Master Plan: The proposed development shall be consistent with the Reno Master Plan. The decision-making authority:
 - a. Shall weigh competing plan goals, policies, and strategies; and
 - b. May approve and application that provides a public benefit even if the development is contrary to some of the foals, policies, or strategies in the Reno Master Plan.
- 2) Compliance with Title 18: The proposed development shall comply with all applicable standards in this Title, unless the standard is lawfully modified or varied. Compliance with these standards is applied at the level of detail required for the subject submittal.

- 3) Mitigates Traffic Impacts: The project mitigates traffic impacts based on applicable standards of the City of Reno and the Regional Transportation Commission.
- 4) Provides Safe Environment: The project provides a safe environment for pedestrians and people on bicycles.
- 5) Rational Phasing Plan. If the application involves phases, each phase of the proposed development contains all of the required streets, utilities, landscaping, open space, and other improvements that are required to serve or otherwise accompany the completed of the project, and shall not depend on subsequent phases for those improvements.

Amendments to Text of Title 18: Text amendments shall be in substantial conformance with the statement of purpose and intent for this Title, as set forth in Chapter 18.01 Article 2, *Purpose*, and the Master Plan:

The general purpose of this Title is to promote the public health, safety, and welfare by providing appropriate and reasonable controls for the development and use of lands in Reno, while also protecting the rights of property owners. This Title also is intended to:

- (a) Implement the policies, goals, and strategies adopted by the City of Reno, including those set forth in the Reno Master Plan and other adopted plans;
- (b) Promote, preserve, and protect environmental quality as a critical element in Reno's quality of life and encourage the wise use of natural resources;
- (c) Conserve and enhance the architecture, history, pedestrian-orientation, mixed-use, and urban character of Downtown Reno, and promote its role as regional government, civic, entertainment, and tourist center;
- (d) Promote economic development and the improvement of property, with priority given to adaptive reuse and redevelopment projects in Downtown Reno and urban mixed-use areas;
- (e) Conserve and enhance the character of Reno's established residential neighborhoods through mitigation of adverse factors, promotion of a balanced mix of housing types, and through appropriately scaled and planned infill development;
- (f) Encourage innovative, affordable, and quality residential development so that growing demand for housing may be met by greater variety in type, design, and layout of dwellings, and by conservation and more efficient use of open space ancillary to such dwellings;
- (g) Encourage quality, nonresidential development that preserves and protects the character of the community, including its natural landscape, and that minimizes objectionable noise, glare, odor, traffic, and other impacts of such development, especially when adjacent to residential uses;
- (h) Facilitate adequate provision of transportation, water, wastewater, electricity, gas, communications, schools, parks, trails, stormwater management, and other public requirements; and

- (i) Provide the economic and social advantages gained from a comprehensively planned use of land resources.

Attachments:

Attachment A – Sign Standards Draft Amendments

Attachment B – Written Public Feedback Received

Chapter 18.02 Zoning Districts

Article 6 Overlay Districts

18.02.601 Overlay Districts, Generally

(c) **Gaming (G) Overlay District**

(1) **Purpose** This district establishes regulations that recognize the unique characteristics of hotel/casino developments to mitigate potential impacts and encourage higher quality destination resorts that will increase tourism within the community.

~~(2) **General Standards**¹~~

~~a. **Signs** Sign regulations for the Gaming Overlay District are set forth in the following table.~~

Table 2-37 Sign Regulations for Gaming Overlay District				
Maximum Height (Freestanding)	Sign Area (Freestanding)	Sign Area (Wall)	Illumination (All)	Flashing or Animated (All)
100 ft. [1]	No limit	No limit	All types	No limit
Note: [1] Conditional use permit required to exceed 100 feet.				

Chapter 18.05 Signs

Article 1 On-Premises Signs

¹ Prior to the Development Code rewrite in 2021, the Downtown Entertainment District was allowed very liberal sign standards. The intent of the Gaming Overlay sign standards in current code was to allow what was previously allowed in code but regulated through the overlay. This unintentionally included much more area than before. Amending the standards as shown will align with the initial intent of allowing more liberal sign standards for the Downtown Entertainment District, as well as legally established nonrestricted gaming operations, which is currently allowed by code.

18.05.101 Purpose, Scope, and Authority

The purpose of this article is to promote the public health, safety, general welfare, and aesthetics by regulating and controlling the size, number, height, and location of on-premises signs. This article is intended to accomplish the following:

- (a) To promote and maintain healthy commercial centers by providing for effective communication of the nature of goods and services available, and eliminating wasteful and unsightly competition in signs;
- (b) To encourage sign design that is integrated with and harmonious to the building and sites occupied;
- (c) To add to the quality of life by minimizing visual pollution;
- (d) To attract and direct persons to various activities and enterprises, thereby providing for the maximum public convenience;
- (e) To notify or warn the public about the location or existence of hazardous or dangerous conditions;
- (f) To protect and enhance the residential neighborhoods by prohibiting obtrusive and incompatible signs; and
- (g) To allow noncommercial speech on any otherwise permissible sign.

18.05.102 On-Premises Allowable Sign Area

Where the allowable sign area is a function of business frontage, no more than two business frontages may be counted in calculating the allowable area for any building occupant.

18.05.103 Location of Permanent On-Premises Signs

Signs located on private property shall not extend across property lines into adjacent property or into a public right-of-way except as provided in this chapter, unless approved by the City Engineer². Freestanding or projecting signs may be located within, or project into, setbacks except that no sign shall be located in a manner that would create a hazard for pedestrian, bicycle, or automobile traffic.

18.05.104 Number of On-Premises Signs

The number of freestanding signs allowed is specified in Table 5-1, Sign Regulations by Zoning District, below. Wall signs are not specifically restricted by number, provided the maximum area is not exceeded. In all zones, suspended signs located perpendicular to the front of the building and not exceeding six square feet in area will not be included in calculating the number of signs. Multiple signs on a single freestanding structure are allowed; provided, that all signs supported by a single structure are visually compatible with one another.

18.05.105 Sign Area Computation for On-Premises Signs

The allowable sign area shall apply to the maximum geometric area of all sign faces visible from any one point at eye level. Where a sign consists of individual letters, numbers or symbols, painted on or attached directly to a building, which are without an integrated background and are not enclosed in a frame or cabinet, the area of the display shall be the average height of the display times the average width or the sum of the surface area of

² This verbiage would better allow for unique situations where a building might be built to the property line and contain a wall sign that slightly projects into the right-of-way. This type of situation would typically require a revocable occupancy permit, that would be approved through Public Works and the City Engineer.

individual letters, whichever is smaller. If such a display consists of more than one line or component, the area of each line or component may be calculated separately. Where a display is enclosed in a frame or cabinet, or has an integrated background, the entire area within the frame, cabinet, or background shall be included.

18.05.106 Regulated On-Premises Signs

All on-premises signs erected or located in the city, which are not exempted by federal or state law, or Title 14, Buildings and Construction, are subject to the provisions of this Chapter and Title 14, Buildings and Construction.

18.05.107 Permit Required

- (a) Except as otherwise provided, no person may erect, enlarge, alter (except for normal maintenance), or relocate within the city, any sign without first having obtained a sign permit.
- (b) On-premises signs greater than 150 square feet in size, and located within 150 feet of the centerline of the Truckee River, shall require review and approval under Section 18.08.~~602~~603, MinorMajor Site Plan Review.

18.05.108 Exempted On-Premises Permanent Signs

The following types of signs are not subject to the permit or application requirements of this Chapter and need not be included in any aggregate area computations, however, they are otherwise subject to the standards and requirements of this Title:

- (a) Address number or plates and residential nameplates as required by NRS Section 278.0231-.
- (b) Changes in copy or advertising display on an existing sign which do not alter the structure, size, or configuration of the sign.
- (c) On residentially zoned parcels, one or more signs not exceeding a combined total of 16 square feet and the top of the sign(s) is no greater than three feet above the ground located on parcels of one acre or less; one or more signs not exceeding a combined total of 32 square feet and the top of the sign(s) is no greater than six feet above the ground on parcels that are one to five acres; one or more signs not exceeding a combined total of 64 square feet and the top of the sign(s) is no greater than 12 feet above the ground on parcels greater than five acres.
- (d) Flags displayed from permanently located freestanding or wall-mounted flagpoles which are designed to allow raising and lowering of flags. The number of such flagpoles shall be limited in number to one per parcel and the maximum height shall be 30 feet.
- (e) Sign or tablets when cut into any masonry surface or constructed of bronze or other noncombustible surface not to exceed eight square feet in area when located within commercial zones.
- (f) Official traffic-control sign, signals, or devices, and street name signs.
- (g) Signs that notify the public of the location or access of emergency medical services.
- (h) Public safety signs that notify or warn the public about the location or existence of hazardous or dangerous conditions.
- (i) Signs that are located within a building.
- (j) Drive-through facility signs, subject to the following standards:
 - ~~a~~1. For each approved drive-through lane:
 - ~~a~~1. Up to two signs per lane;
 - ~~b~~2. Not to exceed a combined 64 square feet per lane, with a maximum height of seven feet.

-
- ~~b~~2. Exempted drive-through facility sign copy area shall not be oriented to or visible from any public right-of-way. Signs may be changeable provided:
 - ~~1~~a. Displays do not appear to be in motion, flashing or have video;
 - ~~2~~b. Display does not create a glare or other condition that impairs the vision of drivers or obstructs or interferes with a driver's view of surrounding traffic situations;
 - ~~3~~c. The sign does not exceed 150 nits between sunset and sunrise; and
 - ~~4~~d. The sign automatically adjusts/dims to changes in ambient light.

18.05.109 On-Premises Signs Prohibited

The following types of signs are prohibited within the city:

- (a) Signs that constitute a hazard to traffic or pedestrians;
- (b) Signs located within any stream or drainage canal;
- (c) Mobile, A-framed, or portable signs except as provided in Section 18.05.110;
- (d) Inflatable or other temporary or wind signs except as otherwise provided;
- (e) Signs which initiate or simulate official signs, or which use yellow or red blinking intermittent light resembling danger or warning signals;
- (f) Sign on public property or rights-of-way or signs attached to utility poles, street-light standards, fences, sheds, trees, hydrants, or similar structures except as otherwise provided in this Chapter;
- (g) Roof signs;
- (h) Wall signs extending above the top of the wall or beyond the ends of the wall to which the signs are attached unless the signs conform to the requirements for projecting signs, or ground signs;
- (i) Signs emitting and/or producing noise, odor, smoke, fire, or other such emissions; and
- (j) Signs within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a freeway that exceed 20 square feet and have faces which are visible from the travel lanes of the freeway.

18.05.110 Temporary On-Premises Signs

In addition to the permanent signage allowed, the following signs shall comply with all provisions and regulations of this chapter; however, no fee, permit, or application is required. Temporary signs are prohibited signs except as provided by this section.

- (a) **Generally**
 - (1) **Illumination** No temporary sign shall be internally or externally illuminated.
 - (2) **Location**
 - a. Except as provided by this section, no temporary sign shall extend into or over the public right-of-way.
 - b. No temporary sign shall extend into the vision triangle area as defined and set forth in Section 18.04.601(b), Vision Triangles.
 - (3) **Maintenance** Temporary signs shall be kept neat, clean, and in good repair. Signs which are faded, torn, damaged, or otherwise unsightly or in a state of disrepair shall be immediately repaired or removed.

