1 Pledge of Allegiance
Chairman Weiske led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Woosley</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Reno</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Weiske</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Schneider</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

3 Public Comment
Janet Fisher requested a traffic impact assessment for 395 and a school impact assessment in the Lemmon Valley area.

4 City Council Liaison Reports
None

5 Traffic Signal Warrants Presentation by NDOT
Ismael Garza, Chief Operations Officer for NDOT, gave a presentation on the traffic signal warrants process.
Commissioner Gower asked for a definition of channelization. Mr. Garza explained that it is utilizing traffic control devices or barriers to restrict a specific problematic movement.

Commissioner Reno asked what warrants round-a-bouts instead of traffic signals. Mr. Garza stated that round-a-bouts are favored up to a certain amount of traffic and lanes.

Commissioner Woosley asked if there is a program in place to remove signals if they are not warranted. Mr. Garza explained that NDOT builds some signals but local agencies operate and maintain them. If there is a need to remove one, it would be requested by the local agency.

Chairman Weiske requested information on the pedestrian warrant. Bill Gall, Senior Civil Engineer, clarified that if a signal were to be justified on pedestrian counts alone, the pedestrian warrant would have to be met.

PowerPoint Presentation for Traffic Signal Warrants  - Presented/Distributed at Meeting

6 Public Hearings

6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC16-00002 (Dutch Bros. Coffee) - This is a request for a special use permit to: 1) construct an ±810 square foot coffee shop with a drive-through facility; and 2) allow for a reduction of the required minimum floor area ratio. The ±15,072 square foot site is located on the northwest corner of South Virginia Street and Kumle Lane (4555 South Virginia Street) in the Mixed Use/Convention Regional Center/Tourist Commercial (MU/CRC/TC) zone. The site has a Master Plan Land Use designation of Special Planning Area/Convention Regional Center/Tourist Commercial. hrm [Ward 2] 6:29 PM

John Krmpotic, KLS Planning and Design, stated that the applicant has concerns with a couple of the conditions and requested a continuance to the October 22, 2015, Planning Commission meeting. The applicant would like to conduct traffic and crosswalk studies before the public hearing.

Heather Manzo, Assistant Planner, confirmed that staff has no objection to continuing this item.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, confirmed that there will be a Planning Commission meeting on October 22nd.

At this time Chairman Weiske opened public comment for this item.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Weiske closed public comment.

*It was moved by Commissioner Woosley, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, to continue this item to the October 22, 2015, meeting. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Jason Woosley, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Troy Schneider, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Gower, Johnson, Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC15-00094 (Caughlin Ranch PUD Amendment/Newton School) - This is a request to amend the Caughlin Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) Standards Handbook to add a K-12 school as an allowed use to the one acre Child Care Center site identified in the Caughlin Village sub land use category. The ±1.08 acre site is located on the southeast corner of the Caughlin Parkway/Village Green Parkway intersection in the PUD zone. The site has a Master Plan Land Use designation of Special Planning Area. vak [Ward 1] 6:37 PM

John Krmpotic, KLS Planning and Design, reviewed information regarding this amendment request.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, pointed out that this is just an option for this site to add the school use and the daycare facility will still be an allowed use. There are restrictions placed on the school including a maximum of 50 students and start and end times that do not overlap with the adjacent elementary school. Staff received 8-10 phone calls, mostly informational. Mr. Kloos confirmed that even if the type of school were to change, it would still be limited to 50 students.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they visited the site.

At this time Chairman Weiske opened public comment for this item.

Courtney Paulos spoke in opposition.

Elinore Moran submitted a comment card in opposition but did not wish to speak.
Koleena Rios submitted a comment card but did not wish to speak.

RJ Larrieu spoke in favor.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Weiske closed public comment.

Chairman Weiske reminded the Commission that this is a request for an amendment to a handbook to allow a school of up to 50 students, not a specific school or project.

Commissioner Reno expressed concerns regarding congestion if 50 students are dropped off at the same time. Mr. Krmpotic stated that it would be less intense traffic than what is going on today and the drop off time is spread out over a 20 to 30 minute period.

