

**MINUTES OF THE  
ROCK ISLAND BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

**Regular Meeting**

**7:00 p.m.**

**April 13, 2011**

ATTENDANCE:	(x) Present	( ) Absent
(x) Kevin Day		(x) Karen Williams
(x) Dave McAdam		(x) Larry Tschappat
(x) Gary Snyder		( ) Robert Wild
(x) Faye Jalloh		

Staff Present: Alan Carmen, Alan Fries

Chairman Snyder called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He said Case 2011-08 had been withdrawn by the applicant and that Case 2011-13 will be considered after Case 2011-03 due to its proximity to that case.

**Approval of Minutes** – Mr. Tschappat made a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 9, 2011 meeting. Ms. Jalloh seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Procedural Explanation** - Chairman Snyder explained the procedure to be followed for the public hearing. He said there were two Interested Party Statements submitted for Case #2011-03 (Don and Mara Adams of 2811 24<sup>th</sup> Street and Elizabeth Eagle, attorney representing Jack J. Boccarossa, Trustee of the Joseph Boccarossa Trust for 2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue) and one submitted for Case #2011-13 (Arthur Milton 2926 27<sup>th</sup> Street).

**Public Hearing #2011-03 - Request from Jordan Catholic School for a special exception to expand an authorized use, a variance of 12 feet of the 20 foot separation requirement between a school and a residential zoning district adjacent to 2811 24<sup>th</sup> Street and a variance of five feet of the 20 foot separation requirement between a school and a residential zoning district adjacent to 2418 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue in an R-2 (one family residence) district at 2901 24<sup>th</sup> Street.**

Mr. Fries said this is a continuation of the case from March 9, 2011 when the Board voted to defer action pending a meeting of neighbors and the applicant to discuss and resolve issues that came up at the March hearing.

The applicant will remove the existing single-family residence located at 2817 24<sup>th</sup> Street and consolidate that lot with the large parcel where the elementary school is located. The approximate 9,563 square foot one-story northwesterly addition will extend into this former residential parcel to within eight feet from the north property line. A four-foot tall chain link fence will be located adjacent to the proposed addition along the north property line. This addition will also extend approximately 41 feet to the west from the existing western building façade (maintaining a 28-foot west front yard and exceeding the 25-foot minimum by three feet). This addition will include classrooms and computer and science labs that will accommodate 110 new 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students who will be transferred from an existing school location in Milan (floor plans and building elevations for all three proposed additions are in the case file).

The 5,856 square foot addition off the north end of the gym area of the existing school will extend to within 15 feet from the property line adjacent to 2418 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue (an existing detached garage currently located in this area will be removed). The proposed one story addition will include a music, art and multi-purpose room that will be used by all of the 430 students of the school.

The proposed 968 square foot one-story addition off the west entrance will include a new principal's office and lobby area. This addition will extend 22 feet out from the existing west exterior wall and will maintain an approximate 48-foot west front yard.

School officials and architects met with neighbors on March 25<sup>th</sup>. Copies of information provided by Gere-Dismer Architects including attendees, discussion item notes and information provided by the Terracon Engineering firm regarding drainage issues that are in the agenda packet and case file. Four design changes are proposed by the applicant. They include the following:

1. Install a trench drain system in the “vicinity” along the north property line of the school property to allow water runoff to drain in a westerly direction.
2. Install a new four-foot tall chain link fence on or near the north property lines. Existing chain link fences in this area will be removed. An attached letter from Jack Boccarossa requests an eight-foot tall solid vinyl fence along the Boccarossa property (2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue). The applicant has not yet agreed to this request.
3. Changes to provide more low level landscaping along the north property lines.
4. Additional surface mounted lighting (directing light downward) along the north façade of the addition to provide better security.

A second letter from Mr. Boccarosa outlines his request to defer the public hearing until the June 8<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting because he will not be available in April or May. Staff sent a letter and left a phone message with Mr. Boccarossa informing him that he should contact the applicant with his request, but that staff will also relay this information to the Board.