-
- (4) **Placement** Temporary signs shall not be attached to trees, shrubbery, utility poles, or traffic control signs or devices. They shall not obstruct or obscure signs on adjacent premises.
- (5) **Sign Collection and Retrieval**
- a. The City may collect temporary signs placed in the public right-of-way in violation of Section 18.05.110.
 - b. Each sign collected will be stored for a minimum of 30 days excluding all handbills as defined in Chapter 18.09 Rules of Construction and Definitions.
 - c. Notice will be mailed within five ~~business-working~~³ days of the date of collection to the owner of each sign if the ownership is reasonably discernible.
 - d. The owner of the sign may retrieve a sign collected by the City within 30 days of the collection date. The owners shall present proof of ownership of the sign.
 - e. The owner of the sign may appeal the City's action as an administrative action by filing an appeal and paying the appeal to the City Council with the City of Reno Clerk's Office within ten days of the sign being removed. The City Clerk shall set the hearing before the City Council at the next City Council meeting at least 15 days in the future.
- (b) **Allowed Signage** In the following districts, temporary signage shall be allowed for each parcel as follows. This signage shall not be restricted by content.
- (1) **Residential Districts** One temporary sign per street frontage not exceeding six square feet for up to 95 days total per calendar year. On tracts of land of more than two acres, the sign area may be increased to 32 square feet.
 - (2) **~~Nonresidential-Employment Districts~~ and ~~Mixed-UseUrban~~ Districts** One temporary sign per street frontage not exceeding 32 square feet for up to 95 days per calendar year. Square footage may be increased on parcels without established uses or structures by the square footage that would be allowed when calculating for permanent freestanding signs; in this situation street frontage would be used for business frontage.

18.05.111 Canopies

Canopies over the building entrance shall be permitted in all districts and may extend into the public right-of-way with the permission of the owner of the right-of-way. Canopies may be embellished with copy that does not exceed 20 square feet. Canopies shall not count towards the sign area allowed or number of signs allowed. Permit required.

18.05.112 Removal of Abandoned ~~of~~ On-Premises Signs

Any sign or sign structure which has been abandoned for a period of six months shall be removed or restored to use within 30 days after a notice of abandonment is issued by the Administrator to the owner of the sign. The Administrator may allow an abandoned sign or sign structure to remain in place, provided that the sign or sign structure is maintained in good condition, and that there is a reasonable possibility that the sign can be restored to use within a one-year period.

³ Language throughout the code was amended to reflect consistent verbiage of “working” instead of “business” days.

18.05.113 Permanent On-Premises Sign Regulations by Zoning District

Sign regulations for each zoning district are established in Table 5-1, below:

Table 5-1 Sign Regulations by Zoning District [1]					
District	Height, freestanding (max.)	Area, freestanding (max.)	Area, Wall (max.)	Illumination	Flashing/ Animation [2] ⁴
Residential Districts					
LLR-2.5, LLR-1, LLR-0.5, SF-3, SF-5, SF-8, SF-11, MF-14, MF-21, MF-30 AH ⁵	6' maximum monument only ⁶	50 sq. ft. per access, up to 150 sq. ft. max w/site plan review One per street frontage. ⁷	20 sq. ft. maximum. One per street frontage. [1][2]	Indirect [8] or internal with opaque background ⁸	Not allowed
Mixed-Use Urban Area Districts					
All districts not listed below [6] [11] MD-UD, MD-ID, MD-RD, MD-NWQ, MD-PD, MU, -MS, MU-MC, MU-RES ⁹	8' maximum OR, if the parcel is ≥ one acre, freestanding sign maximum height is 25' (35' if parcel fronts street posted at 35 mph or	125 sq. ft. maximum [5][7][3] ¹¹	1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of business frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per business. ¹² Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each business shall be allowed 40 sq.	All types	Permitted on parcels fronting North Virginia Street, South Virginia Street, West 4th Street, East 4th Street, and Mill Street and shall not exceed 125 sq. ft. Any other street shall require a major site plan

⁴ NRS Sections 590.160 — 590.330 requires that Advertisement of Motor Vehicle Fuel and Petroleum Products be allowed with certain limitations, found in 18.05.114(b)(5). Moving the footnote will allow this to be applicable to all districts.

⁵ Clarification added to the table to identify which specific zoning districts are being referenced in the applicable row.

⁶ Clarification added.

⁷ Difficult to administer as it was unclear how many signs were allowed and whether a site plan review was required for every sign. Amended to allow one 50 sq. ft. sign per access and removed the site plan review requirement. Overall, more square footage may be allowed compared to current code, however, the sign size per access is limited, which was unclear before.

⁸ Simplified language from previous code and attempted to still meet the intent.

⁹ Section existed in other parts of code that were more obscure to find. Since it was related to signs, it was included in the table for clarity.

¹¹ New footnote [4] still limits the number of freestanding signs allowed. Reference to previous footnote [5] to allow for doubling of square footage on arterial roadways with a posted speed limit of 35 mph or higher removed. Previous footnote [7] which specified copy area only was removed.

¹² Previous code limited this standard to 400 square feet per parcel, however, that was difficult to administer, as the sign square footage for existing businesses or future potential was difficult to accurately review and account for. The square footage is still limited based on length of business frontage.

	greater) ¹⁰		ft. of sign area. ¹³ Sign length shall not exceed 75% of business frontage All wall sign area shall not exceed 400 sq. ft. per parcel 5' maximum letter height Notwithstanding above, each business shall be allowed a minimum 40 sq. ft.		review for flashing/animated signs. ¹⁴ Not allowed [12]
MD-ED ¹⁵ [4]	Maximum sign height of 100' Major site plan review required to exceed 100'.	No limit	No limit	All types	No limit
GC [6] ¹⁶ [9] ¹⁷	8' maximum 1' per 4' of linear street frontage Not to exceed 35' for signs adjacent to a major arterial; over 35' adjacent to a major arterial	60 sq. ft. up to 100 lineal street ft. 125 sq. ft. for parcel between 100-400 lineal ft. frontage 250 sq. ft. for parcels with more than 400 lineal ft.	1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of business frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per business. Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each business shall be allowed 40	All types	Allowed up to 35' in height if not facing residential zoning districts.

¹⁰ Previous language was difficult to administer as speed limits on roadways can change. Removed ambiguity to allow for 35' height maximum in all cases where the parcel is larger than one acre.

¹³ Verbiage clarified and simplified by removing maximum letter height and sign length standards.

¹⁴ Previous footnote was included in the appropriate cell in the Table for clarity.

¹⁵ See annotation 1.

¹⁶ Reference to the number of freestanding signs allowed was moved to the freestanding sign column.

¹⁷ Removed footnote in an attempt to simplify standards.

	with a conditional use permit <u>OR</u> , if the parcel is \geq one acre, freestanding sign maximum height is 35' ¹⁸	[5][7] artistic embellishment, no limit 150 sq. ft. if street frontage \leq 400 ft. 250 sq. ft. if street frontage > 400 ft. [3] ¹⁹	sq. ft. of sign area. 6' maximum letter height for anchor tenants, 4' maximum letter height for line shops and pad sites Notwithstanding above, each business shall be allowed a minimum 40 sq. ft. ²⁰		
NC, PO [6] ²¹	8' maximum monument only. May be increased to 12' if more than 100' of street frontage. 8 ft' if < 100' street frontage (12' if 100'+)	60 sq. ft. maximum monument ²² [3]	1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of business frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per business. Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each business shall be allowed 40 sq. ft. of sign area. 1 sq. ft./100 GFA (all signs combined not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per parcel, 3' maximum letter height) [4]	Indirect or internal with opaque background. ²³	Not allowed [13]
PO	8' monument only [3]	1 sq. ft./100 sq. ft. of GFA, max 25% of	20 sq. ft./parcel	Indirect [8]	Not allowed

¹⁸ Attempted to simplify standards.

¹⁹ Attempted to simplify standards.

²⁰ Attempted to simplify standards by removing letter height requirements. Limited area to 400 sq. ft. per business.

²¹ Make NC and PO zones consistent and further simplified standards.

²² Monument only requirement still maintained in the freestanding sign height column, consistent with other districts.

²³ Unclear if the original footnote ~~[8]~~ was mistakenly not included, as it was in all other districts. Made to be consistent with other districts in the table and previous allowance in PO.

		business frontage on a building			
<u>Nonresidential Employment Area Districts</u>					
I, IC, ME, MA ²⁴	25' maximum	80 sq. ft. per frontage; For properties with 2 or more street frontages, maximum combined area of 160 sq. ft. per sign; 150 sq. ft. maximum	1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of business frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per business. Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each business shall be allowed 40 sq. ft. of sign area. 1/business/ street frontage 1 sq. ft./lineal foot of building frontage	All types	Not allowed {13}
IC ME	25' or bldg. height 1/ street frontage	3 sq. ft./100 GFA combined {10}	3 sq. ft./100 GFA combined {10}	All types; indirect facing residential zones {8}	Allowed up to 25' if not facing residential zones
<u>Special Purpose Districts</u>					
PF ²⁵	8' maximum monument only. May be increased to 12' if more than 100' of street frontage. 6' monument established by conditional use permit	15% of allowed wall sign area 60 sq. ft. maximum	1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of business frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft. per business. Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each business shall be allowed 40 sq. ft. of sign area. 10 sq. ft./acre	All types; none facing residential	Not allowed

²⁴ Combined employment districts and included MA, which was inadvertently left out in current code. Attempted to simplify standards.

²⁵ Attempted to simplify standards and make them consistent with other standards in the table.

<u>PGOS²⁶</u>	<u>6' maximum monument only.-ft</u>	<u>60 sq. ft. maximum</u>	<u>1 sq. ft. of sign area per lineal foot of building frontage not to exceed 400 sq. ft.</u> <u>Notwithstanding above, at a minimum, each building shall be allowed 40 sq. ft. of sign area.</u>	<u>All types; none facing residential zoning district.</u>	<u>Not allowed</u>
<u>UT-5, UT-10, UT-40²⁷</u>	<u>6' maximum monument only.</u>	<u>50 sq. ft. per access. One per street frontage.</u>	<u>20 sq. ft. maximum. One per street frontage.</u>	<u>Indirect or internal with opaque background</u>	<u>Not allowed</u>
<u>Overlay</u>					
<u>Gaming²⁸</u>	<u>100'</u> <u>Major site plan review</u> <u>Conditional use permit required to exceed 100'.</u>	<u>No limit</u>	<u>No limit</u>	<u>All types</u>	<u>No limit</u>
<p>Notes:</p> <p>[1] Established by conditional use permit for nonresidential use in residential zone.</p> <p>[1] Signs in all zoning districts that are larger than 150 sq. ft. and proposed within 150 feet of the center line of the Truckee River require approval of a major site plan review.</p> <p>[2] In all zoning districts, sign copy regulated by NRS Sections 590.160 — 590.330, Advertisement of Motor Vehicle Fuel and Petroleum Products, permitted subject to standards outlined in Section 18.05.114(b)(5)</p> <p>[2] Either a wall or monument sign is allowed per street frontage.</p> <p>[3] On multi tenant building, may have one 12 feet center identification sign/frontage.</p> <p>[4] Gross floor area (GFA).</p> <p>[5] The allowable square footage may be doubled on arterial roadways with a posted speed limited of 35 mph or greater.</p> <p>[6] Number of freestanding allowed: one per frontage, 2nd or one additional sign allowed if over 10 acres. Gas stations may have one additional 16 sq. ft. sign.</p> <p>[7] Copy area only.</p> <p>[8] Signs of light copy and dark backgrounds with internal illumination are permitted, provided the copy makes up less than 50 percent of the sign area.</p> <p>[9] As an alternative to specific square footage allowances for wall and freestanding signs in the GC zone, two square feet/lineal foot of building frontage may be utilized for all sign types combined.</p> <p>[10] Three sf/100 GFA is the maximum total sign area and may be provided on wall and/or freestanding signs.</p> <p>[11] Legally established Nonrestricted Gaming Operation, land uses may use Gaming Overlay MD-ED district sign requirements.</p> <p>[12] Permitted on parcels fronting North Virginia Street, South Virginia Street, West 4th Street, East 4th Street, and Mill Street and shall not exceed 125 sq. ft. Any other street shall require a site plan review for flashing/animated signs.</p> <p>[13] Permitted subject to standards outlined in Section 18.05.114(b)(6).</p>					

²⁶ Was inadvertently left out of current code. Created standards similar to other standards found within the table.

²⁷ Was inadvertently left out of current code. Created standards similar to residential district standards.