Commissioner Gower disclosed that his office is across the street from this location. The peak flow for the drop off at the school is from 8:45 to 9:05 and traffic would not be an issue.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manger, asked Bill Gall to speak about trip generation calculations. Bill Gall, Senior Civil Engineer, explained that trip generation is based on the size of a facility. One trip to drop off one child would be considered 2 trips.

Commissioners Reno and Johnson stated that they can make the findings.

_It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, in the case of LDC15-00094 (Caughlin Ranch PUD Amendment/Newton School), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the amendment to the Caughlin Ranch PUD Standards Handbook, subject to Condition A. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present._
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Charles Reno, Commissioner
SECONDER: Mark Johnson, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Gower, Johnson, Schneider
ABSENT: Paul Olivas

6.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC15-00076 (Sky Vista PUD Amendment Parcel E) - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment to amend the Sky Vista Planned Unit Development (PUD) to: 1) increase the total number of residential units allowed in the PUD by 72 from 2,286 to 2,358; 2) allow the option to construct up to 72 multifamily residential units in lieu of the convenience commercial uses on Parcel E; 3) add standards to allow grading disturbance within the two major drainage ways running through Parcel E; and 4) modify the handbook standards, text and graphics to reflect the changes discussed in items 1, 2 and 3 as listed above. Parcel E contains ±3.45 acres located on the west side of Sky Vista Parkway between its intersections with Black Bear Drive to the north and Trading Post Road to the east. The entire PUD contains ±582 acres located in the area bounded by Sky Vista Parkway to the east, Rising Moon and Black Bear Drives to the south Stoney Creek Way and Kernite Street to the west and Lear Boulevard to the north in the PUD zone. The site has a Master Plan Land Use designation of Special Planning Area. vak [Ward 4] 6:55 PM

Chairman Weiske stated that City Staff received a letter from Angela Fuss, CFA, requesting that this item be continued to the October 8, 2015, Planning Commission meeting.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, confirmed that staff has no objection to continuing this item. The applicant will attend the Ward 4 NAB tomorrow, September 17th. Comments from that NAB meeting will be provided at the October 8, 2015, Planning Commission meeting.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, stated that the NAB meeting is September 17th at 5:30 p.m. at DRI.

At this time Chairman Weiske opened public comment for this item.

Michael Perez spoke in favor of the continuation of this item due to many unanswered questions regarding the amendment request.

Robin Johnson spoke in opposition.
Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Weiske closed public comment.

Chairman Weiske announced that tomorrow's NAB meeting will be a good place to get questions answered and concerns addressed.

Mr. Kloos stated that the NAB agenda is online and will have information regarding the exact location of the meeting at DRI.

*It was moved by Commissioner Schneider, seconded by Commissioner Woosley, to continue this item to the October 8, 2015, meeting. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Troy Schneider, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Jason Woosley, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Gower, Johnson, Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. TXT15-00007 (Public Notice Requirements) - This is a request to amend the Reno Municipal Code Title 18, “Annexation and Land Development,” Chapter 18.06, “Administration and Procedures,” Section 18.06.203, “Public Notice,” to amend public notice requirements. The proposed amendment considers expanding noticing requirements for Neighborhood Plan/Overlay amendments and abandonments. hrm [All Wards] 7:03 PM

Heather Manzo, Assistant Planner, reviewed details of this proposed text amendment that considers expanding noticing requirements for Neighborhood Plan/Overlay amendments and abandonments.

At this time Chairman Weiske opened public comment for this item. Seeing and hearing no public comment requests, Chairman Weiske closed public comment.

Commissioner Reno asked about the cost for noticing. Ms. Manzo stated that the cost would be borne by the City of Reno.

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, in the case of TXT15-00007 (Public Notice Requirements), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the text amendment by ordinance. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Vice Chairman
SECONDER: Troy Schneider, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Gower, Johnson, Schneider
ABSENT: Paul Olivas

6.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. TXT13-00002 (On-Premise Digital Signs) - This is a request to amend the Reno Municipal Code Title 18, “Annexation and Land Development,” Chapter 18.16, “Signs,” and Chapter 18.24, “Rules of Measurement and Definitions,” to add standards and definitions as they relate to on-premise digital signs. cch [All Wards] 7:26 PM

Chairman Weiske called for a 10 minute recess at 7:11 p.m. The meeting resumed at 7:26 p.m.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, reviewed background information regarding this item. Ms. Hanson stated that there are a few issues that have come up that will be reviewed as the Commission goes through the ordinance.