Staff supports the revisions made to the applicant’s request, except for the proposed eight-foot tall fence adjacent to the Boccarossa property. The Zoning Ordinance allows up to a six-foot tall privacy fence in a side and rear yard and the eight-foot tall fence would be excessive in height. Staff believes that the proposed fencing and landscaping (agreed to by neighbors) will provide an adequate buffer for the adjacent residential properties.

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

Jeff Dismer, 3401 South Shore Drive in Moline and architect for the project, was sworn in. He said that at the meeting with neighbors on March 25<sup>th</sup> the applicant agreed to provide additional drainage protection with a trench system, but did not agree to provide an eight-foot tall fence. He said they believe that a four-foot tall fence will be adequate because the north yard will not be an area that children will be using for an exit or playground. He added that Mr. Boccarossa’s request to remove trees was also not considered because the trees are not on school property and are not affected by the proposed additions or fence.

Mr. McAdam said he understood not providing an eight-foot tall fence, but asked if they would consider a compromise to provide a six-foot tall fence. Mr. Dismer replied that it was the school’s decision and asked for the school principal to come forward.

Michael Daley, 7104 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue B Court in Moline and school principal, was sworn in. He said that they believe that a taller fence will detract from both properties and that a four-foot tall fence will provide adequate security and buffering. He added that the removal of trees did not come up at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, but was added in a later letter from Mr. Boccarossa. He said that the trees are not on school property.

Chairman Snyder then asked if either of the Interested Parties would like to cross-examine the applicant.

Both Interested Parties declined.

Chairman Snyder called for opponents.

Steve Tollenaer, 2515 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Fourth Ward Alderman, was sworn in. He questioned the accuracy of the aerial photograph with the proposed improvements highlighted on the map indicating that he believes that the power lines show that the addition will be much closer to the Don and Mara Adams property at 2811 24<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that the applicant is showing a lack of regard for adjacent property owners as the building will only be eight feet

away from their property line. He said that he is there to highlight the concerns of the four adjacent property owners who believe that the request will affect their property values. He said he does not want them to move out of the city.

Ms. Williams asked where he would propose to locate the addition. Mr. Tollenaer replied that the Board should talk to the neighbors.

Ms. Williams then said that was the purpose of the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting and asked if he had other ideas. Mr. Tollenaer said that he was there to protect the values of property owners in the city, but was specifically representing the Adams or the Boccarossas.

Mr. McAdam said he believes that the existing residence on the subject property was located eight to ten feet from the property line. Mr. Tollenaer said he believes it was twelve feet from the line.

Don and Mara Adams, 2811 24<sup>th</sup> Street, were sworn in. Mr. Adams said their concerns were over stormwater issues and property values. He said that the applicant has also revised its landscaping plan to be keeping with their request for lower level of landscaping and has also addressed the drainage concern, but the proposed addition will still have a negative effect on their property value. He said he appreciated the extra time they have had to meet with school officials and their architect, but they feel they have had no power to change the basic design of the addition and that it is still an imposing structure close to their property.

Ms. Adams said that she has concerns about some misinformation about how people associated with the school feel about them and vice-versa. She said expressing their concerns has been a difficult choice because they are in the teaching profession and attendees of the church.

Mr. Adams added that there is no guarantee that the trench drainage system will keep water from getting into their basement.

Mr. McAdam said that the Zoning Ordinance would allow a two-story residence to be located on the subject site to within eight feet from the property line.

Mr. Adams said that a residence would not likely have as long a wall as the school is proposing adjacent to their property.

Elizabeth Eagle, 2917 27<sup>th</sup> Street Court in Moline and attorney representing Jack J. Boccarossa, Trustee of the Joseph Boccarossa Trust for 2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue, was sworn in. She said that she assumes that the Board did not consider his request to table the case as the hearing has proceeded tonight. She said that she also has concerns about the accuracy of the map and believes that it is unwise for the Board to move on the request without complete and accurate information. She said the Board's decision could be subject to objection and review. She identified similar concerns as those expressed at the March hearing including negative effect on neighbor's property value, losing of neighbor privacy, turning their back yard area into a semi-commercial space, the lighting of exit doors facing the neighboring properties and noise from the roof air conditioner units. She said that a chain link fence does not provide any buffering or privacy for the neighbors and says the eight-foot fence would give her client better protection. She added that the trees on the Boccarossa property overhang from the yard and it would be difficult to remove them after a fence is put in.