²⁸ See annotation 1 above.

18.05.114 Additional Regulations for Animated Signs

(a) **Applicability** The following regulations only apply to fixed message electronic signs and computer controlled variable message electronic signs as defined in Chapter 18.09 Rules of Construction and Definitions.

(b) **Standards**

- (1) No animated sign shall exceed 1,500 nits between sunset and sunrise. No animated sign shall exceed 5,000 nits between sunrise and sunset. Signs shall automatically adjust/dim due to changes in ambient light, such as inclement weather.
- (2) Any animated sign constructed prior to December 2, 2015, shall be brought into conformance with the nit standards listed in Subsection 18.05.114(b)(1), above, by December 2, 2017.
- (3) Animated signs shall only be allowed within 750 feet of residentially zoned property with the approval of a ~~conditional use permit~~ [major site plan review](#). The 750 feet shall be measured from the base of the sign to the property line of the residentially zoned parcel.
- (4) No animated signs shall be allowed within 300 feet of the outer boundary of the outer travel lane/white line of:
 - a. State Route 431 (Mount Rose Highway);
 - b. Interstate 80 west of Robb Drive, to the western most city limit;
 - c. U.S. 395 north of North McCarran Boulevard; and
 - d. Interstate 580 south of South McCarran Boulevard.

~~e.(5)~~ Any animated signs located within these areas which were in existence prior to December 2, 2015, may only be enlarged or relocated with the approval of a ~~conditional use permit~~ [major site plan review](#)²⁹.

- (~~6~~5) Notwithstanding Subsection (b)(~~5~~4), above, only that portion of sign copy regulated by NRS Sections 590.160 — 590.330 , Advertisement of Motor Vehicle Fuel and Petroleum Products, may be animated provided that:
- a. The display brightness does not exceed 150 nits between sunset and sunrise;
 - b. Displays do not appear to be in motion, flashing, or have video;
 - c. Displays change no more than 24 times per day; and
 - d. All other sign regulations in this Title that are not specified in these NRS regulations (including zoning limitations, and limitations on number and size of signs) remain in effect.

18.05.115 Nonconforming On-Premises Signs

A "nonconforming on-premise sign" is a sign that was lawfully erected prior to the adoption of the sign regulations codified in this chapter, or subsequent amendments thereto, which would not be permitted under the current provisions of such regulations. "Nonconforming signs" include signs that were erected without a conditional use

²⁹ [Amended to major site plan review to be consistent in review types. Still requires public noticing and hearing through the Planning Commission.](#)

permit, or other entitlement, and which would require a major site plan review under the current provisions of this chapter or of Section 18.08.60~~32~~, Major Site Plan Review. ³⁰

18.05.116 Right to Maintain and Continue the Use of a Nonconforming On-Premises Sign

A nonconforming on-premises sign may be maintained and continued in use, provided that:

- (a) It is not altered structurally, enlarged, or relocated without proper permits; and
- (b) It is maintained in a good and working condition.

18.05.117 Termination of Right to Nonconforming On-Premises Sign

- (a) Any nonconforming on-premises sign that is declared a hazard by the Administrator shall be removed or repaired within ten days of notice to the owner of the sign.
- (b) Any nonconforming sign that requires repairs costing more than 50 percent of its replacement value shall be removed or made to comply with the provisions of this chapter and Title.

18.05.118 Alteration, Enlargement, or Relocation of On-Premises Sign

Excluding Section 18.05.114(b)(4),⁷ above, no permit shall be issued for the alteration, enlargement, or relocation of a nonconforming sign unless any changes decrease the amount of any nonconforming size by a minimum of 25 percent and any nonconforming height by a minimum of 25 percent. Methods of lighting shall not be changed until all other elements of the sign are brought into full conformance.

18.05.119 Time Limitations on Review of Applications for On-Premises Signs

- (a) The Administrator shall review and make a decision or recommendation regarding an application for on-premises signs which are not a part of or accompanied by an application for any other development on the parcel within five working days of the date the completed application is accepted by the Community Development Department.
- (b) The Administrator shall review and make a decision regarding an application for a temporary or special events on-premises signs no later than three working days of the date the completed application is accepted by the community development department.
- (c) The Administrator shall review and make a decision or recommendation regarding an application for on-premises signs which are a part or accompanied by an application for any other development no later than the decision regarding the development is rendered.
- (d) If the Planning Commission reviews the application the Planning Commission shall hold a hearing promptly but in no event no later than 65 days from the date the completed application is file-stamped within the Community Development Department.
- (e) The Planning Commission shall make its decision promptly but in no event later than 30 days of the date of the opening of the hearing.
- (f) The City Council shall make its decision promptly but in no event later than 30 days of the date of the opening of the hearing.
- (g) If the applicant requests a continuance or a specified time or date for the matter to be heard, the timelines provided herein are deemed waived.

³⁰ Added clarification. Now requires a major site plan review.

18.05.120 Appeal of Administrator's Decision

- (a) Aggrieved persons may appeal the Administrator's decision to the City Council by filing a written appeal in the City's Clerk's office setting forth how they are aggrieved and the reasons for the appeal within five days of the Administrator's written decision.
- (b) The City Clerk shall schedule an appeal before the City Council no less than 14 days or more than 45 days following the last day of the appeal period following the administrative decision.

18.05.121 Judicial Review

- (a) Judicial review may be sought in accordance with NRS Chapter 34 .
- (b) Except as otherwise provided, if the City denies a "First Amendment" application, the City will institute legal proceedings within ten working days of its final action to determine in an adversarial proceeding the constitutionality of the denial on prior restraint grounds, unless otherwise waived by the applicant. For purposes of this subsection, a "First Amendment" application is one in which the applicant has inserted the words, "First Amendment" in the caption of the application.

18.05.122 Decisions Regarding On-Premises Signs

- (a) Decisions shall be in writing.
- (b) Decisions shall include an explanation setting forth the reasons for the decisions.

18.05.123 Content Neutrality and Substitution³¹

- (a) Content Neutrality Despite any other provision of this Chapter, the content of a sign's message does not limit its permissibility under this Chapter. However, location-based standards such as off-premises regulations, do apply.
- (b) Substitution Allowed Any sign allowed a commercial message may contain any non-commercial message. Any sign allowed a non-commercial message may contain any other non-commercial message.

Article 2 Off-Premises Advertising Displays

18.05.201 Purpose and Intent

Recognizing that the City of Reno is a unique city in which public safety, maintenance, and enhancement of the city's esthetic qualities are important and effective in promoting quality of life for its inhabitants and the City of Reno's 24-hour gaming, entertainment, recreation, and tourism economy; recognizing that the promotion of tourism generates a commercial interest in the environmental attractiveness of the community; and recognizing that the visual landscape is more than a passive backdrop in that it shapes the character of our city, community, and region, the purpose of this article is to establish a comprehensive system for the regulation of the commercial use of off-premises advertising displays. It is intended that these regulations impose reasonable standards on the number, size, height, and location of off-premises advertising displays to prevent and alleviate needless distraction and clutter resulting from excessive and confusing off-premises advertising displays; to safeguard and enhance property values; and to promote the general welfare and public safety of the city's inhabitants and to promote the

³¹ Language added to address content neutrality.

maintenance and enhancement of the city's esthetic qualities and improve the character of our city. It is further intended that these regulations provide one of the tools essential to the preservation and enhancement of the environment, thereby protecting an important aspect of the economy of the city that is instrumental in attracting those who come to visit, vacation, live, and trade on any otherwise permissible sign.

18.05.202 Restrictions on Permanent Off-Premises Advertising Displays

Except as specifically provided in this chapter, or state or federal law, the City shall not issue any permits authorizing the construction of any new, permanent off-premises advertising displays.

18.05.203 Nonconforming Permanent Off-Premises Advertising Displays

- (a) All legally established, permanent off-premises advertising displays existing within the city on the effective date of this Title or subsequently annexed into the city, thereafter, are deemed nonconforming. Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to require the removal of any nonconforming permanent off-premises advertising display.
- (b) No later than 30 days after the effective date of this Title and by July 15th of each year thereafter:
 - (1) All owners of nonconforming permanent off-premises advertising displays shall submit a report to the Administrator detailing the size, height, location, and City of Reno inventory number of their current inventory of nonconforming permanent off-premises advertising displays.
 - (2) All holders of banked receipts shall submit a report to the Administrator detailing the size, height, location, demolition permit number, and City of Reno inventory number of the permanent off-premises advertising displays associated with holder's unexpired banked receipts.
- (c) All nonconforming permanent off-premises advertising displays may be continued and maintained at their current location until:
 - (1) Required to be removed because of termination of the lease that governs the placement of the nonconforming permanent off-premises advertising display on the real property pursuant to the terms of that lease; or
 - (2) Destroyed or damaged in excess of 50 percent of its material structural value because of a natural disaster, including, without limitation, a fire, flood, earthquake, windstorm, rainstorm, and/or snowstorm.

18.05.204 Permanent Off-Premises Advertising Displays: Permitted and Prohibited Locations

- (a) **Mapped Locations** The "Off-Premise Advertising Map" shall serve as the official map for Off-Premise Advertising locations. The map is adopted by reference and will be updated in accordance with changes to the referenced zoning and roadway designations, except where noted.
- (b) **Permitted Locations**
 - (1) Off-Premise advertising displays shall be permitted only in areas depicted as "Potential Off-Premise Advertising Locations" on the Off-Premise Advertising Map. These areas shall include:
 - a. Areas in the Industrial (I), Industrial Commercial (IC), and General Commercial (GC) districts when within 100 feet of the edge of the right-of-way line of a major or minor arterial road or freeway unless otherwise prohibited within this article.
 - b. Specific areas depicted as "Permitted Location 1b" on the Off-Premise Advertising Map, when located within 100 feet of the edge of the right-of-way line of a major or minor arterial road or

freeway unless otherwise prohibited by this section. These areas reflect areas within the prior Industrial Business (IB) District prior to adoption of this Title.

- c. Specific areas depicted as "Permitted Location 1c" on the Off-Premise Advertising Map, when located within 100 feet of the edge of the right-of-way line of a major or minor arterial road or freeway unless otherwise prohibited by this section. These areas include properties identified by historic zoning districts (AC, CC, IC, IB or I) prior to being rezoned to MU prior to adoption of this Title. This is a fixed boundary.

(c) Prohibited Locations

- (1) No permanent off-premises advertising display shall be erected closer to a street than the right-of-way line. No portion of any permanent off-premises advertising display may be placed on or extend over the right-of-way line of any street.
- (2) No permanent off-premises advertising display, or part thereof, shall be located on any property without the consent of the owner, holder, lessee, agent, or trustee.
- (3) No permanent off-premises advertising display shall be located within specific areas depicted as "Prohibited Location 3" on the Off-Premise Advertising Map. This area includes property within 300 feet of the centerline of the Truckee River or within 300 feet of the outer boundary of any areas designated in this Title as the Truckee River Corridor or its successor.
- (4) No permanent off-premises advertising display shall be erected within 300 lineal feet of a residentially zoned parcel on the same side of the street.
- (5) The number of permanent off-premises advertising displays located within 300 feet of the centerline or within the boundaries of the following areas shall not exceed the number of legally existing permanent off-premises advertising displays in that location on July 1, 2012:
 - a. Interstate 80 right-of-way from Robb Drive to the most western city limit.
 - b. U.S. 395 right-of-way from Panther Drive to the most northern city limit.
 - c. Specific areas depicted as Restricted Locations 5c.1 through 5c.7, inclusive on the Off-Premise Advertising Map. These areas reflect certain zoning districts that were in place prior to adoption of this Title, including: the Downtown Reno Regional Center Plan (5c.1), the East 4th Street TOD Corridor (5c.2), Mill Street TOD Corridor (5c.2), the Medical Regional Center (5c.2), the Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan (5c.2), the northern section of the South Virginia Street TOD (5c.2), and the Midtown District (5c.2). These are fixed boundaries.
 - d. If any off-premises advertising displays are removed from the areas identified in Sections 18.05.204(c)(5)a. ? c., above, the maximum number of permanent off-premises advertising displays allowed in the identified area shall be reduced accordingly. The removed signs shall not be replaced or banked.
 - e. This subsection neither prohibits relocation of existing off-premises displays within the above locations nor reconstruction of existing off-premises advertising displays provided that the relocated and/or reconstructed permanent off-premises advertising display conforms with this article.
- (6) No permanent off-premises advertising displays shall be located within 200 feet of the right-of-way of McCarran Boulevard except within the following locations:
 - a. Talbot Lane east to Mill Street.
 - b. Northtowne Lane west to Sutro Street.