Chairman Weiske stated that the ordinance will be reviewed section by section, line by line. Chairman Weiske suggested that the Commissioners write down names of those making public comments so they can be brought back up if needed when addressing issues raised.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they received emails. Commissioner Reno and Chairman Weiske also disclosed that they have met with members of Scenic Nevada.

At this time Chairman Weiske opened public comment for this item.

The following did not wish to speak but submitted comment cards: Jim Terry was in opposition to the ordinance, and Gary Hour was in opposition to digital signs.

John Frankovich did not state opposition or support but provided comments.

Mike Draper spoke in opposition to the ordinance.

Michael Alonso spoke in opposition to the ordinance.

Lori Wray did not state opposition or support but provided comments.

Kathy Bohall did not state opposition or support but provided comments.
Jennifer Kaufman spoke in opposition to digital signs.

Tray Abney spoke in support of digital signs.

Lea Tauchen spoke in support of digital signs.

Tom MacIntosh expressed concerns regarding the ordinance.

Karen Munson expressed concerns regarding the ordinance.

Dr. Bradley Corbin spoke in support of digital signs.

Nick Brunson spoke in support of digital signs.

Tom Weatherby expressed concerns regarding the ordinance.

Berry Hall spoke in opposition to digital signs.

Sue Smith expressed concerns regarding digital signs.

John Hara expressed concerns regarding digital signs.

Brian Reeder expressed concerns regarding the ordinance.

Ken Krater spoke in support of digital signs.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Weiske closed public comment.

Ms. Hanson stated that items underlined are new wording and strike throughs are items that are being eliminated.

**Discussion on Section 1, Section 18.16.01(a)(5)**

Commissioner Woosley commented on the ability to have more control over signs with newer technology and asked if there are any requirements regarding the level of technology of digital signs. Ms. Hanson stated that new signs could be limited or restricted but there is nothing in the ordinance that requires existing signs to be updated to more modern or digital signs.
Commissioner Gower commented on code enforcement issues. Ms. Hanson stated that they are working with code enforcement and do send out notices for abandoned signs that need to be removed.

Commissioner Reno commented on the need to define obtrusive and incompatible signs.

Commissioner Johnson pointed out that the definition of obtrusive and incompatible signs does not need to be spelled out here as that is the intent of the ordinance as a whole.

**Discussion on Section 2, Section 18.16.702(a)(1)**

Commissioner Schneider stated that the minimum hold period or flip time for messages should be shorter than 8 seconds.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he is okay with 8 seconds but would prefer 6 seconds.

Ms. Hanson confirmed that this issue did come up in the workshop and that 8 seconds has been acceptable to the sign industry in the past.

Chairman Weiske pointed out the second sentence in this section which states "Multiple digital displays on the same sign shall be synchronized to change messages at the same time."

Commissioner Schneider asked staff if the City of Reno has hired an outside consultant to review these issues or if information is being gathered only from Scenic Nevada and the sign industry. Ms. Hanson stated that staff has worked with Scenic Nevada, the sign industry, and has researched sign ordinances in other jurisdictions. An outside consultant representing the City of Reno has not been hired to review this ordinance.

Commissioner Johnson stated that in light of the second statement in this section regarding messages being synchronized to change at the same time, he is willing to stay with 8 seconds as a minimum.

Chairman Weiske asked what the flip time is for the City of Sparks. Karen Munson stated that Sparks has hold times of 8 seconds.

*It was moved by Commissioner Woosley to keep the hold time at 8 seconds as written.*

Commissioner Gower asked if there would be motions on each of the items where there are points of dispute, in terms of process. Chairman Weiske responded yes and stated that he would like City Council to understand if the Commission is in agreement or not.
The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

Commissioner Reno asked if a second to the motion is required. Chairman Weiske responded no and stated that it is just a recommendation to City Council so they can see if the Planning Commission is split on any part of the ordinance.

