



**SCOTT COUNTY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, July 7, 2015
7:30 P.M.**

MEETING MINUTES
1st Floor Board Room
600 W. 4th Street
Davenport, IA 52801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Clayton Lloyd, Gary Mehrens, Carolyn Scheibe, Lynn Gibson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Allan Kluever, Tony Knobbe (excused)

STAFF PRESENT: Timothy Huey, Planning & Development Director
Brian McDonough, Planning & Development Specialist
Ellen Schwartz, Planning & Development Intern

OTHERS PRESENT: Shauna Strom, applicant
2 representatives from Girl Scouts of America
Diane Holst, Supervisor

1. **Call to Order:** Clayton Lloyd called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.
2. **Minutes:** Lloyd called for approval of minutes from the June 2nd Meeting, Scheibe made the motion for approval and Mehrens seconded the motion, all approved. **All Ayes (4-0).**

3. **Final Plat of Strom First Addition, Section 30 of Lincoln Township**

Lloyd called to McDonough to review the case. McDonough explained that the property has a greater amount of frontage than neighboring lots, and is therefore more conducive to further subdivision. He explained the subdivision of the property would create a development right for a single-family dwelling for the new lot due to the property's R-1 zoning. He explained that the Sketch Plan for this development was reviewed at the Commission's May 19th meeting. At that meeting, Health Department comments were discussed relating to the location of the existing septic system on the property. On the Final Plat, Lot 2 has been reduced in size to ensure that the existing septic does not encroach onto Lot 2.

Lloyd called for public comments. Shauna Strom (applicant) reiterated that the septic system problems have been addressed. **Lloyd ended public comments and asked for staff recommendation.** McDonough recommended approval with the conditions that signed copies of all platting documents be submitted prior to consideration by the board of supervisors, and the City of Eldridge approve the plat prior to consideration by the Board of Supervisors. **Lloyd called for any other comments from the board or the audience.** Shauna Strom stated that Eldridge had no concerns with the Sketch Plan.

Mehrens motioned to approve the plat in accordance with staff's recommendation. **Gibson** seconded the motion. All Ayes (4-0)

4. Site Plan Review, Camp Conestoga Girl Scouts Camp, Sections 14 and 23 of Liberty Township

Lloyd called upon Huey to present the case. He showed aerials and site pictures and explained past building permits issued for the property. He stated that because this new lodge building is in excess of 20,000 ft² and is multi-use staff determined this a significant expansion requiring site plan review by the Planning Commission. A building of this size will require a sprinkler system. Huey mentioned that staff has spoken with the general contractor and architect. There is an understanding of what needs to be done in order to receive a building permit, including the design of the on-site sprinkler system since there is not a community water connection. There will have to be a water tower on-site to provide capacity for the sprinkler system. Huey showed an architect's rendering of the proposed building. Staff contacted the district fire chief regarding the standards of the interior roads within the camp to handle emergency vehicles. No comments have been received back at this point in time. The new proposed building will have 3 full bunk rooms, each housing 20 people plus space for 12 leaders. The increase from the 8 demolished cabins that could only hold 32 people will be a difference of 40 more people; the new capacity will be 72. Huey stated that the roads will need to be widened slightly to ensure the ability to have emergency vehicle access. There also needs to be better handicap parking stalls, these would need to have been paved and connected to the sidewalk system.

Lloyd called for public comments. A representative from the Girl Scouts explained that the roads are going to be widened to twice the width of what they are now. He explained that they are shortening the travel to public activity areas, turning the roads from one-way traffic to two-way traffic, and building a new stretch of road to further connect and loop activity areas. The equestrian area was moving locations. Lloyd asked about the location of the equestrian area, which is where the camp is going to reroute traffic to go through instead of where it is now on the main access point. The Girl Scouts representative pointed it out on the aerial map.

Huey pointed out that emergency responders like a looped traffic flow so that if there is a blocked area it makes it easier to maneuver. Lloyd questioned the accessibility of the roads and the driving area, Huey and the camp ranger explained that it will all be fixed to code and that it will be accessible to emergency vehicles. **Lloyd closed public comments and asked for the staff recommendation.** Huey stated that staff recommends approval with the following conditions, 1) Access to the building be upgraded and maintained for year road access for emergency vehicles; 2) Handicapped parking stalls be hard surfaced and connected to sidewalks per accessibility requirements; and 3) Compliance with all Scott County Health and building Codes.

Scheibe motioned for approval in accordance with staff's recommendation. Mehrens seconded the motion. All Ayes (4-0)

Zoning Ordinance Work Session

Huey explained that he and McDonough have been working hard on these changes. He reviewed the agenda for the work session.

Proposed table of contents

Discussion of mobile home parks and travel trailer park regulations

Accessory building regulations

Next steps....

Huey presented the table of contents and explained that this will give the Ordinance some flow and guide users quickly to the correct sections. The Board had no questions or comments, and agreed with the order and presentation of the table of contents. Huey noted that this is a draft, and as the Ordinance continues to be tweaked, the table of contents can be adjusted.