-
- c. This subsection neither prohibits relocation of existing off-premises displays within the above locations nor reconstruction of existing off-premises advertising displays provided that the relocated and/or reconstructed permanent off-premises advertising display conforms with this article.
 - (7) The number of permanent off-premises advertising displays within 300 feet of the centerline of U.S. 395 from Patriot Boulevard to Neil Road shall not exceed seven permanent off-premises advertising displays.
 - (8) The number of permanent off-premises advertising displays located within annexation areas that are regulated by Washoe County specific plans shall not exceed the number of legally existing off-premises permanent advertising displays as of their respective effective dates of annexation,
 - a. If permanent off-premises advertising displays are not specifically listed as an allowed use in the pertinent specific plan, permanent off-premises advertising displays shall be prohibited.
 - b. Reconstruction of an existing off-premises advertising display is allowed provided that the reconstructed off-premises advertising display conforms with this article.
 - (9) No permanent off-premises advertising display, or part thereof, shall be located within a Historic or Conservation District.
 - (d) **Prohibited Digital Displays** No permanent off-premises digital advertising display, or part thereof, shall be located within City of Reno or the City of Reno Sphere of Influence.

18.05.205 General Standards for Permanent Off-Premises Advertising Displays

- (a) The area of display surface shall be the total square feet of geometric area of display surfaces which comprise the total off-premises advertising display, except the structure. The computation of display surface of a back-to-back off-premises advertising display shall be limited to one display surface.
 - (b) No off-premises advertising display shall have a primary display surface, not including allowed cut-outs, greater than 672 square feet.
 - (c) A cut-out shall not exceed ten percent of the primary surface area of the off-premises display.
 - (d) No off-premises advertising display shall exceed 35 feet in height as measured from the surface of the road grade to which the sign is oriented to the highest point of the off-premises advertising display. If the off-premises advertising display is oriented to more than one road grade, the lowest road grade shall be the reference point.
 - (e) No off-premises advertising display shall be located closer than 750 feet to the next off-premises advertising display on either side of the same street. No mechanically changeable off-premises advertising display shall be located closer than 1,000 feet to the next mechanically changeable off-premises advertising display on either side of the same street.
 - (f) All off-premises advertising displays shall be maintained in a clean and well-functioning condition. Surface shall be neatly painted. Property immediately surrounding off-premises advertising displays shall be maintained and kept free of litter, rubbish, weeds, and debris. Any off-premises display deemed to be a nuisance as defined in Chapter 8.22, Nuisances, shall be enforced as provided for in Chapter 1.05, Code Enforcement.
 - (g) The permit/inventory number, as assigned by the Administrator shall be displayed on every permanent off-premises advertising display.
 - (h) The reverse side of a cut-out shall be dull and non-reflective.
 - (i) The reverse side of a single-face off-premises advertising display shall be dull and non-reflective.
-

-
- (j) No tree may be removed for the purpose of erecting an off-premises advertising display. If an existing tree would impact the visibility of a site which otherwise meets the requirements of Sections 18.05.204 and 18.05.205, above, a variance to the spacing requirements may be requested. If the variance to the spacing requirements is denied as a final action, the tree may be removed. If the variance to spacing requirements is approved, the tree may not be removed.
 - (k) Off-premises advertising displays shall be of monopole design.
 - (l) All lighting shall be directed toward the off-premises advertising display.
 - (m) An off-premises advertising display may not contain more than two faces and one face may not be angled from the other face by more than 20 degrees as measured from the back of the structure supporting the face.

18.05.206 Prohibited Types of Off-Premises Advertising Displays

The following off-premises advertising displays are prohibited:

- (a) Signs which emit noise via artificial devices;
- (b) Roof signs;
- (c) Signs which produce odor, sound, smoke, fire, or other such emissions;
- (d) Stacked signs;
- (e) Temporary signs except as otherwise provided in Sections 18.05.208 and 18.05.209;
- (f) Wall signs;
- (g) Signs with more than two faces;
- (h) Building wraps; and
- (i) Computer controlled variable message electronic signs.

18.05.207 Expiration and Redemption of Banked Receipts; Litigation Stay

- (a) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the removal of any existing, permanent off-premises advertising displays, or extinguish or impair the rights of any existing holders of banked receipt(s).
- (b) **Expiration of Banked Receipts**
 - (1) Banked receipts issued by the City prior to July 19, 2012 expire 15 years after the date of issuance.
 - (2) Banked receipts issued by the City after July 18, 2012 expire three years after the date of issuance.
 - (3) Banked receipts issued by the City in connection with any litigation expire in accordance with the terms and conditions of any applicable:
 - a. Court order; or
 - b. Settlement agreement.
- (c) **Application** The holder of an unexpired and valid banked receipt may submit a sign permit application to the City to construct a permanent off-premises advertising display. At a minimum, the sign permit application shall include the following:
 - (1) The banked receipt which is being exchanged for the proposed off-premises advertising display. Such receipt shall include the inventory number assigned by the City of Reno and proof that a minimum ratio of one square foot of the display represented by the banked receipt is exchanged for one square foot

of new display construction. Should the proposed construction exceed the size of the banked receipt display an additional banked receipt shall be redeemed.

- (2) A description of the proposed site prepared by a land surveyor, licensed by the State of Nevada, demonstrating compliance with the applicable zoning and spacing criteria contained in this chapter;
 - (3) Dimensions of the proposed new permanent off-premises advertising display;
 - (4) Structural calculations and related engineering specifications;
 - (5) Signature of the holder of the banked receipt;
 - (6) Signature of the applicant; and
 - (7) Any other information requested by the City reasonably required to promote the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community, and control the location and soundness of the proposed permanent off-premises advertising display.
- (d) **Redemption of Banked Receipt** Upon review and in accordance with the applicable zoning, spacing, and general standards contained in this chapter, the Administrator shall issue a permit authorizing the holder of a banked receipt to construct a new permanent off-premises advertising display on the proposed site. Upon completion of construction, the legally established, permanent off-premises advertising display shall be deemed nonconforming for the purposes of this chapter.
- (e) **Litigation Stay** Notwithstanding Sections 18.05.207(a)-(d), until the validity of banked receipts issued prior to October 24, 2012 is resolved in *Scenic Nevada v. City of Reno, et al.*, Case No CV17-00361, the City shall not accept any permit applications authorizing the construction of new, permanent off-premises advertising display based on banked receipts issued prior to October 24, 2012, not in connection with any prior litigation. Banked receipts created because of ReTRAC shall be accepted.

18.05.208 Temporary Off-Premises Advertising Displays

Off-premises temporary advertising displays are allowed without permit on private property in any zoning district with the permission of the owner(s), holder(s) lessee(s), agent(s), or trustee(s) as applicable, when the temporary off-premises advertising displays:

- (a) Are located in any zoning district within ½ radial mile of the site on which the activity will take place;
- (b) Shall be a maximum of six square feet;
- (c) Shall be designed to be stable under all weather conditions, including high winds;
- (d) Shall not obstruct the vision triangle as defined and set forth in Section 18.04.601(b) or traffic control device or impair access to a sidewalk, street, driveway, bus stop, or fire hydrant; and
- (e) Displayed for less than 12 hours each day, no earlier than 6:00 a.m. or later than 9:00 p.m.

18.05.209 Temporary Off-Premises Advertising Displays for Special Events

A holder of a special event's permit may apply for a building permit pursuant to Title 14, Buildings and Construction, to erect a temporary off-premises advertising display promoting the special event provided the temporary off-premises advertising display:

- (a) Complies with this article, as applicable;
 - (b) The applicant has obtained a permit to hold a special event;
 - (c) The proposal complies with City policies if the applicant seeks to use City-owned improvements such as poles designed for temporary signs or buildings;
-

-
- (d) Such off-premises advertising displays, when permitted, shall not be installed prior to 30 days before and shall be removed within ten after the special event advertised;
 - (e) The temporary off-premises advertising display shall not exceed 100 square feet;
 - (f) The temporary off-premises advertising display shall be designed to be stable under all weather conditions, including high winds; and
 - (g) The temporary off-premises advertising display shall not obstruct the sight distance triangle as defined in Section 18.04.601(b) nor a traffic control device or impair access to a sidewalk, street, highway, driveway, bus stop or fire hydrant.

18.05.210 Abandoned Off-Premises Advertising Displays

- (a) Abandonment is the cessation of the right to continue the existence of a permanent off-premise advertising display:
 - (1) Under existing law;
 - (2) When a state of disrepair exists because of substantial tearing, chipping, or missing material 30 days after receipt of notice sent pursuant to Chapter 1.05, Code Enforcement;
 - (3) When there is no current business license in existence for the owner(s) of the off-premises advertising display; or
 - (4) When there has been no display for a period of one year with respect to a permanent off-premises advertising display.
- (b) Any off-premises advertising display determined to be abandoned shall reduce the number of off-premises advertising displays allowed under Section 18.05.203(b).

18.05.211 Time Limitations on Review of Applications for Off-Premises Advertising Displays

The following are time limitations on the pertinent decision-maker to review applications for off-premises advertising displays as applicable:

- (a) The Administrator shall review and make a decision regarding an application for an off-premises display within five working days of the date the application is filed-stamped by the Community Development Department, on the appropriate form and with payment of the appropriate fee, if any.
- (b) The Administrator shall review and make a decision regarding an application for a temporary or special events off-premises advertising display within two working days of the date the application is filed-stamped by the Community Development Department, on the appropriate form and with the appropriate fee, if any.
- (c) If the Hearing Examiner or the Planning Commission review the application, Hearing Examiner or the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing within 65 days of the date the application is filed-stamped with the Community Development Department.
- (d) The Hearing Examiner or Planning Commission shall make its decision within 30 days from the date of the opening of the public hearing.
- (e) The City Council shall make its decision within 30 days of the date of the opening of the public hearing.
- (f) If the applicant requests a continuance or a specified time or date for the matter to be heard, the timelines provided herein are deemed waived.

18.05.212 Appeal of Administrator's Decision

- (a) Aggrieved persons may appeal the Administrator's decision to the City Council by filing a written appeal setting forth how they are aggrieved and the reasons for the appeal within five days of the Administrator's written decision.
- (b) The City Clerk shall set the hearing before the City Council at the next available City Council meeting at least 15 days in the future.

18.05.213 Decisions regarding Off-Premises Advertising Display

- (a) Decisions shall be in writing.
- (b) Decisions shall include an explanation setting forth the reasons for the decisions.

18.05.214 Regulated Off-Premises Advertising Display

All off-premises signs erected or located in the city, which are not exempted by federal or state law, are subject to the provisions of this article and Title 14, Buildings and Construction.

18.05.215 Permit Required

Except as otherwise provided, no person may erect, enlarge, alter (except for normal maintenance), or relocate within the city, any sign without first having obtained a sign permit.

Chapter 18.09 Rules of Construction and Definitions

Article 4 All Other Terms Defined

Sign

A design or device displayed to the public for the purpose of identifying, advertising or promoting the interests of any person, persons, firm, corporation or other entity by conveying an advertising message, a non-commercial message or attracting the attention of the public. This definition shall include all parts of such a device, including its structure and supports and shall also include balloons, flags, banners, building wrap, pennants, streamers, canopies, or other devices which are used to attract the attention of the public, whether or not they convey a specific advertising message.