Section 18.16.702(a)(2)

Ms. Hanson explained that this sub-paragraph would not allow scrolling.

Commissioner Schneider asked if existing signs will be grandfathered in. He stated that if this is put this into action, these signs will no longer be in compliance. Ms. Hanson stated that Section 18.16.801(b) gives them 6 months to come into compliance with the lighting standards (Items 1-13).

Commissioner Schneider would like the existing signs that have scrolling be grandfathered in. He stated that in 6 months the technology may not be available for them.

Chair Weiske asked Commissioner Schneider if he would like to add that here or in the non-conforming section.

Commissioner Schneider stated that this could be placed in the non-conforming section.

Section 18.16.702(a)(3)

Ms. Hanson stated that this sub-paragraph would not allow motion or video on digital signs. This is one item that the gaming industry disagrees with and has brought up as an issue.

There was discussion regarding the process for reviewing this ordinance and it was decided that gaming issues will be addressed as each section is reviewed.

Commissioner Gower suggested that each of these sections applies to casinos unless stated otherwise, and he does not see the need to exclude casinos from this section of the ordinance.

Commissioner Reno agreed there should not be an exemption for casinos in this section.

Commissioner Schneider expressed the desire to support casinos. He stated it doesn't
seem fair to allow video for digital signs for casinos but not for other businesses. He stated it should be the same across the board.

Ms. Hanson stated that gaming is looked at differently due to the spacing criteria and zoning. New gaming facilities cannot open without a special use permit anywhere in the city.

Commissioner Woosley agreed that casinos should be allowed to have digital signs with video.

Commissioner Reno suggested that other things can be done to support the Hotel Casino (HC) industry like allowing larger size and scale signs but video should not be allowed.

There was discussion regarding the possibility of limiting motion or brightness of digital signs between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. Commissioner Schneider pointed out that HC is a 24-hour a day industry and should be allowed to have video on their digital signs. Chairman Weiske suggested that brightness may be more of the issue than video.

*It was moved by Commissioner Schneider to exclude non-restricted gaming from sub-paragraph 3.*

Commissioner Gower stated that he would not support the motion to exclude non-restricted gaming from this section. Commissioner Gower referred to the issues raised at the workshops regarding digital signs with motion and stated that they should not open the door for that type of sign to be allowed again unregulated.

Chairman Weiske stated that he will support the motion because it allows gaming an opportunity to use their signs to draw business in.

Commissioner Reno will not support the motion and stated that motion on digital signs is intrusive.

Karl Hall, Reno City Attorney, requested a formal motion for this item.

*It was moved by Commissioner Schneider, seconded by Commissioner Woosley, to exclude non-restricted gaming from sub-paragraph 3. The motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Reno and Gower.*

Ms. Hanson stated that language will be changed throughout the ordinance as it applies to allowing video for non-restricted gaming signs.
Section 18.16.702(a)(4) - no discussion

Section 18.16.702(a)(5) - no discussion

Section 18.16.702(a)(6) - no discussion

Section 18.16.702(a)(7)

Commissioner Johnson asked if this requirement in the event of a sign malfunction is technically feasible. Ms. Munson stated that she cannot speak for other sign manufacturers but YESCO signs are designed to revert to solid black or off in the event of a malfunction. It would depend on how the sign is built.

Section 18.16.702(a)(8)

Commissioner Gower asked how this sub-paragraph would be enforced. Joe Henry, Acting Code Enforcement Manager, stated this in unenforceable.

Ms. Hanson stated that the definition of glare could be expanded or the sub-paragraph could be eliminated.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the language is too vague and it is hard to quantify impairment of a driver's view. This issue can be addressed under other sections regarding brightness and size that would be able to be quantified and enforced.

It was moved by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to remove sub-paragraph 8. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

Section 18.16.702(a)(9)

Commissioner Schneider asked why sound is addressed in this section. Ms. Hanson explained that there have been complaints on a sign that has sound.

Commissioner Schneider asked about a decibel rating requirement that already addresses that. Ms. Hanson confirmed that they do have to comply with sound code and further explained that PA systems are restricted at car dealerships now and that this restriction is an effort to limit the amount of sound that is exterior to a facility.