Mr. Day said that the architect said last month that there will not be any lighting along the north side yard and that the Adams family also requested a chain link fence along their property line.

Ms. Williams asked if she thought the accuracy of the map drawing was a basis for her to appeal the decision in court. Ms. Eagle replied that yes she would be concerned about the accuracy of the map.

Mr. Tschappat said that the staff report gives an accurate written description of the variance request and that the

Board can make a decision based on that information. He said that the map gives a general description to the location of property lines and the proposed improvements that is meant to be a guide for the Board's decision.

Chairman Snyder asked for a rebuttal by the applicant.

Mr. Dismer supplied a survey done by a professional surveyor that said that power poles on the site are not located on the property line.

Chairman Snyder asked neighbors to come forward to the head table to view the survey document together with the Board.

Following viewing of the survey, Mr. Dismer said that there will be five to six smaller air conditioning units on the roof to reduce the noise from fewer and larger units.

Mr. Tschappat asked how far the units would be from the north façade of the addition. Mr. Dismer replied 30 feet.

Mr. McAdam said that there likely would be a one-foot or so parapet on the roofline to block view of the units. Mr. Dismer said that the roof line would be similar to the north roof line of Farrell Hall on the school/church property.

Mr. Dismer identified that there would be no exits facing north, but one exit facing east with a light on top of it. He added that the Adams family had also requested two security lights on the north facade of the proposed addition. He added that the applicant and architects have tried to work with neighbors and their concerns, but that they cannot meet all of them and complete the addition to meet all the school's needs.

As there was no one else to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**Decision Case #2011-03** – Mr. Tschappat made a motion to approve the request because:

1. The proposed additions will add needed classroom and educational resource labs for the school.
2. The proposed additions' locations best fit the school's existing floor plan.
3. The proposed additions will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

He added the following stipulations:

1. Install a trench drain system in the vicinity along the north property line of the school property to allow water runoff to drain in a westerly direction.
2. Install a new four-foot tall chain link fence on or near the north property lines. The existing chain link fences in this area will be removed.
3. Provide more low level landscaping along the north property lines.
4. Additional surface mounted lighting (directing light downward) along the north façade of the addition to provide better security.

Mr. McAdam seconded the motion.

Chairman Snyder said all the Board members are concerned with property values and that his vote always weighs the concerns of neighbors. He said that he believes that Jordan School has been a good neighbor and that progress needs to be made, but that he would not like the proposed addition so close to his back yard. He concluded that this will be a very difficult decision for him to make.

Mr. McAdam agreed and said in his seven years on the Board this will probably be the most difficult decision he has ever had to make.

Ms. Williams said that the school has tried to make the situation better by revising its request to accommodate most of the neighbor's concerns.

Mr. Tschappat said that if the request was reduced to be only one classroom it would still be an imposing structure next to a residential area.

Chairman Snyder called for a vote on the motion approve the request with stipulations, and it passed unanimously.

**Public Hearing #2011- 13 – Request from St. Vincent DePaul Society (St. Pius X Catholic Church) for a special exception to expand an authorized use in an R-2 (one family residence) district at 2502 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

Mr. Fries presented the staff report. He explained that the Zoning Ordinance requires Board authorization to expand an authorized use in a residential zoning district (Section 15.3). The applicant proposes to construct a one-story detached combination maintenance garage and food pantry (36' x 80') and an adjacent 24-space parking lot in the east side yard.

The applicant will remove an existing detached maintenance garage on the north side of the property to facilitate the proposed school expansion (BZA Case #2011-03). The proposed structure for the subject case will be used to store the maintenance equipment from this former garage and also to house a food pantry area currently operated out of the church Rectory structure. The proposed structure will be located southeast of the Rectory and situated six feet to the east of another existing detached garage. The proposed wood frame structure will be located approximately 42 feet from the east property line. The east rear yard has several mature trees that will help buffer the proposed vinyl-sided structure from adjacent residential uses.