The definition of "sign" above includes the following specific sign types, which are further defined below:

Abandoned Sign

A sign that has not been maintained in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance for a period in excess of 90 days following legal notice from the Administrator to the owner of property and the owner of the advertising display that said sign does not meet minimum maintenance standards or the cessation of the right to continue the use of an off-premises advertising display.

Advertising Display

Any arrangement of material or symbols erected, constructed, carved, painted, shaped or otherwise created for the purpose of advertising or promoting the commercial interests of any person, persons, firm, corporation, or other entity, located in view of the general public. This definition shall include signs,

billboards, posters, graphic advertising messages, flags, banners, balloons, building wrap, canopies, pennants, streamers, or other devices which used to attract attention, advertising copy, accessory signs and similar displays, but shall not include courtesy bus benches bearing advertising placed in public rights-of-way and covered by the City of Reno/Regional Transportation Commission Franchise Agreement. Advertising structure means any structure or device erected for the purpose of supporting any sign or other advertising display, and the framework of the sign. For the purposes of sign or advertising display removal, the removal shall include advertising structures.

Animated Sign

A sign which meets the definition of changeable sign as contained in this chapter or a tri-vision display.

Architectural graphic

A painted design, mural, relief, mosaic or similar feature of an artistic nature which is incorporated into the architectural design of a building and conveys no advertising message.

Area Identification Sign

A permanent, decorative sign used to identify a neighborhood, subdivision, commercial or office complex, industrial district or similar distinct area of the community.

Awning

See, Canopy Sign.

Back-to-back sign

A structure with two parallel and directly opposite signs with their faces oriented in opposite directions. A back-to-back sign shall constitute one off-premises sign or billboard.

Banner

A temporary sign made of any on-rigid fabric-like material that is mounted to a pole at one or more edges. National flags, state or municipal flags shall not be considered banners.

Billboard

See, Off-Premises Advertising Display.

Building Wrap

A sign applied to or painted on, all or a portion of a building exterior wall(s). Building wraps include the application of a flexible material to a building containing an off-premises advertising display.

Canopy Sign

A sign affixed or applied to the exterior facing surface or surfaces of a building or freestanding canopy. Canopy signs may not project above the roof line. Signs attached to a canopy will be considered a wall sign when flashed back to the canopy.

Changeable Sign

A sign whose informational content can be changed or altered by manual or electric, electro-mechanical, or electronic means. Changeable signs include the following types:

- a. Manually activated. Signs whose alphabetic, pictographic, or symbolic informational content can be changed or altered by manual means.
- b. Electrically activated. Signs whose alphabetic, pictographic, or symbolic informational content can be changed or altered on a fixed display surface composed of electrically illuminated or mechanically driven changeable segments. Includes the following two types:
 - i. Fixed message electronic signs. Signs whose basic informational content has been preprogrammed to include only certain types of information projection, such as time, temperature, predictable traffic conditions, or other events subject to prior programming.

-
- ii. Computer controlled variable message electronic signs. These are signs whose informational content can be changed or altered by means of computer-driven electronic impulses. A common example of this type of sign would be a digital advertising display.
 - c. Mechanically changeable signs. These are signs that contain mechanically driven changeable segments. A common example of this type of manually changeable sign would be a Tri-Vision type display.

Community Directory Sign

A sign, or a group of signs designed as a single display, which gives information.

Directional Sign

A permanent sign which directs the flow of traffic or pedestrians on private property.

Directory Sign

A sign, or a group of signs designed as a single display, which gives information about the location of businesses, buildings or addresses within a residential, office, commercial or industrial complex.

Drive-Through Sign

Any permanent sign accessory to allowed drive-through facilities.

Electronic Readerboard

See, Changeable Signs, Electrically Activated.

Facing or Surface

The surface of a sign upon, against, or through which the message is displaced or illustrated.

Flashing Sign

A sign which uses blinking, flashing or intermittent illumination, either direct, or indirect or internal.

Freestanding Sign

A sign that is supported by its own structure apart from a building including, but not limited to, monument signs and pole signs, as further defined in this section.³²

Inflatable Sign

Any device that is supported by air pressure or inflated with air or gas which is used to attract the attention of the public, whether or not it displays any specific advertising message.

Mobile Sign

A sign attached to or suspended from any type of vehicle, other than normal identification of the business owned and served by the vehicle. Mobile signs shall not include those normally painted on or attached permanently to a franchised mass-transit vehicle or taxicab, nor shall mobile signs include special events signs.

Monument Sign³³

A permanent on-premise freestanding sign with a low profile and having a base and support structure with a solid appearance that is at least as wide as the width of the widest part of the sign's face.

Official Sign

Any sign erected by or at the direction of a governmental agency.

Off-Premises Advertising Display

Any arrangement of material, words, symbols or any other display erected, constructed, carved, painted, shaped or otherwise created for the purpose of advertising or promoting the commercial interests of any person, persons, firm, corporation or other entity, located in view of the general public, which is not

³² Clarity was needed in determining which types are signs are considered freestanding.

³³ This term is used in the sign section of code but never defined. This definition will help staff when applying code.

principally sold, available or otherwise provided on the premises on which the display is located. An off-premises advertising display includes its structure. Off-premises advertising displays are commonly called billboards.

Off-Premises Advertising Display, Permanent

A permanent off-premises advertising display is a sign displayed for more than 12 hours in a day and for longer than 30 consecutive days, except signs for special events.

Off-Premises Advertising Display, Conforming Permanent

An off-premises advertising device that is constructed or erected in conformance with all applicable local ordinances and codes in effect on the date a building permit is issued for the off-premises advertising display.

Off-Premises Advertising Display, Temporary

A temporary off-premises advertising display is a sign displayed only temporarily and is not permanently mounted.

Off-Premises Digital (also known as Digital Off-Premises) Advertising Display

A type of computer controlled variable electronic message for off-premises signs whose informational content can be changed or altered by means of computer-driven electronic impulses.

On-Premises Sign

Any arrangement of material, words, symbols or any other display erected, constructed, carved, painted, shaped or otherwise created for the purpose of advertising or promoting the commercial interests of any person, persons, firm, corporation or other entity, located in view of the general public, which is principally sold, available or otherwise provided on the premises on which the display is located.

Pennant

A temporary sign made of any lightweight plastic, fabric, or other material, whether or not containing a message of any kind, suspended from a rope, wire, string, or other similar device usually in series, designed to move in the wind.

Permanent Sign

Any sign that is designed, constructed and affixed at the site in such a manner that it cannot be conveniently moved from place to place.

Pole Sign

Any [freestanding](#) sign that is supported by a pole (sometimes more than one) and otherwise separated from other structures, buildings, and the ground by air.

Portable Sign

Any sign that is designed and constructed in such a manner that it can conveniently be moved from place to place. This definition shall include cardboard, paper, fabric, canvas and plastic banners and signs.

Projecting Sign

Any sign, other than a wall sign, that projects from and is supported by a wall of a building or structure.

Roof Sign

Any sign located on the roof, of a building and either supported by the roof or by an independent structural frame. A sign which is attached flat against the wall of a penthouse or other similar roof structure or architectural blade shall not be considered a roof sign that does not extend above the roof line.

Stacked Sign

Two or more off-premises signs affixed to the same standards which are not back-to-back signs and which vary in height from the ground.

Temporary Sign

A sign which is which is not permanently mounted and is designed and constructed in such a manner that it

can be conveniently moved from place to place and is allowed by Chapter 18.16 to remain in use for a limited time only.

Wall Sign

A sign attached to or erected against the wall of a building or structure with the exposed face of the sign in a parallel plane to the plane of the wall.

Wind Sign

Any display or series of displays, banners, flags, balloons or other objects designed and fashioned in such a manner as to move when subjected to wind pressure.

Sign Structure

Those parts of a sign designed to support it in place.

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Martin Fineman <dogcatdocreno@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Wed 10/9/2024 10:39 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Dr. Martin Fineman

9900 Wilbur May Pkwy Apt 2802 Reno, NV 89521-4028

dogcatdocreno@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Gina Hames <ginahames@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Wed 10/9/2024 8:50 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Gina Hames

160 Ryland St Apt 1A Reno, NV 89501-2292

ginahames@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Nancy Radford <nancyradford@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Wed 10/9/2024 9:00 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

No thank you, please.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nancy Radford

7623 Jimson Dr Reno, NV 89511-1365

nancyradford@charter.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Pat Wallace <reno1334@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Wed 10/9/2024 7:30 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

First was to water down the Building Zoning Laws, now the beauty, and what could become beautiful they want to reverse a common signage ordinance? As one individual that had to work with the city in the 1970 & 1980s to get signage and Billboards approved for the Old Harrah's including preparing simple colors renderings of the signs for approval, to go to something that sounds like anything goes would be a shame and I'd be embarrassed to bring our guests downtown, so it would drive locals away from downtown.

As one would say "Don't"

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Pat Wallace

13340 Fieldcreek Ln Reno, NV 89511-6603

reno1334@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Carol Fiechtl Steiger <business4carol@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 1:38 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs Carol Fiechtl Steiger

3122 Vincinato Dr Sparks, NV 89434-7317

business4carol@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Sharon Young <the_myrrh@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 4:08 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sharon Young

2300 Dickerson Rd Reno, NV 89503-4946

the_myrrh@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Thomas Beard <tebeard02@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 2:59 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

City has gone down hill for the last 20 years. Get the damn Republicans out of city hall and county government. We have almost no quality of life left in Reno.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Thomas Beard

13332 Travertine Ln Reno, NV 89511-5946

tebeard02@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Colleen Dane <colleendane@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 12:21 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Colleen Dane

4155 Flintlock Cir Reno, NV 89519-2968

colleendane@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Teresa Schriewer <schriewert@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 12:21 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Teresa Schriewer

1990 Geiger Grade Rd Reno, NV 89521-8447

schriewert@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Bradley Schriewer <schriewerb@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 12:21 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr Bradley Schriewer

1990 Geiger Grade Rd Reno, NV 89521-8447

schriewerb@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Erin Albright <erin@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 10:14 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown Reno is already an eyesore with the torn down buildings (mainly by Jacob's Entertainment and Seigel), failure of Jacob's Entertainment to bring its vision to fruition in a timely manner, homeless people everywhere, and the lack of any businesses/restaurants/experiences to draw locals and visitors. The addition of these signs will make Reno look even more low rent than it already. As a local who was born and raised in Reno, its a travesty to see what this city council has allowed to happen to downtown (and, not too mention, South Meadows/Damonte Ranch).

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Erin Albright

10663 Fire Poppy Cir Reno, NV 89521-6272

erin@renotahoelife.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Renee Lauderback <chickeata@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 10:35 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

!!!!!! WHAT THE HECK ARE YOU PEOPLE THINKING????!!!!!!

If you truly do love Reno, which in your position you better, or leave,,,, You WOULD PUT AN IMMEDIATE STOP TO THE DISGUSTING NOTION OF OBNOXIOUS, OFFENSIVE and DISTASTEFUL Neon and large signage in our already suffering downtown area!!!!!! How WRONG of you!!! WAKE UP !!!

Downtown Reno used to be beautiful,,,Look what you've done to the entire downtown area! The character has been obliterated block by block. IS MONEY THE ONLY THING YOU CARE ABOUT?! Ugly mega apartment buildings looming everywhere right at the sidewalks!!! Zero conscientious foresight, zero class, zero consideration on your part leaves us true Renoites wondering what is wrong with our City officials brains!