Section 18.16.702(a)(10) - no discussion

Section 18.16.702(a)(11) - no discussion
Section 18.16.702(a)(12)

Commissioner Schneider asked about temporary signs. Ms. Hanson discussed the use of temporary signs and banners and stated that one outcome of the workshops was that digital signs should eliminate the need for temporary signs and banners. This sub-paragraph is an attempt to reduce clutter. Ms. Hanson also stated that most of the a-frame, sandwich board-type signs used are in the City right-of-way blocking sidewalks or potentially taking up required parking spaces.

Commissioner Schneider stated that he does not agree with eliminating the use of temporary signs and banners across the board.

Chairman Weiske asked if a special event with a special use permit (SUP) allows for any signage. Mr. Henry stated that temporary signs are not addressed with a special event or special activity.

Commissioner Schneider asked why temporary signs are included in this section with freestanding on-premise digital sign displays. Ms. Hanson explained that during the workshop it came up that it is cluttered when using both types of signs. With a digital sign there is the option to bring in additional messages throughout the day so the temporary signs are not necessary. Ms. Hanson also recommended that certain types of signs, similar to real estate and election signs, be excluded.

Commissioner Woosley stated that some banners that are supposed to be temporary end up remaining permanently.

Commissioner Schneider stated that temporary signs should be addressed under the overall sign code update and not in this digital sign ordinance.

It was moved by Commissioner Schneider to remove this section from the ordinance. The motion died for lack of a second.

It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to leave this sub-paragraph as written. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Schneider.

Section 18.16.702(a)(13)

Commissioner Reno suggested that this sub-paragraph may not be needed since the flip time was changed to 8 seconds. Commissioner Schneider agreed that this is not needed.
Commissioner Gower suggested adding that signs need to be turned off, where the use is appropriate, between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

Chairman Weiske referred to sub-paragraph 15 addressing the percentage of signs that can be digital vs. static and suggested that the digital portion could be turned off because the back lit, static portion of the sign would still be visible.

Commissioner Schneider stated that it should be up to business owners when they can and can't have their sign on. The brightness has been lowered and the flip time has been changed to 8 seconds.

Commissioner Reno stated that if a business wants to do something different, they can apply for an SUP.

Commissioner Schneider asked if owners of existing signs would have to apply for an SUP. Ms. Hanson stated that the way it is currently written, yes.

*It was moved by Commissioner Woosley, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to keep this sub-paragraph as written, and note that it does not apply to non-restricted gaming.*

Commissioner Gower suggested adding language that if it is associated with a digital sign on a monument sign with associated back lit display that the digital sign be turned off between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the word static in the proposed language can also mean off. Commissioner Gower concurred with Commissioner Johnson's comments and agreed that it should be up to the business if they want to take advantage of that opportunity.

*The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Schneider.*

**Section 18.16.702(a)(14)**

The Commissioners agreed with the intent of this section and changes as discussed by Ms. Hanson.

**Section 18.16.702(a)(15)**

Commissioner Schneider asked about the definition of a large retail establishment. Ms.
Hanson stated that a large retail establishment is a minimum of 50,000 square feet.

Chairman Weiske asked if this applies only to monument signs or wall signs as well. Ms. Hanson stated it would apply to both.

Commissioner Johnson asked for more information on the definition of a large retail establishment. Ms. Hanson stated that the definition is lengthy and is an extensive section of code. A large retail establishment requires one major tenant at 50,000 square feet.

Commissioner Schneider expressed concern that this ordinance limits small business and requested that it be stricken from the ordinance.

Commissioner Reno requested clarification that this restricts the digital sign portion for a small business but the rest of the sign could still be a static sign. Ms. Hanson stated that is correct.

Commissioner Schneider stated that he feels this is making a decision for a business owner that they should be able to make, if the sign meets all of the other requirements included in the ordinance. Commissioner Reno stated that if that option is available, small businesses would transition to all digital signs, and the City is trying to avoid having that many digital signs.

Commissioner Johnson requested confirmation that there is already a sign ordinance in place restricting the size of signs allowed based on square footage of an establishment. Ms. Hanson stated that is correct.

