

**PLAN COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
Wednesday, May 8, 2019

**Present:** Bill Fitzsimmons (Chairman), Mike Crotty, Craig Mack, Butch Trevor, John Wetzel

**Absent:** Peter McDermott, Alan Hon, Dennis Kelly, Jeff Nelson, Matt Puck, Cindy Wermuth

**Staff:** Ryan Berger

**Others:**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Fitzsimmons called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

**2. Reading and approval of Minutes – April 10, 2019**

**No quorum; unable to approve minutes.**

**3. New Business**

None.

**4. Other business**

**Residential Accessory Building – Zoning Code Review (Ryan Berger, Land Development Manager)**

Mr. Berger introduced the zoning code regarding how to determine the size of an accessory structure. Mr. Berger noted that there has been confusion from the public regarding how the City determines the permitted size of accessory structures. Mr. Berger sought to investigate how other communities in the area would determine the permitted size of an accessory structure in comparison to Moline.

It was determined that the permitted accessory structure is determined by the following calculations. The example discussed pertains to a lot located in the R-2 zoning district, where the rear yard setback requirement is 30 ft.

**Moline:** Required rear yard setback \* Width of lot

**Rock Island:** Actual rear yard (distance form rear property line to house) \* Width of lot

Chairman Fitzsimmons inquired if any building or accessory structure could be located in the required rear yard setback; Mr. Berger clarified that this setback is only for principle structures. Mr. Berger noted that he has received questions from elected officials as to why the Moline code is restrictive of accessory structure size even on larger lots.

Mr. Berger clarified that the current calculation for the size of the permitted accessory structure has been based upon an interpretation of the zoning code, as Moline and Rock Island have the same code as it pertains to accessory structures. Chairman Fitzsimmons noted that the City Code's original intent, pertaining to zoning, was to achieve uniformity throughout Rock Island County. Chairman Fitzsimmons suggested that the City should seek uniformity, with other communities, in the way that the Code is

interpreted as well as written and that the City should attempt to remain competitive with communities in the local area. Mr. Berger concurred and stated that the current interpretation of the Code in Moline is more restrictive when compared to other local communities.

Commissioner Wetzel sought to confirm that it is the width of the property that has the greatest impact on the permitted size of the accessory structure. Commissioner Wetzel queried why the length is not determined by the distance between the principal structure and the required rear yard setback.

Chairman Fitzsimmons sought to clarify that the setback requirement used to calculate permitted accessory structure size only applies to the principal structure; Mr. Berger confirmed this fact.

Mr. Berger also noted that accessory structures have their own setback requirements, and the required rear yard setback used to calculate the permitted size of an accessory structure only pertains to the principal structure. Mr. Berger then proceeded to explain how Bettendorf and Davenport calculate the permitted size of an accessory structure.

**Bettendorf:** Accessory structure may be up to 75% of the foot print square footage of the principal structure.

**Davenport:** cover up to 25% of lot with building.

Further discussion amongst commissioners took place.

It was the general consensus amongst the commissioners that the current code interpretation is currently too restrictive.

Some further discussion took place amongst the commissioners.

The consensus amongst the commissioners was in favor of the Davenport code in determining accessory structure size. Mr. Berger was tasked with applying the Davenport code, pertinent to accessory structures, to various lots in Moline to determine the effects a text amendment would have on the permitted size of accessory structures.

## 5. Review upcoming meeting

No upcoming business.

## 6. Public comment

None.

## 7. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Silas Metternick-Jones, Planning & Development Assistant  
Recording Secretary Pro Tem