FROM THE DESK OF

TIFFANY B. **MOORE**
PO Box 8443
Kansas City, MO 64114
e/ tiffanyinkcmo@gmail.com
p/ 816-695-6862

February 5, 2026

Mayor Quinton Lucas
Mayor Pro Tem Park-Shaw
City Council Members
414 E 12 Street
Kansas City, MO 64108

RE: Ordinance 250876, Digital Signs in Residential Zoning

Dear Mayor and Council,

As you consider final action on the proposed amendments to Chapter 88-445-06 Signs in Residential Districts, I also want to submit a final statement from the perspective of a constituent that cares deeply about the quality, consistency, and reliability of the Zoning & Development Code. I was recently asked for feedback on the most recent committee substitute or what I might still recommend for consideration. I always appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process of developing policy and am honored when asked to contribute, however, this particular effort is frustrating. We have bigger fish to fry.

Kansas City does not need ordinance 250876, which amends 88-445-06 to allow digital signs in residential districts. I encourage you to vote NO and end months of staff time and volunteer capacity drained into this initiative and acknowledge the significant erosion of confidence resulting from watching this kind of legislation be dragged through the process.

The changes proposed in this amendment are in no way aligned with any current City initiatives or priorities. This amendment will not reduce violent crime; it will not expand affordable housing opportunities or combat rising rates of houselessness; it will not add jobs or help close the budget gap facing our City. It does not align with Vision Zero or reduce incidents along the high-injury network; it does not help expand or stabilize public transit. It does not help residents become more connected or informed on important issues facing our city or region.

The use of special use permits, which are regressive and burdensome, shifts the duty of the City to maintain consistent guidance and oversight of zoning policy to individuals and neighborhood organizations.

No one came before any body during the approval process to illustrate or explain exactly how digital signs would be used by schools and institutions or benefit surrounding communities.

No one testified that they wanted digital signs in their neighborhood.

What was presented outlined consistent concerns from neighborhoods about the scale of the impact when ALL non-residential uses within residential zones are allowed to have digital signage. Those permitted uses also include the following (and more):

Group living	Daycare	Lodges, Clubs & Fraternities
Colleges and Universities	Libraries, museums	Cultural exhibits
Office & Professional Services	Churches	Church-related facilities
Nursing homes	Funeral homes	Bed & Breakfast facilities
Neighborhood-serving retail	Hospitals	Historic landmarks

Similar amendments have failed in previous attempts because there is simply no appetite for digital signage from neighborhoods. Broadly expanding the use of digital technology, adding the burden of special use permits, and increasing the enforcement obligation of the City (which is complaint-based), are not in the best interests of the public.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Moore
tiffanybellemoore@gmail.com
816.695.6862