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too. PLEASE WAKE UP.... Maybe someone should put a neon sign up by your bedroom window.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Renee Lauderback

2021 Watt St Reno, NV 89509-3763

chickeata@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Lynne Cuttone <lcuttone.lc@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 8:18 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Lynne Cuttone

10635 Birch Point Ct Reno, NV 89521-6267

lcuttone.lc@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Gaia Brown <gaiabrown@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 8:38 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

We are the Biggest Little City -- not a poor person's Las Vegas. Growth is inevitable, but trashy glitz doesn't have to be. The flashes of sun off the Truckee and the snow on the mountains give us the kind of vibe we should be promoting. And downtown should be at least as much for the locals as for tourists. And you know, we might attract more tourists if we emphasize our natural beauty.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Gaia Brown

4345 Mountaingate Dr Reno, NV 89519-7916

gaiabrown@me.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Charlotte Voitoff <cvoitoff@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Tue 10/8/2024 8:40 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Charlotte Voitoff

3310 Sunnyvale Ave Reno, NV 89509-5057

cvoitoff@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Mike Barnes <mblouisphotography@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 11:13 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mike Barnes

455 E 2nd St Reno, NV 89502-1020

mblouisphotography@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Susan Stephens <s.stephens.ret.un@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 7:23 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

Before I start, allow me to reiterate that we Americans are the ultimate energy hogs. Even in these times of climate emergency. Profit appears to be the blanket just.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too. Bad taste?

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms Susan Stephens

245 McClellan Dr Washoe Valley, NV 89704-9728

s.stephens.ret.un@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Sara Lafrance <saralafrance1@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 6:10 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

It is frustrating to see the city consider discarding existing sign regulations, which are meant to regulate the proliferation of digital and other signs. We see this as an invitation to downtown property owners to clutter their businesses with multiple signs "by right" – no public input, no public hearings.

Allowing more signs won't improve the aesthetics of downtown, which has a somewhat tacky and outdated vibe. Over time, it could lead to sign wars with businesses competing for attention like carnival barkers with megaphones. We see no reason to allow more garish digital signs and sign clutter to make it worse.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sara Lafrance

6005 Lake Geneva Dr Reno, NV 89511-5050

saralafrance1@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Elizabeth Weyman <eweyman@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 9:48 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Elizabeth Weyman

15140 Redmond Loop Reno, NV 89511-4579

eweyman@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Tom Clark <tclark742@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 9:43 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

Hillary ShieveCity staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr Tom Clark

3145 Penfield Cir Reno, NV 89502-9639

tclark742@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From David Horne <kinfolk-09.infirm@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 4:02 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

You will lose the "Biggest Little City " reputation and increase the light pollution so that no stars will be visible!

Come on who is passing money under the table?

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr David Horne

6158 Sunrise Meadows Loop Reno, NV 89519-7382

kinfolk-09.infirm@icloud.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Susan Lewis <notsosuttle1@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 8:56 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Susan Lewis

3805 Aspen Holw Reno, NV 89511-3288

notsosuttle1@hotmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Jacqueline Dawson <jacquendawson@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Mon 10/7/2024 8:37 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jacqueline Dawson

535 Marsh Ave Reno, NV 89509-1416

jacquendawson@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Mark Wray <mwrap@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 9:25 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

The City staff is pushing for unlimited signage in the "entertainment" district. If you allow that, are you going to then allow other businesses in the city to do the same thing? If the staff gets its way and signs 100 feet tall sprout up all over downtown, might as well throw out all of Reno's sign ordinances and call ourselves "Las Vegas North". I don't particularly care for what I see in Las Vegas, and a large part of that is the seeming unlimited signage everywhere. We can be better than Las Vegas. We ARE better than Las Vegas. Don't turn our town into a junkbox of big, flashing, ugly signs. The people of this town voted in 2000 to be rid of billboards. While the signs that staff are proposing would be on-premise signs, if the people were allowed to vote, they would be opposed to unlimited on-premise signs just like they are opposed to billboards. Why staff would want to push this on our citizens is anyone's guess, but it makes no sense and it is not only poor planning, it is the opposite of planning at all.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mark Wray

2802 Outlook Dr Reno, NV 89509-3951

mwrap@markwraylaw.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Cheri Martin <cheriamartin99@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 7:57 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Really I can't believe you are serious with this. The light pollution alone is astonishing here in Reno. Casinos and downtown don't have to look like this. If they get to put up a digital sign they should have to plant 100 trees in this paved desert. Show some foresight.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms Cheri Martin

4289 Cutting Horse Cir Reno, NV 89519-2998

cheriamartin99@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Linda Mezieres <mitchmez@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 6:56 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Linda Mezieres

1333 W Mulberry Dr Phoenix, AZ 85013-4028

mitchmez@hotmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Jean Sprague <jeansprague26@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 4:33 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jean Sprague

173 Hanby Ave Bishop, CA 93514-2820

jeansprague26@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Marilyn Naylor <naylorhome@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 3:43 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

Please do not allow changes to the sign code that would allow any business in the downtown district to have practically unlimited signage regulations.

The public has been led to believe that Reno's new brand is as a hub for the tech industry and as a home to many great new innovative businesses. The University of Nevada, very near downtown, is a key part of that identity and will contribute to that vision as a " leader in research and creativity". A myriad of signs in Reno's city center will not characterize that new brand. UNR students and potential permanent residents will definitely not be attracted to live in the downtown area as brightly lit signs create light pollution that negatively impacts mental health and human behavior.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marilyn Naylor

1005 Dunbar Dr Washoe Valley, NV 89704-9201

naylorhome@charter.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From John Linden <nyyankeejohn@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 2:33 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Linden

9955 Bandana Way Reno, NV 89521-6163

nyyankeejohn@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Shelley Beckett <shelbeck1168@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 9:27 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Shelley Beckett

5415 Fenno Way Reno, NV 89519-2195

shelbeck1168@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Robert Tschida <bobtschida1@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 9:21 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Tschida

3022 Sydney Cir Washoe Valley, NV 89704-9770

bobtschida1@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From S Belk <tastodo@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 7:12 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

What is the purpose of allowing the signage to become tacky? Are you purposely trying to chase people (and their money) away? I already have no problem seeing the casino signs from south Reno.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S Belk

2414 Iron Square Dr Reno, NV 89521-8658

tastodo@aol.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Barbara Lee <bjlcpa@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sun 10/6/2024 5:34 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Lee

PO Box 519 Spicewood, TX 78669-0519

bjlcpa@aol.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Joan Love <joannecatlover@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 9:26 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Joan Love

2245 Peavine Valley Rd Reno, NV 89523-3825

joannecatlover@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From mary sande <marysande@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 6:17 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

Dear Council Members,

Our community has the right to ban unlimited signage, large billboards and especially digital ones; (Note Austin vs Reagan 2022) for the sake of aesthetic, safety and environmental concerns. Too many details for this message but---

Reno's current metro population is 538,000 and growing and do you see them flocking to the downtown area?--NO. Will I bring my visitors from out of town downtown?--NO

I like casinos and what they offer but I don't like the vibe on the streets and this Unlimited Signage is just another damaging effect on an already trashy area.

I can see this type of advertising on billboards along highways but next to the property is hard to justify and wonder if it works anyway. Flooding a street with multiple signs is not effective.

Signage should not be unlimited. If a business wants a new sign then the old ones have to be taken down.

I am strongly against this proposal and request that you do not change the City's sign code

Thank You,

Mary Sande

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. mary sande

4284 Ross Dr Reno, NV 89519-2943

marysande@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Jesse Ruppert <nikomagirl@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 5:57 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

Nevada is such a beautiful state. Northern Nevada is distinctly different from Las Vegas, we should strive to not only maintain, but also increase this difference. Rather than more lights, how about less? In the far north we are blessed with a dark sky sanctuary. Our little city has grown so much that even on the outskirts one can barely see the Milky Way. Have you considered instead a shift to dark sky-friendly lighting for the entire city? This would be much better for our citizens, not to mention the environment and cost to the city and patrons for lights. Please do not allow further light pollution to our city.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jesse Ruppert

5895 Sunset Ridge Ct Reno, NV 89511-4363

nikomagirl@hotmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Mary Sande <marysande@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 5:38 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Sande

4284 Ross Dr Reno, NV 89519-2943

marysande@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Kathy Newman <newmankelly@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 5:02 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

We already have too much light pollution. And one of the wonderful things about Reno is that it is not Vegas.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms Kathy Newman

4490 Reno, NV 89509

newmankelly@comcast.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From George Woodside <grwsystems@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 4:57 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr George Woodside

2370 Lincoln Meadows Dr Reno, NV 89521-5229

grwsystems@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Cynthia Kimball <cindykimball25@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 4:40 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Cynthia Kimball

5565 Wedgewood Cir Sparks, NV 89436-3716

cindykimball25@hotmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Lisa Daines <daineslisa@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 12:25 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs Lisa Daines

235 Falling Water Ct Reno, NV 89519-2167

daineslisa@charter.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From John Gray <john.f.gry@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 12:09 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Dr. John Gray

4284 Muirwood Cir Reno, NV 89509-7002

john.f.gry@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Mike Lewandowski <baplew.michael@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 10:35 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mike Lewandowski

3370 Southampton Dr Reno, NV 89509-6837

baplew.michael@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Michael Johnson <m.johnson8993@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 9:46 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr Michael Johnson

5485 Fenno Way Reno, NV 89519-2195

m.johnson8993@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Sandi Beckett <skbeckett53@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 9:26 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sandi Beckett

5485 Fenno Way Reno, NV 89519-2195

skbeckett53@gmail.com

Comments on new proposed signage language in the RMC

From Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>

Date Sat 10/5/2024 9:25 AM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Good morning,

While I accept that our Downtown casinos have valid reasons for wanting large signs to advertise their business, I am opposed to broadening the RMC to all any and all businesses to have the right to up to 100 foot high signage in Downtown Reno.

As a long time Downtown resident, my vision for Downtown is a true mixed use where Residents' interests are equally balanced with those of businesses. For me, this means that the appearance of Downtown is equally balanced such that Residents are not bombarded with large signs in their neighborhood.

In my opinion, the current, suggested signage revisions are heavily slanted to the benefit of business interests and are not compatible to Residential uses, especially when the City of Reno wants to attract more infill for residential growth.

Kind Regards,
Gary Cecil
255 N Sierra St
Reno

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Carol Raphel <c.raphel@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 8:54 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Additionally, it will add to the growing light pollution that is destroying what is left of any dark skies over the Truckee Meadows. The flashing digital signs already installed on casinos are a night-time nuisance to anyone living outside the downtown core, especially the GSR signage.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Carol Raphel

3240 Markridge Dr Reno, NV 89509-8906

c.raphel@att.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Ashleigh Henry <hen.ash.dev@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 8:27 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ashleigh Henry

1310 Lander St Reno, NV 89509-2654

hen.ash.dev@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Tracy Girdwood <tracygirdwood@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 6:37 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Tracy Girdwood

1170 Wyoming Ave Reno, NV 89503-3321

tracygirdwood@att.net

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Paula Scholer <bodhidiva@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 5:18 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

We are not and do not want to be Las Vegas!

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms Paula Scholer

15155 Western Springs Dr Reno, NV 89521-8487

bodhidiva@yahoo.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Joanne Husar <husarj@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 3:57 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Joanne Husar

1622 W 25th St Apt 4 Los Angeles, CA 90007-1530

husarj@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Lori Wray <lwrap@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 3:14 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

I don't understand why staff is reaching back to a previous version of code to justify allowing the biggest signs possible for the non-casino businesses in the downtown entertainment district. Reno citizens have shown their opposition to big, bright signs over and over again. Reno voters overwhelmingly voted to ban new billboards. I know these signs aren't billboards, but they could be even bigger, taller and definitely brighter (because digital billboards are banned, too) than any that we have in town. Downtown looks outdated and cluttered now. Adding more sign clutter will just make it worse. Forward thinking cities have strong sign controls to protect the aesthetics for everyone. Certainly, they don't reach into the past. This proposal isn't in line with what's been accomplished so far to limit signs and provide a better aesthetic.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting. That means big, bright digital displays, running videos, or flashing changing messages day and night - by right - no public hearings, no public input.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Ms. Lori Wray

2802 Outlook Dr Reno, NV 89509-3951

lwrap@markwraylaw.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Judith Lockwood <sarman.lockwood@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 3:07 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Judith Lockwood

3810 N Westpoint Dr Reno, NV 89509-6874

sarman.lockwood@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Thelma Matlin <thelmatmatlin@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 2:40 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Light pollution is not good for birds. The distraction to drives is dangerous. There is no redeeming value to these signs.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Thelma Matlin

4755 Bradford Ln Reno, NV 89519-0936

thelmatmatlin@gmail.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Paul Malikowski <paul@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 2:35 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Paul Malikowski

4755 Cedarhill Ln Reno, NV 89519-0939

paul@nvlaw.com

I am writing to you today regarding a very important issue

From Max Duchaine <max.duchaine@everyactioncustom.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 2:02 PM

To Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Dear Angela Fuss,

I am opposed to allowing all businesses in the downtown Mixed-Use – Entertainment District (MD-ED) the same, almost unlimited, signage as casinos.