A maintenance and lawn equipment storage area will take up the northern one-half of the proposed structure. There will be an overhead access door facing west (see building elevation and floor plan). The food pantry area will take up the southern one-half and have pedestrian access doors on the west and south side of the structure. The food pantry will operate six days a week and have hours similar to Jordan School hours. Clients and staff will utilize the proposed 24-space parking lot for vehicle parking. The parking lot will have two to three light standards facing light downward towards the parking spaces.

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

Italo Milani, 2801 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and architect for the request, was sworn in. He said that the proposed structure is replacing the existing maintenance garage along the north property line that will be removed to accommodate the school addition approved in the previous case before the Board. He said that the proposed parking lot will extend from the existing parking lot and that rain gardens will be provided to the east of the proposed building and north of the parking lot and to help minimize water runoff into the ravine to the east of the site. He then summarized the floor plan of the maintenance garage and food pantry area in the proposed structure.

Mr. Tschappat asked what equipment was going to be in the structure. Mr. Milani replied that it would be garden equipment including the possibility of a tractor and a snow plow.

Mr. Tschappat then asked if there would be a vehicle parked in the structure. Mr. Milani replied that there may be a pickup truck also parked in the structure.

Mr. Tschappat then asked if he considered locating the building closer to the existing parking lot. Mr. Milani replied that it would then intrude on the playground area and that they looked at several alternatives, but determined that this was the best location.

Mr. Tschappat then asked if he would consider adding more landscaping to the east side of the proposed structure. Mr. Milani replied that the plantings in the rain garden to the east of the structure could grow to be four to five feet in height, but that he was not opposed to adding additional landscaping.

Chairman Snyder asked if the Interested Party had any questions of the applicant.

Arthur Milton, 2926 27<sup>th</sup> Street, was sworn in. He asked how tall was the roof of the structure going to be. Mr. Milani replied 15 feet to the peak.

Chairman Snyder then asked for opponents.

Mr. Milton, who had already been sworn in, came to the podium. He said that he was also speaking for his son, Andrew Cambell of 2922 27<sup>th</sup> Street who has lived there off-and-on since 1975. He said that he has lived there since 1981 and thinks the proposed structure is too big, too wide, too close, too tall, too wet and nonresidential for the site. He said that the proposed structure is on higher ground that it will be more imposing and will also block his view to the west. He said the roof is also too close to the edge of the ravine and it will increase water flow into the ravine. He suggested that there be a rain garden located on the east side of the parking lot and that the building be moved closer to the existing parking lot and turned so that it would be parallel to 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue. He added that then there would not be a need for additional parking and that people coming to the food pantry could use the existing parking lot on the east side of the site.

Chairman Snyder asked the applicant if he wanted to ask questions of Mr. Milton.

Mr. Milani declined.

Linda Milton, 2926 27<sup>th</sup> Street, was sworn in. She agreed that would not be a need for a new parking lot if the proposed structure would be turned and moved closer to the existing parking lot on the east side of the site.

Chairman Snyder called for a rebuttal.

Mr. Milani said there will be more students and parents on the site because of the expanded school addition, so there will be a need for additional parking. He said that due to new City Codes (Stormwater Ordinance) the drainage requirements on the proposed structure and parking lot are more stringent than in the past, so that is why the rain gardens are proposed. He said they could consider putting in a combination rain garden and water detention pond on the site to help deal with drainage issues. He said that the building was sited at the proposed location because it is a closer location to extend utility lines from the Rectory structure.

Mr. Tschappat asked if he would add a stipulation to add more landscaping on the east side of the structure would he have opposition to it. Mr. Milani said he would not.

As no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**Decision Case #2011-13** – Mr. McAdam made a motion to approve the request because:

1. The proposed special exception will add needed maintenance, storage and food pantry space to the site.
2. The proposed special exception will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Williams seconded the motion.

