



**SCOTT COUNTY  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Tuesday, August 18th, 2015  
7:30 P.M.  
MEETING MINUTES  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Board Room  
600 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
Davenport, IA 52801**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Allan Kluever, Clayton Lloyd, Carolyn Scheibe, Marsha Findlay, Lynn Gibson, Gary Mehrens

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Tony Knobbe (excused)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Timothy Huey, Planning & Development Director  
Brian McDonough, Planning & Development Specialist

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Paula and Damon Kingsley (applicants);

1. **Call to Order:** Clayton Lloyd called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

2. **Minutes:** Consideration of the August 4, 2015 meeting minutes. **Scheibe** asked that her name be corrected on page 2. **Lloyd** asked about the discussion of the Park View plan being amended due to the Ordinance rewrite. It was decided that no change was needed in this regard. **Scheibe made a motion to approve the corrected minutes. Seconded by Gibson. Vote: All Ayes (6-0).**

3. **Site Plan Review**

**Lloyd** called on staff to review the case. **Huey** gave a brief history of the Mt. Joy Industrial Park, and reviewed the case. He showed aerial photos and the submitted site plan. The request was for a change in use from a contractors' office and storage yard to used auto sales. **Huey** explained the difference between controlled access storage, which does not require paving, and parking and circulation areas for employees and the general public, which does require paving. The applicant's will hold a recyclers license in order to buy and sell salvaged vehicles, but they are not engaged in salvaging or dismantling at the site. Dismantling or junking requires an industrial zoning classification and approval of a special use permit. The site is currently zoned C-2 which permits used auto sales, but not junk yards.

**Lloyd asked for public comments. Damon Kingsley (applicant)** stated that he and his wife are moving their current business from west Davenport to Mt. Joy. **Kluever** asked where the off-street parking would be located, and the applicant pointed it out on the site plan. **Findlay** stated she visited the site, and did not see any issues other than needing to stripe the already paved parking area. **Lloyd** also stated he visited the site.

**Lloyd asked for the staff recommendation. Huey** presented staff's recommendation for approval with one condition to hard surface and stripe the required 4 parking stalls with one reserved for handicapped accessibility. **Mehrens made a motion to approve. Seconded by Gibson. Vote: All Ayes (6-0)**

#### **4. Zoning Ordinance Work Session**

**Huey** reviewed the rationale and necessity for a well written sign ordinance as well as the current sign regulations and proposed changes. He went over the proposed general intent sections, and reviewed exemptions such as address, traffic, warning, government, subdivision identification, historic marker signs. **Huey** further explained subdivision identification signs and asked the Commission for input. **Kluever** asked if our regulations would prevent extreme sign density. **Huey** said yes, each property is limited to 300 ft<sup>2</sup> of total sign area. **Lloyd** asked that the wording be changed to clarify whether the limit is 300 ft<sup>2</sup> per sign or total sign area. **Huey** stated that currently wall signs are not limited in area. **Huey** showed pictures of wall signs and explained the difference between attached and detached on premise signs.

**Mehrens** asked about limits on billboard signs. **Huey** stated that he will get to billboard regulations, but that they are called off premise signs and are regulated by both the county and the state DOT if they are adjacent to a state right-of-way. **Lloyd** asked the Commission if it was appropriate to leave attached signs such as wall and roof signs as unregulated. **Huey** commented that the Ordinance should allow for multiple accessory signs with some limit on overall square footage. **Huey** reviewed proposed language on electronic message signs. Staff is recommending no full animation, flashing, or video display signs, and also limiting electronic message signs to no more than 50% of the total sign face. Huey showed a recent sign permit example in Park View as well as the example of Casey's General Store on Highway 61 west. The Casey's sign demonstrated the provision limiting signage to no more than 10 ft<sup>2</sup>, non-illuminated, and facing away from adjacent land uses if such land uses are a residential district, residence, school, or church.

**Huey** reviewed billboard/off premise signs. Staff is proposing an 800 ft<sup>2</sup> maximum allowable sign area for billboards. They are currently only allowed in commercial and industrial zoning districts, and are not allowed in any residential or Ag districts; staff is proposing no change there. **Huey** mentioned that he reached out to sign contractors about tonight's meeting. None had any comments on the actual substance of the Ordinance, but some did comment on procedure. **Lloyd** asked if the 800 ft<sup>2</sup> limit was per side or cumulative for multisided signs. Huey stated it was per side. **Mehrens** asked about regulations for lighted signs. **Huey** stated that currently the planning director has review over lit signs as stated in the Ordinance, and stated that it could be left in. **Lloyd** agreed that it should remain in the Ordinance to add scrutiny to signs that can affect adjacent properties with light spillage. **Huey** said staff would reword the language on lit signs, but leave it in the Ordinance. **Lloyd** asked about delay in electronic messaging signs. **Huey** said that delay or the time between image changes is an industry standard, and staff is not proposing that language be included in the Ordinance.

**Huey** briefly reviewed the provisions for temporary signs. He explained that this is a delicate subject because it deals with limiting 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment free speech rights. Content cannot be regulated, but the size, location, and duration of temporary signs can be regulated. **Gibson** asked what would happen if a "for sale" sign or other temporary sign was up for more than the temporary period of time. **Huey** stated that enforcement of these provisions is largely done on a complaint basis. **Findlay** asked what constituted temporary. **Huey** stated it is 6 months. **Lloyd** asked about temporary banner signs such as blow-up windsocks and floppy banner signs. **Huey** stated that the definition of temporary would exclude any mechanical or lit sign. **Mehrens** asked about barn signs. **Huey** said if they were advertising off premise they would be billboards and subject to regulations. If complaints were received, he could require their removal. The Commission agreed to have staff re-work the sign regulations based on tonight's discussion and come back with a revised draft. **Huey** stated there will be no September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, with the next meeting set for September 15<sup>th</sup>. At that time Staff hopes to have a full draft of the revised Ordinance prepared for preliminary review. He would also like the Commission to discuss public hearing dates, times, and locations at that meeting. **Lloyd** and **Findlay** mentioned they will be absent on September 15<sup>th</sup>. **With no further public comments and no other business to discuss, Chairman Lloyd adjourned the meeting at 8:33 P.M.**