Huey reviewed staff's proposed changes to mobile home and travel trailer park regulations. As defined, these are very different land uses, and therefore staff is suggesting that they be separated into different sections. A mobile home is a more permanent structure set on a foundation and with minimum sizing requirements. Mobile homes and mobile home parks typically have more investment from their residents. Many people construct permanent landscaping and build accessory buildings. Residents do not own the land but rent or lease it from the park owner. In contrast, travel trailer parks house temporary travel trailer units, used mainly for recreational purposes. There are not long-term leases, but nightly charges. Such parks could really be called campgrounds. He explained that the creation or expansion of a travel trailer or a mobile home park requires approval of a special use permit from the Board of Adjustment. Currently both parks are allowed in A-G, R-2, C-1, and C-2. The Commission has preliminarily agreed to remove both parks from any consideration in A-G. At this time staff is recommending that travel trailer parks be reinserted as a special use in A-G. Huey explained there are suitable areas for travel trailer parks on existing A-G land or through a rezoning of A-P land to A-G. Because travel trailer parks allow short-term recreational vehicles, they can be looked at more favorably than would be allowing mobile home parks in A-G.

Huey reviewed the restrictions on length of stay for travel trailers. They are allowed in travel trailer parks for no more than 30 consecutive days, and no more than 104 days in a calendar year. Staff is proposing that they be allowed in mobile home parks so long as a majority of the occupied spaces remain occupied by mobile homes, and any travel trailer is limited to a stay of 180 days per year or less. Huey explained how one existing mobile home park recently amended their special use permit to allow for the temporary location of recreational vehicles. The park had difficulty renting spots, and transient, seasonal workers requested location of their recreational vehicles. **Lloyd** asked for clarification and stated that protecting the property investment of mobile home residents versus travel trailer residents is something to consider. Huey stated that private covenants exist for some mobile home parks, and would serve to protect those residents that chose to locate in such a park. He clarified that existing mobile home parks would have to amend their special use permit in order to take advantage of this new provision allowing a limited number of travel trailers. Similarly, any new mobile home park would need to expressly ask for this provision to apply as a part of their special use permit approval.

Lloyd asked if they could talk about the administrative process to grant the special use permit and the reasons behind the permit and placement of specific trailers. **Lloyd** asked for clarification on how the stay limits for travel trailers in either park would be monitored and enforced. Huey explained that it is dealt with on a complaint basis, and enforcement can be a challenge. **Lloyd** suggested language requiring the park owner to hold documentation of compliance with the regulations, including move in and move out dates. The other commissioners did not agree to any language changes, and thought that documentation and compliance should be left to individual parks.

Lloyd corrected the open space requirement from 3/100 to 3/10. Staff agreed it was a typo, and would be corrected. **Lloyd** questioned if the fees should be allowed in the Ordinance itself. Huey agreed that no fees should be referenced by Ordinance. **Scheibe** pointed out that the mobile home park regulation E5 should remove reference to "travel trailer." to get rid of the wording "travel trailer." McDonough questioned Huey about the wording and Huey stated that it could be taken out.

Lloyd asked how travel trailers on subdivision lots were treated. **Huey** stated mobile homes are only allowed within approved mobile home parks. They are allowed as secondary dwelling units during construction of a permanent residence or for care of an elderly family member. If located on a farm and occupied by a farmer, any mobile home would be exempt. **Lloyd** questioned the farm exemption in regards to a travel trailer on the farm property, and Huey stated that exempt is exempt, and if a trailer is on a farm and occupied by residents who work on that farm they are allowed to be there.

Lloyd asked about parking and paving requirements. Huey explained that paving in this case does not necessarily mean concrete, but that County Engineer approved seal coat would be allowed.

Scheibe brought up a typo on page 10 paragraph 2 about the word "a" – Huey explained that it was a typo and that it would be removed. A second potential typo that **Scheibe** brought up was page 11 paragraph 2 – Huey agreed to remove it.

Lloyd pointed out a typo on page 10 #7 – Huey explained that there can be leniency through the board adjustment. **Lloyd** expressed that it isn't clear if a hard surface access road is required or not required.

McDonough clarified the difference in surfacing requirements between mobile home and travel trailer parks. Mobile home park surfacing requirements reference the subdivision ordinance, and therefore require hard surfacing. Travel trailer parks reference dust-free surfacing and adequate access, therefore allowing potential gravel surfacing for interior roads. The idea is that the temporary nature of travel trailer parks allows for a lesser standard than a permanent mobile home park. Ultimately the Board of Adjustment could require any surfacing they deemed appropriate during the special use permit approval.

Lloyd asked if there were any other comments before the continuation of the presentation – no comments made and Huey expressed that staff was not ready to fully discuss accessory building regulations. Staff provided the handout draft regulations as a starting point, but if no one objected they would wait until the next work session to tackle the issue. The Commission agreed, and Huey stated that staff will work on other sections as well, including sign regulations. **Gibson** asked about the next meeting date. Huey explained that a lack of agenda items means there will be no July 21st meeting. **Mehrens** commented that electronic signs are painful and dangerous to driving safety, and should be addressed in the County's new sign regulations. Huey agreed and also noted that he will be reaching out to a professional company to put together graphics and handout styles for the final version of the Ordinance.

Other business: Gibson will not be at the August 4th meeting, which is tentatively set as the next work session

With no further public comments and no other business to discuss, Chairman Lloyd adjourned the meeting at 8:44 P.M.