Mr. Tschappat asked if a stipulation could be added to provide additional landscaping along the east side of the proposed structure.

Ms. Williams said that the neighbor who objected to the request did not include lack of landscaping as a reason for their objection.

Mr. McAdam agreed and said he would not add it to his motion.

Chairman Snyder called for a vote on the motion to approve the request and it passed, with Mr. McAdam, Ms. Williams, Mr. Day, Ms. Jalloh and Chairman Snyder voting aye and Mr. Tschappat voting nay.

Chairman Snyder called for a short break.

Ms. Williams had to leave the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

**Public Hearing #2011- 04 – Request from James Sexton for a variance of 2.5 feet of the 3.5-foot maximum height for a fence in a front yard and a variance of 25 feet of the 25-foot setback from point of intersection for a fence in a front yard on a corner property in an R-3 (one and two family residence) district at 1800 9 ½ Street.**

Mr. Fries presented the staff report. He explained that action on this case was deferred at the February 9, 2011 meeting for staff to meet with the applicant after the snow melts and to resolve visibility and location questions. The Zoning Ordinance requires a maximum height of 3.5 feet for fences in a front yard and a 25-foot setback from point of intersection for fences on a corner lot (Section 8.12). The applicant proposes to maintain a six-foot tall privacy fence in an approximate 40-foot long segment in the north front yard. The remainder of the fence in the north and east yards will be changed to meet the 42-inch height limit, but will be maintained to approximately eight feet up to the corner, not set back 25 feet as required.

The City received a complaint regarding the existing fence and contacted the applicant about the need to either bring the fence into conformance with zoning regulations, or apply for and receive a variance. The applicant has decided to apply for a variance based on a revision to his existing fence configuration. The applicant will reduce the fence height in the east front yard and proposes to only maintain a six-foot tall height for the fence along an approximate 40-foot long segment along the north front yard. This area will include 20-foot long segment between the subject house and the west property line (providing privacy for the west rear yard) and a 20-foot long segment from the north side door of the house eastward towards the intersection. The applicant indicates that he would like to maintain the six-foot tall fence in this area to provide for more privacy and security for a child's bedroom since there have been people knocking on the side door when walking past the house.

The City Engineer has again reviewed the applicant's fence height revisions in relation to visibility at the intersection and recommends that the fence be set back approximately eight feet from point of intersection along the east and north property lines. The applicant was not able to be present with the City Engineer and staff during a meeting approximately two weeks ago due to his work schedule. Staff contacted Mr. Sexton about the City Engineer's and staff's recommendation, but were unable to speak to him prior to the meeting.

The revised staff recommendation would set the fence back to the sidewalk entrance to the residence off 9-½ Street and eight feet from the point of intersection along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The City Engineer indicates that this would provide adequate visibility at the corner. The applicant understands that he could still enclose the front yards by angling the fence at the corner from the eight-foot setback points along the east and north property lines. Staff also recommends that the height of the fence along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue be allowed to be six feet in height in the west rear yard area and from the doorway off 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue eastward 20 feet. This would accommodate a four-foot gate and two eight-foot long panels along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue (the fence would need to then drop down to 3.5 feet at a point approximately between the bedroom windows and the front room windows along the north façade of the residence).

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

Jim Sexton, 1800 9-½ Street, was sworn in. He said that he was aware of the City Engineer and staff recommendation, but would like to also propose that there be an additional eight-foot long, six-foot tall section of fence along the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue side of the property. He said this would allow for a six-foot tall fence from the gate to 28 feet to the east. He said this would provide additional privacy for his living room along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Decision Case #2011-04** – Mr. McAdam made a motion to approve the revised request to allow the 28-foot long segment of six-foot fence requested by the applicant because:

1. The proposed variance will improve the return on the property.

2. The lot is a corner lot with two front yards.
3. The proposed variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Public Hearing #2011- 09 – Request from Kris Homan for a special exception to expand an existing non-conforming one car detached garage located up to the east property line in an R-4 (one to six family residence) district at 2620 5 ½ Avenue.**

Mr. Fries presented the staff report. He explained that zoning ordinance requires Board authorization to expand a non-conforming structure (Section 5.12). The applicant proposes to construct a 24' x 24' attached garage addition to the west of the existing 14' x 20' garage located in the south rear yard.