City staff has prepared changes to the sign code to allow any business – from pawn shops to liquor stores – in the downtown district in addition to casinos to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on number, size or types of lighting.

This is an invitation for more digital displays as big as those put up by casinos. It's also a license to expand sign clutter and further degrade the aesthetics of our city. And having unlimited signage in the "entertainment district" will encourage applications for zone changes by nearby businesses who happen to be outside the entertainment district, so that they can have unlimited signs flashing day and night, too.

Downtown has a reputation as a tired looking honky-tonk of a place. There is no reason to allow more tacky digital signs and unnecessary sign clutter to make it worse. Please protect our downtown from further degradation by scrapping this proposal to allow non-casino businesses practically unlimited signage regulations that have always been reserved for casinos.

Sincerely,

Mr. Max Duchaine

1012 14th St NW Washington, DC 20005-3403

max.duchaine@scenic.org

RE: Draft sign code changes

From Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Date Wed 10/2/2024 5:42 PM

To lwray@markwraylaw.com <lwray@markwraylaw.com>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Cc John Hara <countertourist@gmail.com>; Joyce Thompson <jreno1968@gmail.com>; leah.sanders14@gmail.com <leah.sanders14@gmail.com>; Mark Wray <mwray@markwraylaw.com>

Hi Lori,

At this time, we are not planning to make any changes to the redline draft that was presented last week. We anticipate bringing the same draft to the Planning Commission and City Council so that everyone is reviewing the same proposed edits. We will provide both the Planning Commission and City Council with a summary of the feedback received, as well as the written public feedback provided.

Following review and input at the Planning Commission and City Council meetings, we will develop a new proposed draft document based on the feedback and direction received.

Thank you,
Lauren



Lauren Knox, AICP

Senior Planner
Development Services
775-334-2372 (o) or 775-433-8971 (c)
KnoxL@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | Connect with us: 

From: Lori Wray <lwray@markwraylaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 2, 2024 1:27 PM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Cc: John Hara <countertourist@gmail.com>; Joyce Thompson <jreno1968@gmail.com>; leah.sanders14@gmail.com; Mark Wray <mwray@markwraylaw.com>

Subject: Draft sign code changes

Hi Angela and Lauren,

I was wondering if there will be any changes to the draft presented last week since the stakeholder and community meetings have concluded. You had mentioned in a previous email that the proposed changes could be withdrawn if there were "disagreements from the stakeholders and broader community." I'm in

From: [David Porter](#)
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Signing regulations: alternatives to consider
Date: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 12:09:23 PM

Large signs. Only allow large signs if you can eliminate 2 or more billboards for each new sign. Otherwise, please do not allow any more new large signs. We should eliminate the large sign exception for casinos. Why should they get a special break for taking peoples money? I support not adding more sign pollution in Reno or Washoe County!

From: [Gennie Alderson](#)
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Expanding Use of Casino Sign Regulations to other Downtown Businesses
Date: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 6:11:16 PM

Hello -

I am very much OPPOSED to the City of Reno expanding casino sign regulations to other downtown businesses. Our downtown area has gotten junkier & junkier in the last five years or more due in part to Mr. "J" coming in, getting special privileges/incentives and tearing down multiple motels along West Fourth Street (which at least were temporary shelter for housing insecure people who now roam the streets throughout Reno). His large, flashing sign on the side of the J. Resort building, the music piped out into the wider neighborhood, and the tacky looking "Neon District" fabric signs (in shreds at times) which are attached to chain link fencing around vacant lots are all repugnant in my view. I feel like the city council (and/or planning department) have sold us all down the river (no pun or racial slur intended).

What we needed in the West Fourth Street corridor was more affordable housing units, not another "entertainment" district! And what we really don't need are more gigantic flashing signs – we already have enough light pollution! Thank you.

Gennie Alderson
Reno Resident and Homeowner

From: kswan775@gmail.com
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Casino signage
Date: Monday, September 23, 2024 3:21:34 PM

I oppose allowing casino sign size ordinances to apply to any other signage for non casino businesses in Reno.
Don't need additional sign blight. Thank you
Ken Swanson. kswan775@gmail.com 775-530-4665

From: [Peter Neumann](#)
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Cc: [Karl Hall](#)
Subject: Casino sign Regulation proposal for expansion of use
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 4:50:43 PM

September 20, 2024

To: Ms. Lauren Knox
Reno City Hall
One East First Street
Reno, Nevada 89501

Re: Reno Municipal Code "cleanup" amendment proposal relative to downtown Reno outdoor signs

Dear Ms. Knox:

I am Peter Chase Neumann, residing at 1 Elm Court, Reno, Nevada which is adjacent the south bank of the Truckee River and 250 west of the Promenade Center for Independent Living near the west end of Court Street. My home was built by Senator Frances Newlands, in the year 1890, the same year he built his residence, which is 200 feet west of my home.

I respectfully oppose the proposal to expand the city code (as it applies to casino sign regulations) to allow any other downtown Reno business owners or operators to construct, permit, or display additional billboards or signs on their owned or leased properties in the downtown Reno district.

I believe that to do so would be in violation of existing law, and the court-approved stipulation that was entered into and ratified by the Reno City Council and Scenic Nevada organization, in settlement of the long-standing litigation between those two parties.

I also believe that to expand the venerable negotiated settlement giving additional businesses such as bars, pawn shops, tattoo parlors, or any other business properties the right to construct large billboard sized outdoor "signs" would have an additional adverse effect upon Reno's downtown area, which is already affected by many adversities.

Only this week the downtown district of Reno was described only by the London Daily Mail as decidedly "tacky." [Murdoch children arrive for trial over dad Rupert's News Corp empire](#)





Murdoch children arrive for trial over dad
Rupert's News Corp empire

Meriam-Webster dictionary defines "tacky" as:

"Gaudy"; "Dowdy"; "Loud"; "Tawdry"; or "Trashy."

I have made Reno my home for 55 years. Sadly, I cannot disagree with the characterization of it in internationally distributed news publications like the London Daily Mail in describing to its international readers, the appearance and character of downtown Reno, Nevada USA.

Downtown Reno definitely is "tacky." In fact, it is an embarrassing eyesore that many Renoites that I know, are ashamed to display to visiting friends or relatives. I certainly am ashamed of it. When old friends visit me, I make a point of NOT taking them downtown. It is depressing. It is loud. It is ugly. It is **tacky**.

And if the City of Reno amends its code to allow even more billboards on downtown properties, this will only add to the "tackiness," and further discourage the development of attractive, inviting, eco-friendly and hospitable businesses. It will also constitute, in my opinion, a breach of the *implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing* which the City of Reno is obligated by the Rule of Law to afford to the Scenic Nevada organization and the people it represents. In other words, it will precipitate more litigation in the courts.

Please do NOT allow any more outdoor signs and billboards to be displayed in downtown Reno. Reno desperately needs less, not more, billboards.

Sincerely,

Peter Chase Neumann
1 Elm Court, Reno, NV 89501
775-742-3066

From: [Dennis Ghiglieri](#)
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Reject allowing non-casino 100ft signs
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 2:15:27 PM

To: Lauren Knox

I am opposed to expanding the use of casino sign regulations to other businesses downtown. I live near the 4th Street casino area and find that large signs are damaging to the sense of community.

Sincerely,

Dennis Ghiglieri
Reno, NV

From: donna@dannaholland.com
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Business Signs
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 12:58:26 PM

I am opposed to allowing other businesses to have the large signs historically reserved for casinos by expanding the use of casino sign regulations to other businesses downtown. . Let's preserve some of the beauty this valley offers and not make it into another Las Vegas.

Donna Holland
14290 E Windriver Ln
Reno, NV 89511

From: [adrienne.fisher](#)
To: [Lauren.Knox](#)
Subject: Sign codes
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 10:55:14 AM

Hello Ms. Knox, I'd like to express my concern that the City is changing the rules for 100 foot signs to include businesses that are not casinos. We live in a beautiful place, and I hate to think we would litter it with more signs (and billboards) than we already have. I am completely opposed to this change and would even be in support of moving the opposite direction where we don't allow ANY signage of 100 feet. Thanks for reading and sharing my thoughts with the appropriate people.

Adrienne Fisher
30+ year Reno resident

From: [julie.uren](#)
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Signs
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 12:19:53 PM

Hello,
Please note I am adamantly opposed to more signage especially large digital signs in the Reno area.
Thank you,
Julie U'Ren

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: babyjean@protonmail.com
To: [Lauren Knox](#)
Subject: Ugly huge signs
Date: Friday, September 20, 2024 11:00:32 AM

Dear Lauren Knox,

We are opposed to the expansion of casino signs to other businesses. These signs are ugly and should be limited not expanded!

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Tiner
Mrs. Ronnie Tiner

the process of sending out an alert to our membership and I'd like to include the most current information that will go to the planning commission this month.

Thanks,

Lori

Lori Wray, Director
Scenic Nevada
608 Lander Street
Reno, NV 89509
775 848-8288

Re: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

From Leah Sanders <leah.sanders14@gmail.com>

Date Sun 9/22/2024 7:13 PM

To lwray@markwraylaw.com <lwray@markwraylaw.com>

Cc Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>; Mark Wray <mwray@markwraylaw.com>; John Hara <countertourist@gmail.com>; Joyce Thompson <jreno1968@gmail.com>; Alicia Barber <aliciambarber@gmail.com>; dkeats@sbcglobal.net <dkeats@sbcglobal.net>; toniharsh@charter.net <toniharsh@charter.net>; Peter Neumann <pcn@att.net>

Thank you Lori for stating clearly what has been on my mind as well. There is a phrase for what is going on, but it requires colorful inappropriate language. I'm not sure what the city's obligation is presently to developers who may want a big sign. This was not the intent as Title 18 was unveiled. It is not going to help Reno look great and be a city that benefits all. Yes, Reno is tacky...downtown is no longer a place I would want to go. I drive farther to my destinations just to avoid the tackiness.

I'll be on the webinar.

leah sanders

On Sep 22, 2024, at 5:23 PM, Lori Wray <lwray@markwraylaw.com> wrote:

Hi Angela,

Thanks very much for your email. My questions were what are the boundaries of the downtown entertainment district and how many parcels would get the casino signs, under your proposed draft. The map of the "Entertainment District" below, which is about as big as my thumbnail, doesn't really help. But looking at your second red-lined draft version (attached), the Gaming Overlay District on the sign chart was replaced with the MD-ED (Mixed-Use Downtown Entertainment District). The attached map of the MD-ED is from the GIS maps on the city's website. My understanding from your email is that every parcel in the MD-ED will be able to have 100-foot-tall signs by right that can be gigantic digital jumbotrons, because there are no limits on number, size and lighting.

I don't understand your reference to Section 18.08.405. As far as I can tell, it does not exist today in municipal code. I tried to find it in the Zoning Code on the city's website. It jumps from 18.08.403 to 18.18.501. The same is true for 18.16.207 and the table at 18.16-1. It doesn't exist in current code as far as I can tell.

What I think you may be trying to explain is that in an old code somewhere there was a reference to allowing the old DRRC designation to have large signs. That designation was removed and replaced with Gaming Overlay. You say, "When the new zoning code was adopted in 2021, the DRRC designation was deleted, and the new signage language was changed to reference the "Gaming Overlay District".