Chairman Weiske stated that small businesses have the option of a larger sign that is static and back lit, or a smaller digital sign with 8 second flips allowed.

*It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to keep sub-paragraph 15 as is. The motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Johnson and Schneider.*

**Section 18.16.702(a)(16)**

Ms. Hanson stated that non-restricted gaming has a 100 feet maximum and can request higher with an SUP.

There was discussion regarding lowering the maximum height of digital signs, outside of non-restricted gaming areas.
Ms. Hanson confirmed that the maximum height is 25 feet in most zoning districts, and 35 feet with certain conditions.

_It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, to limit the maximum sign height of the digital portion of a sign to 25 feet in all zoning districts, and leave non-restricted gaming areas as per sign code. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present._

**Section 18.16.702(a)(17) - no discussion**

Chairman Weiske called for a break at 10:41 p.m. The meeting resumed at 10:53 p.m.

Ms. Hanson stated that existing sign owners will have six months to come into compliance with the requirements of the following sub-paragraphs (1) through (6).

**Section 18.16.702(b)(1)**

Commissioner Schneider asked if there is a light sensing device currently on digital signs. Ms. Munson stated that many major sign manufacturers have them.

Commissioner Schneider asked about the expense to add something like that to a sign that does not have it. Ms. Munson stated that she can only speak for YESCO and all of their signs come with the sensor.

**Section 18.16.702(b)(2)**

Ms. Hanson stated that nits and footcandles are measuring two different things. One is the intensity of the light coming off. Illuminance is the perceived brightness of a sign. The City can measure it either way. The nits will measure the intensity of the light coming from the source, where the footcandles or illuminance is going to be the glow related to the ambient lights. Mr. Henry explained why a nit measuring gun would be better for enforcement. The standard is .3 footcandles based at 100 feet for a sign that is 100 square feet wide, 5 feet off the ground at a 90 degree angle. You can't do that on every sign. A lot of the digital signs are brought forward are part of a static sign. That would not work as the static sign gives off light also. The nit gun will focus on just the digital portion of the sign.

Ms. Hanson stated that there will be outreach to owners of existing digital signs regarding coming into conformance within six months. Mr. Henry confirmed that staff would only go out to check on digital signs when there is a complaint.
There was discussion regarding nits vs. footcandles. Nits are more accurate. It was suggested that nits are used for measuring light intensity.

Commissioner Johnson suggested tabling discussion on sub-paragraph 2 until there is discussion on sub-paragraph 3.

Chairman Weiske asked for a motion to use nits instead of footcandles for sub-paragraph 1 through 6.

_It was moved by Commissioner Schneider, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to discuss sub-paragraph b, items 1 through 6 in nits versus footcandles. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present._

There was discussion regarding whether or not sub-paragraph 2 is needed. Commissioners Reno and Woosley discussed the need for this section to remain. It is to show the intent with the digital billboard plan that they are within compliance for nits. The photometric plans are produced and given to regulators and is reasonable to keep this section in there. There has to be something in writing saying that we won't go past this.

Commissioner Schneider asked if photometric plans are provided when someone buys a digital sign. Ms. Munson responded no. Ms. Munson also confirmed that nit readers are not carried by sign installers, they measure in footcandles. Ms. Munson also stated that most sign companies should be able to comply with whatever standard is required. There is software in the signs that will allow for calibration of signs to match the nit requirement.

Chairman Weiske asked if a photometric plan is required on a new sign. Mr. Henry stated that Section 2 is for new applications. Every sign requires a building permit and this requirement can be included as part of the application for a building permit.

Chairman Weiske asked Mr. Henry if he thinks sub-paragraph 2 is needed. Mr. Henry stated that it is not needed.

_It was moved by Commissioner Schneider, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to eliminate sub-paragraph 2. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Reno._

**Section 18.16.702(b)(3)**

Chairman Weiske suggested a motion to direct staff to re-write these sub-paragraphs
appropriately for measurements in nits.

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to direct staff to look at sub-paragraphs 1 through 6 in terms of illuminance and measurement in nits. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*

Chairman Weiske requested a detailed discussion on how measurements in nits would best be dealt with, in terms of establishing a level for this sub-paragraph.