The existing non-conforming one-car garage (14' x 20') is located right up to the east property line and the south alley right-of-way line. The applicant desires to construct the attached addition to the west maintaining the non-conforming setback along the east property line and follow the existing south setback to the alley. The 24' x 24' addition will maintain a 12-foot setback from the west property line. The adjacent detached garage to the east (2626 5-½ Avenue) is also located right up to the alley right-of-way line.

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

David Griffin, 566 Oakwood Circle in Coal Valley, was sworn in. He said that he is Mr. Homan's brother-in-law and that the additional garage space will provide for inside parking space for all the vehicles on the property.

As no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**Decision Case #2011-09** – Ms. Jalloh made a motion to approve the request because:

1. The proposed garage will improve the return on the property.
2. The proposed garage will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Tschappat seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Public Hearing #2011- 10 – Request from Mario Rangel for a variance of seven per cent of the 30 per cent maximum coverage of a rear yard for an accessory structure in a rear yard in an R-4 (one to six family residence) district at 1236 14 ½ Street.**

Mr. Fries presented the staff report. He explained that zoning ordinance requires that accessory structures not cover more than 30 per cent of a rear yard area (Section 8.5A). The applicant proposes to construct a detached garage (24' x 24') in the west rear yard. Currently there is not a garage on the property and the applicant parks vehicles on an unimproved surface in the west rear yard. The proposed one-story detached garage will have access off the alley and will be located three feet off the north property line, 15 feet from the alley (west property line) and 16 feet from the residence.

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

Mario Rangel, 1236 14-½ Street, was sworn in. He said that he moved to the property three years ago from California and wants a garage to park his vehicles out of the weather.

As no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**Decision Case #2011-10** – Mr. Tschappat made a motion to approve the request because:

1. The proposed garage will improve the return on the property.
2. The lot is a corner lot with two front yards.



3. The proposed garage will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Day seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Public Hearing #2011- 11 – Request from Marrietta Castle for a variance of two feet of the 25-foot front yard setback requirement in an R-2 (one family residence) district at 2535 45<sup>th</sup> Street.**

Mr. Fries presented the staff report. He explained that zoning ordinance requires a 25-foot front yard setback requirement in an R-2 zoning district (Section 14.6). The applicant proposes to construct an attached open deck (8' x 38') in the west front yard.

The applicant constructed a deck with a pergola style roof structure along the south façade of the residence in recent years and now desires to construct the proposed open deck along the west front façade. The deck will connect to the existing deck to give a “wrap-around” effect to the deck structure. The deck off the south façade met the 25-foot front yard setback requirement, but the proposed open deck requires the two-foot variance maintaining a 23-foot west front yard.

Chairman Snyder called for proponents.

Mark Taylor, 1211 14<sup>th</sup> Street in Moline, was sworn in. He said he was the contractor for the project. He said that the proposed open deck will connect with the existing deck on the south side of the house. He added that new bushes will be planted along the west side of the house adjacent to the proposed deck.

As no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

**Decision Case #2011-11** – Ms. Jalloh made a motion to approve the request because:

1. The proposed variance will improve the return on the property.
2. The lot is a corner lot with two front yards.
3. The proposed variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Tschappat seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Public Hearing #2011- 12 – Request from Cecil Pennington for a variance of three feet of the three foot setback requirement and a variance of four per cent of the 30 per cent area coverage of a rear yard for an accessory structure in an R-2 (one family residence) district at 2051 45<sup>th</sup> Street.**

No one was present for the public hearing.

**Decision Case #2011-12** – Mr. Tschappat made a motion to defer the case until the regular May 11, 2011 meeting because:

1. The applicant was not present to answer questions at the public hearing.

Ms Jalloh seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan M. Carmen, Secretary  
Rock Island Board of Zoning Appeals