

The following are minutes of the Bettendorf Board of Adjustment and are a synopsis of the discussion that took place at this meeting and as such may not include the entirety of each statement made. The minutes of each meeting do not become official until approved at the next Board meeting.

**MINUTES  
BETTENDORF BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
JULY 8, 2021  
5:00 P.M.**

Gallagher called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Item 1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Gallagher, Tansey, Tombergs  
ABSENT: Spranger  
STAFF: Beswick, Fuhrman, Hunt

Item 2. Review of Board procedures.

Item 3. The Board to review and approve the minutes of the meeting of June 10, 2021.

On motion by Tombergs, seconded by Tansey, that the minutes of the meeting of June 10, 2021 be approved as submitted.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Item 4.

The Board to hold a public hearing on the following items:

- a. **Case 21-044; 3923 State Street (I-2)** - Variance to allow an on-premises identification sign on a non-street frontage and to increase the allowable square footage of on-premises identification signage from 279 square feet to 929 square feet, submitted by Manatt's, Inc. (Deferred from meeting of June 10, 2021)

Gallagher asked if there was an affidavit of publication. Beswick stated that notice of public hearing had been received. Notice and affidavit of publication are Annex #2 to these minutes.

Beswick reviewed the staff report. Staff report is Annex #3 to these minutes.

Tansey asked if staff had given any consideration to allowing two building signs of a similar square footage to that proposed by staff for one sign. Beswick stated that staff would not be opposed to that but that the proposed compromise was evaluated based on the original request. Tansey suggested that the applicant could have two of the smaller signs which are slightly less than 200 square feet after subtracting the cutouts and still be approximately the same size as staff's proposed 375 square feet of building signage. Beswick explained that the smaller sign shown does

not have cutouts but that a sign similar in style to the larger sign with cutouts could work. He added that a west-facing sign would not be on a street frontage and so would not be in conformance with the city code. He commented that the west side of the building is the most visible from State Street and Devils Glen Road.

Gallagher asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Graham Cunninghame, the applicant, stated that he purchased the signs because he was unaware of the city's signage requirements. He commented that he would have to purchase two new signs in order to comply with staff's recommendation. He suggested that perhaps a compromise would be to use the larger sign on the street frontage and eliminate the second smaller sign on the west side of the building. He added that the site configuration is odd given that several lots and an alley are involved. Beswick confirmed that the applicant holds deed to all of the property referenced by Cunninghame.

Tansey asked if all of the street frontage was included in the calculation or just the lot where the building is located. Beswick explained that all of the lots were included and that the widest frontage along State Street was used for the calculation.

Cunninghame commented that Manatt's has made many improvements including landscaping to enhance the appearance of the site.

Tombergs asked if the 20-foot by 40-foot sign is the one that has been purchased. Beswick confirmed this, adding that the 10-foot by 20-foot sign and the monument sign have also been purchased. Cunningham stated that his suggestion is to only consider the 800 square foot sign for the building. Tombergs commented that staff has suggested that the sign showing the address be allowed. She added that she believes that there is a hardship given the fact that the billboard on State Street partially obstructs the view of the site. She stated that traffic tends to travel faster than the posted speed limit as well. Tombergs added that the proposed 800 square foot sign is proportional to the large size of the building. Hunt stated that the depth of the lot makes application of the formula for calculating allowable signage difficult as it does not take the geography of a site into consideration. Tombergs commented that the proposed sign would not negatively affect the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Beswick explained that the formula used to calculate allowable sign square footage is the same for all zoning districts in the city.

Hunt asked if the sign would be lit or have any type of digital display. Cunninghame explained that there would be three lights underneath the sign that would reflect up. He added that there is no electronic component.

Gallagher commented that the size of the building, the fact that it is in an I-2 district, and is set back substantially from State Street are unique to this request. He added that approving the request would not be contrary to the public interest given these factors.

On motion by Tombergs, seconded by Tansey, that a variance to increase the allowable on-premises identification signage by allowing a 20-foot by 40-foot building sign on the State Street side and to allow a monument sign be approved in accordance with the Decision and Order.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Decision and Order is Annex #4 to these minutes.

- c. Case 21-054; 6906 Competition Court (proposed C-3) - Special use permit to allow outdoor service areas associated with two restaurants, submitted by Build to Suit, Inc./Kevin Koellner.

Gallagher asked if there was an affidavit of publication. Beswick stated that notice of public hearing had been received. Notice and affidavit of publication are Annex #2 to these minutes.

Beswick reviewed the staff report. Staff report is Annex #5 to these minutes.

Tansey asked why the property is being rezoned to C-3. Beswick explained that the developer has identified a unique tenant who wants to locate his business that involves trucking services in the subdivision which does not fit into the C-7 zoning district.

There being no one wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request, Gallagher closed the public hearing.

On motion by Tansey, seconded by Tombergs, that a special use permit to allow outdoor service areas associated with two restaurants be approved in accordance with the Decision and Order.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Decision and Order is Annex #6 to these minutes.

There being no further business, it was unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m.

These minutes and annexes approved \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Taylor Beswick  
Community Development Director