Ms. Munson stated that she is not able to discuss measurement of nits.

Lori Wray, Scenic Nevada, stated that they commissioned a study in the Truckee Meadows by Gerry Wattell. With regard to disability glare and discomfort glare for driver safety, Mr. Wattell’s study determined that 100 nits in a rural area and 150 nits in an urban area is bright enough.

Ms. Hanson will work with Mr. Henry to amend sub-paragraphs 1-6. They will do additional research regarding the appropriate brightness in nits and bring that to City Council, and report back to the Planning Commission as well.

**Section 18.16.702(c)(1)**

Commissioner Schneider suggested eliminating non-restricted gaming from sub-paragraph 1.

Commissioner Reno stated that one digital sign is appropriate and non-restricted gaming should not be excluded.

Commissioner Gower agreed there should be no exception for non-restricted gaming on this sub-paragraph.

Chairman Weiske agreed it should stay as one digital sign.

Commissioner Schneider asked if there are any casinos with existing multiple freestanding digital signs. Ms. Hanson replied that she cannot think of any that do.

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to keep sub-paragraph 1 as written. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Schneider.*

**Section 18.16.702(c)(2)**
It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, to include I-580 south of McCarran Boulevard in sub-paragraph 2. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

Section 18.16.702(c)(3)

Commissioner Reno asked if Public Facilities (PF) includes high schools. Ms. Hanson replied it does sometimes.

Commissioner Reno stated that schools should be able to have digital signs but not parks. Commissioner Gower discussed possible special events when it would be appropriate for parks to advertise.

Commissioner Johnson pointed out that the Sparks ordinance allows digital signs on parcels that are 10 acres or more, which would allow high schools, large churches, and large parks to have digital signs. Commissioner Reno stated that he liked that compromise and suggested adding that digital signs must be oriented away from residentially zoned properties.

Ms. Hanson stated that a lot of churches and schools are in Single Family zoning so digital signs would not be allowed for those. In the PF zones, 6 foot monument signs require an SUP.

Commissioner Schneider asked if existing digital signs that are within 300 lineal feet of residentially zoned parcels would have to be removed. Ms. Hanson replied no and stated that there are no compliance requirements listed in the non-conforming section of the ordinance for Section 18.16.702(c)(4).

Chairman Weiske stated that digital signs in a PF zone should only be operational outside of daytime hours. Commissioner Gower suggested extending that concept to sub-paragraph 4 to state "shall only be allowed within 300 lineal feet of a residentially zoned parcel if operated during daylight hours only and oriented away from residentially zoned parcels”.

Commissioner Schneider asked why Midtown is excluded. Ms. Hanson stated that came up in a couple of meetings to exclude Midtown because it is not in keeping with the character of the Midtown neighborhood.

Ms. Hanson discussed changing the wording to include the Entertainment District in the Redfield Regional Center. Gaming is an allowed use there so digital signs should be
allowed since they are allowed for non-restricted gaming.

Commissioner Reno suggested restricting digital signs in PF zones to parcels of 10 acres or more.

Commissioner Schneider requested that the language "excluding Midtown" be removed. Ms. Hanson stated that she is not comfortable including Midtown without reaching out to a Midtown focus group.

Commissioner Schneider stated that he does not want to exclude Midtown completely and suggested requiring an SUP for digital signs in Midtown. Ms. Hanson recommended not including Midtown Residential.

It was moved by Commissioner Schneider, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to approve sub-paragraph 3 with the following changes: exclude Midtown residential and require a special use permit for Midtown Commercial, add daytime operation only in PF zones, and include the Entertainment District in the Redfield Regional Center.

Chairman Weiske stated he will not support the motion because he does not believe Midtown should be included.

Commissioner Woosley agreed that Midtown should not be included and will not be supporting the motion.

The motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Weiske and Woosley.

Section 18.16.702(c)(4)

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to only allow on-premise digital displays within 300 lineal feet of a residentially zoned parcel if that display is operated during daylight hours only. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Woosley.

Section 18.16.702(c)(5)

Commissioner Reno suggested using the high water mark instead of the center line of the Truckee River.