And, apparently, when that happened someone "inadvertently" forgot to append Footnote 11 to the Gaming Overlay section of the chart. I'm attaching the first red-lined version you presented

to the planning commission in March and April. You told the commissioners that the change was meant to **correct errors** in 18.05.113, the sign chart. Footnote 11 limiting large signage to casinos was already appended to mixed-use districts, which includes MD-ED, but not to the Gaming Overlay district and you wanted to fix that and did. Look at your first red-lined version of Gaming Overlays in the chart. **My point is that the MD-ED district is not allowed the use of casino signs today.** And the sign code chart says so. Removing the Gaming Overlay designation from the sign code chart and replacing it with MD-ED with casino large sign regulations is not reducing signage as you claim but increasing them in the MD-ED.

The Gaming Overlay Districts may be 1,971 acres but adding Footnote 11 on the sign chart corrected the error you discussed with the planning commission. Giving unlimited signage in the Gaming Overlay to that many properties is ludicrous and was never intended, as you know. Look at your footnote 28 (attached) in 18.02 explaining your reasoning for changing this part of the code to match the sign code chart. It says, "28. This was unintentionally left out. Should only apply to gaming facilities within gaming overlays."

Referring to 18.02, you told commissioners, "The intent was just for the casinos, the licensed casinos to be able to have the bigger signs so we added a clarification. We knew what the intent was. We just missed it in specifying within this specific section of code." You append Footnote 2, the same language as Footnote 11, to the gaming overlay section to correct the error.

Reaching back into past code iterations to justify the proposed change now allowing more signage in the MD-ED makes no sense and will have a detrimental impact, adding more tacky signs to a tired looking downtown. Calling your proposal a reduction in signage is disingenuous at best when you know that large signs in the Gaming Overlay were never, ever intended in the first place. Have any tall signs been approved on non-casino properties in recent years in any of the Gaming Overlay districts you show on your map? I can think of two really awful signs, the green Dollar sign (photo attached) and the old Motel 6 sign, both on South Virginia. I don't know if they are in a Gaming Overlay or not. But both look to be at least 60 feet tall and are two examples of how awful these signs are. Imagine many of these in the MD-ED.

A billboard can only be 35 feet tall. The community voted over 20 years ago to ban these tall signs. The city council also enacted a ban on digital billboards at the urging of Scenic Nevada and the community. Your proposal would open the door to more tall signs with huge digital panels, bigger than a digital billboard, the kind this community has largely rejected as eyesores that ruin property values and the chance of ever improving the aesthetics of downtown. Please reconsider and update the sign code chart to limit the largest signs to casino properties only.

Lori

Lori Wray, Director
Scenic Nevada
608 Lander Street
Reno, NV 89509
775 848-8288

From: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2024 1:37 PM

To: Lori Wray <lwray@markwraylaw.com>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Cc: Mark Wray <mwray@markwraylaw.com>; John Hara <countertourist@gmail.com>; Joyce Thompson <jreno1968@gmail.com>; leah.sanders14@gmail.com; Alicia Barber <aliciambarber@gmail.com>;

dkeats@sbcglobal.net; toniharsh@charter.net; Peter C. Neumann (pcn@att.net)

<pcn@att.net>

Subject: Re: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

Hi Lori,

Below is a breakdown of answers to your questions on allowed signage:

Where did the old zoning Code (prior to 2021) allow signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation?

Since 2005, the Reno Zoning Code has allowed all property (regardless of it being a casino) within the Downtown Reno Regional Center Entertainment District and Hotel Casino (HC) zoning district to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation. This accounts for approximately 146 acres of property.

Excerpt from 2021 Zoning Code related to Signs and the DRRC Entertainment District:

<image002.png>

Map of the DRRC Entertainment District and Hotel Casino Zoning District that allowed for signs to have 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation

<image003.png>

Where does the current zoning code allow for signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation?

The existing zoning code allows for signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation for all parcels located within the Gaming Overlay Boundary. This includes approximately 1,971 acres. When the new zoning code was adopted in 2021, the DRRC designation was deleted, and the new signage language was changed to reference the "Gaming Overlay District".

Here is a map of where all business are allowed to have signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation.

<image004.png>

Staff's recommendation with the Sign Code Text Amendment Language:

Staff's recommendation is to remove the allowance for all business in the Gaming Overlay District to have signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation. Staff recommends that the Code revert back to the language that had been similar to code since 2005 that allowed signage for 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation for all businesses within the Entertainment District AND for all legally established nonrestricted gaming facilities. This area is closer to 136 acres.

This proposed change to the sign code would actually remove signage allowances from the Gaming Overlay Boundary and revert back to just the Entertainment District and Nonrestricted Gaming locations. This has been part of the zoning code for close to 20 years. The Entertainment District is approximately 136 acres, as opposed to the much bigger Gaming Overlay Boundary, which is closer to 1,971 acres. Staffs language proposes to reduce signage requirements in approximately 1,835 acres. Please note that we are seeking community and business input on this change and want to make sure that all parties are aware of the changes.

Angela

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director

Development Services

775-399-3843 (c)

fussa@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](#) | **Connect with us:**

-
-
-
-
-
-

From: Lori Wray <lwrays@markwraylaw.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 5:32 PM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Cc: Mark Wray <mwray@markwraylaw.com>; John Hara <countertourist@gmail.com>; Joyce Thompson <jreno1968@gmail.com>; Leah Sanders <leah.sanders14@gmail.com>; Alicia Barber <aliciambarber@gmail.com>; Dkeats <dkeats@sbcglobal.net>; Toniharsh <toniharsh@charter.net>; Peter C. Neumann <pcn@att.net>

Subject: RE: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

Angela,

The sign code was never interpreted by you or anyone else at the city to allow just any business within the Gaming Overlay District to erect 100-foot-tall signs as you suggest below. And you said as much during presentations to the Reno Planning Commission last spring. Attached is the earlier, red-lined version circulated to the community and presented to the planning commission this year. See the footnote 11 proposed changes. It was meant to be changed to, "[11] This section only applies to parcels with legally established Nonrestricted Gaming establishments and does not apply to the broader Gaming Overlay District."

Here's your full comment concerning this change to the planning commission on April 17, 2024: "We added verbiage to the gaming related sign regulations to clarify that they only apply to legally established gaming establishments in the overlay."

You also added, "What we inadvertently did in our - gaming overlay also includes some different buildings that are not casinos and so we don't want the average pawn shop owner or Burger King to have a 10-foot-tall sign. So again inadvertently, we didn't mean to do that, so we just

provided some clarification that if you are in the gaming overlay and you want to use those sign allowances you also have to be a legally established gaming facility. Pretty simple.”

At an earlier presentation to the Planning Commission on March 20, you said basically the same thing referring to a change of Title 18.02 having to do with overlay districts.

You said: “The intent was just for the casinos, the licensed casinos, to be able to have the bigger signs so we added a clarification. Again, we knew what the intent was, we just missed it in specifying within this specific section of code. So again, just a clean-up to make more sense and frankly match what was in our sign code. So, a quick cleanup relating to gaming overlay.”

Contrary to your statements above and in the email below, you are expanding gaming overlay regulations to others who want to use the gaming overlay regulations and do not have a casino property. Apparently, now you are allowing this flexibility for casino's **“and for parcels zoned within Downtown Entertainment zoning district.”**

Can you clarify whether the new redlined version to be discussed next week is just part of code clean up or is this new red-lined version and round of stakeholder meetings the actual sign code update that is supposed to take place?

In my opinion, this is a major change and intensification of the sign code to allow anyone within the MD-ED 100-foot-tall signs with no limit on area, lighting or animation. As you know animated signs can play videos, flash lights, flip, pop and scroll without any restrictions. Imagine a series of signs like the Glow Plaza sign on west Fourth Street. Do you know how many parcels are affected by this proposed change? And can you send me a map showing the boundaries of the MD-ED zoning district?

For the record, Scenic Nevada is opposed to expanding the use of gaming overlay sign regulations to other businesses which are not licensed casinos.

Sincerely,

Lori

Lori Wray, Director
Scenic Nevada
608 Lander Street
Reno, NV 89509
775 848-8288

From: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 10:15 AM

To: Lori Wray <lwray@markwraylaw.com>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Subject: Re: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

Hi Lori,

The current Code already allows any business located in the Gaming Overlay District to erect a 100-foot sign with no limits on area and lighting. We are proposing to reduce the allowed signage by only allowing this flexibility for casino's and for parcels zoned within Downtown Entertainment zoning district.

Below is a map that shows the Gaming Overlay District. The current Code allows any business to erect a 100-foot sign with no limits on area and lighting within the areas in "red".

<image005.png>

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director

Development Services

775-399-3843 (c)

fussa@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](#) | **Connect with us:**

From: Lori Wray <lwrays@markwraylaw.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 10:02 AM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>

Subject: RE: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

Hello Angela,

The on-premises sign code chart is completely different than the chart circulated earlier in the process. I was told originally there were only going to be minor text changes for clarification. Nevertheless, my concern is that it looks like the biggest signs reserved for casinos in the current code will be extended to all property owners in the downtown area. My question is can any non-casino business downtown erect a 100 foot sign with no limits on area and lighting?

Thanks,

Lori

Lori Wray, Director
Scenic Nevada
608 Lander Street
Reno, NV 89509
775 848-8288

From: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 5:20 PM
To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Lauren Knox <KnoxL@Reno.Gov>
Subject: Update on the City of Reno Title 18 - Sign Code

Sign Stakeholders,

The City of Reno Planning Department is working on updates to the Title 18 Zoning Code. As part of that work, we are looking to clean up the Sign Code. We will be holding two stakeholder meetings that are intended for members of the sign industry and then three additional stakeholder meetings for the broader general public. **The same information will be presented at all the meetings.** Please plan to attend one of the virtual meetings listed below to learn about the draft changes and provide your input. A copy of the proposed redline changes is attached for your review. Also attached is a "clean version" with annotations of the changes.

Options for Meeting Dates/Times:

Sign Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Date: Monday, September 23rd from Noon – 1 p.m.

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_X6B6ERpKRNimoqdMzmYAsQ

Sign Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Date: Tuesday, September 24th from 9 a.m. - 10 a.m.

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_59Y-HdaSTKiu3BXC7mdU7A

General Public Stakeholder Meeting #1

Date: Tuesday, September 24th from 6 p.m. - 7 p.m.

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Ay73jL0HRnO8hYUe94TYfw

General Public Stakeholder Meeting #2

Date: Friday, September 27th from 9 a.m. - 10 a.m.

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN__umHCFvgSTmaWKK8hS3j_w

General Public Stakeholder Meeting #3

Date: Friday, September 27th from Noon – 1 p.m.

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_IZ7KqD39ScGyFq9xiZ9czA

A summary of the draft changes is below:

- Updated triggers for entitlement review related to signs to be consistent across the code. If an entitlement is triggered, the process is for a Major Site Plan Review, which requires Planning Commission approval is required.
- Add a statement on "content neutrality" to address federal laws relating to freedom of speech.
- Modified/added sign definitions for monument sign, pole sign and freestanding sign.
- Moved references to signs with the Gaming Overlay to the Sign section of code.
- Clarified what size and type of signs are allowed within the Downtown Entertainment District.
- Added sign requirements for several zoning districts that had been inadvertently left out of the code.
- Cleaned up the *Table on Sign Regulations by Zoning District* to provide consistency across zoning districts.

- **No changes have been made to code related to billboards (off-premise signs), nits on animated signs, or gas station sign regulations.**

Please e-mail Lauren Knox at knoxL@reno.gov with any comments.

Thank you
Angela

--

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director

Development Services

775-399-3843 (c)

fussa@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](#) | **Connect with us:**

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is also legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and immediately destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you.

<24-09-12 Second Red-lined Draft.pdf> <24-09-20 Mixed Use Downtown - Entertainment District Map.pdf> <23-10-17 First Draft of red-lined chart.pdf> <23-10-17 Footnote 28.pdf> <Dollar Sign.jpg>