It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, to change the wording in sub-paragraph 5 to "...shall not be permitted within 300 feet of the high
Commissioner Johnson asked if the Truckee River Corridor includes downtown. Ms. Hanson responded yes.

Commissioner Johnson expressed concern regarding this limitation and the restrictions it might inadvertently place on non-restricted gaming and other facilities within 300 feet of the river.

Commissioner Schneider withdrew his 2nd on the motion. The motion died due to the lack of a 2nd.

There was discussion regarding the potential impact of this sub-paragraph and the possibility of requiring SUPs for digital signs inside the Truckee River Corridor.

Commissioner Reno asked what the boundaries are of the Truckee River Corridor. Ms. Hanson stated that the Truckee River "District" is essentially one parcel on either side of the river through the downtown.

It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to change the language in sub-paragraph 5 to "On-premises digital displays shall not be permitted within 300 feet of the high water mark of the edge the Truckee River, or within 300 lineal feet of the outer boundary of any areas designated in this title as the Truckee River District without a special use permit." The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

Section 18.16.702(c)(6) - no changes

Section 18.16.702(c)(7)

Commissioner Johnson asked if this sub-paragraph is compatible with the rest of the sign ordinance. Ms. Hanson stated that there is not a requirement like this for non-digital signs.

Commissioner Schneider asked if this will be required for non-digital signs when the sign ordinance is updated. Ms. Hanson stated that it could potentially be required.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the required landscaped area is equal to the square footage of the digital portion of the sign or the overall sign. Ms. Hanson stated that is not specified.
Commissioner Johnson suggested limiting the requirement to square footage equal to the digital portion of the sign.

Commissioner Gower stated that the landscaping standards associated with project ordinances are sufficient to cover this and that sub-paragraph 7 could be removed.

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Schneider, to remove sub-paragraph 7. The motion failed with two (2) in favor and four (4) oppositions by Commissioners Johnson, Woosley, Weiske, and Reno.*

*It was moved by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to modify sub-paragraph 7 to adjust the requirement for the minimum square footage of landscaping be equal to that of the digital portion of the sign. The motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Gower and Schneider.*

**Section 18.16.801(a)** - no changes

**Section 18.16.801(b)**

There was discussion regarding concerns that 6 months may not be enough time for non-conforming signs to come into conformance. It was suggested that 12 months would be more realistic.

Commissioner Schneider suggested the possibility of allowing existing scrolling signs of 35-40 square feet or less to remain as is. Commissioner Reno and Chairman Weiske are not in favor of that.

*It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Woosley, to modify sub-section b to 12 months. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*

**Section 18.16.801(c)**

*It was moved by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to approve sub-paragraph c changing the General Standards to 14 and 15. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Schneider.*

Commissioner Schneider stated he opposed the motion due to the hardships on small businesses.

**Section 18.16.804(a)** - no changes
Section 18.18.804(b) - no changes

Section 18.24.203.4570(1)

The definition of luminance will be added.

Commissioner Schneider stated that he can see both sides of this issue. The casinos and hotels are being set aside with their own separate rules so this ordinance will only be affecting the small business owners in our communities. Personal opinions is really what this ordinance comes down to. Commissioner Schneider recommended continuing on with a couple more workshops before making this an ordinance. Hopefully we can work this out and get an ordinance that will work for all parties.

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Woosley, in the case of TXT13-00002 (On-Premise Digital Signs), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the text amendment by ordinance, including all of the amendments made by the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Peter Gower, Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Jason Woosley, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Gower, Johnson, Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Reno stated that 3 Reno Planning Commissioners were present at the Regional Planning Commission meeting last week where growth in the community was discussed. The next meeting will be Wednesday, September 23, 2105.

8 Staff Announcements

8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

8.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.

8.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.

8.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.
Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, reported that Master Plan Reimagine Reno is moving along; 3 Commissioners attended the APA conference; the UNR Zone changes were approved by City Council last week; and the Meadowood appeal was approve by City Council.

9  Commissioner's Suggestions for Future Agenda Items  (For Possible Action)
None

10  Public Comment
None

11  Adjournment (For Possible Action)
The meeting was adjourned at 12:46 a.m.