

**City of Evansville Plan Commission  
Regular Meeting  
Tuesday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 6:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

- 1. Call to Order** at 6:00pm.
- 2. Roll Call:**

Members	Present/ Absent	Others Present
Mayor Dianne Duggan	P	Colette Spranger, Community Development Director
Aldersperson Bill Lathrop	P	Jason Sergeant, City Administrator
Aldersperson Abbey Barnes	P	Seth Schulz, Andy Phillips, Justin Drogsvold,
Susan Becker	P	Diane and Norm Schulz, Steve Hagen, Joey
John Gishnock	A	Allen, Ericka Adams, Aaron Skinner, John Paquin,
Mike Scarmon	P	Troy Pagenkopf, Gary and Sharon Thompson,
Eric Klar	A	Chester and Sandi Nelson, Laura Schroder, Nancy
		Greve, Dan Cobb, Joe Geoffrion, Andy Gorman
		Jill Johnson, Katie McDaniel, Cora Summers, Mark
		Brusberg, Daniel Kornaus, Katie and David Paar,
		Dave and Nora Rogers, Rebecca Jorge, Dave Olsen

- 3. Motion to approve the agenda, by Lathrop, seconded by Becker. Approved unanimously.**
- 4. Motion to waive the reading of the minutes from the July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025 meeting approve them as printed by Barnes, seconded by Becker. Minor edits regarding attendance. Approved unanimously.**
- 5. Civility Reminder.** Duggan noted the City’s commitment to conducting meetings with civility.
- 6. Citizen appearances other than agenda items listed.** None.
- 7. Action Items**
  - A. Motion to Approve Resolution 2025-16 Public Participation Plan**

Spranger explained that an application had been made to update the Future Land Use Map to the Comprehensive Plan, and this resolution was part of a statutory requirement. The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for most of the City’s decision making and policy concerning land use, so the state mandates an official declaration of public participation for the plan. In the case of a small amendment like this, the City has typically held a public hearing to satisfy the requirements of the State. Lathrop asked for clarification on what the resolution is asking. Sergeant clarified that is both a resolution that Plan Commission approves and recommends Common Council approve. Lathrop asks that the motion be altered to reflect as such.

**Motion to approval and recommend Common Council approve Resolution 2025-16 by Barnes, seconded by Becker.**

**B. Public Hearing and Review of Conditional Use Permit Application CUP-2025-03 for Indoor Commercial Use (Tattoo Shop) on parcel 6-27-93 located at 15 W Main Street**

**1. Review Staff Report and Applicant Comments.**

Spranger summarized the report, explaining that tattoo shops are a grey area of the City's zoning ordinance. She originally had instructed the applicant that no zoning approval was needed, as the closest matching land use to a tattoo parlor was personal or professional service, defined as a service provided directly to an individual or on a one-by-one basis. However, after learning that the business intended to operate until 11PM, well after most other professional services in the downtown, she advised the applicant that a conditional use permit for indoor commercial entertainment would be needed. Indoor Commercial Entertainment uses usually encompass eateries or bars, but also includes language about operating hours that are significantly later other businesses. Justin Drogsvold spoke on behalf of his business, stating that he was willing to adjust the hours to 9:00pm. He has received his operating license from Rock County Public Health, which came with two conditions that they will be following up on.

**2. Public Hearing.**

Duggan opened the public hearing at 6:14pm. There were no comments. Public Hearing closed at 6:15pm.

**3. Plan Commissioner Questions and Comments.**

Becker asked for clarification on who could tattoo at the parlor. Drogsvold replied only he was licensed at the moment and he has an associate who is working toward licensing. Alderperson Barnes asked if the applicant had been operating without a valid conditional use permit. Spranger replied in the affirmative, noting that between the time of her telling Drogsvold he didn't need zoning approval and then the change of decision, the window for public hearing had passed for last month's Plan Commission. In light of that, she chose not to cite the applicant. Alderperson Barnes requested that in the future operating permission would be withheld until zoning approval could be made.

**4. Motion with Conditions**

**Motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for Indoor Commercial Entertainment per section 130-408 on parcel 6-27-93 located at 15 W Main Street, finding that the benefits of the use outweigh any potential adverse impacts, and that the proposed use is consistent with the required standards and criteria for issuance of a CUP set forth in Section 130-104(3)(a) through (e) of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to the following conditions:**

**1) Hours of operation shall be no earlier than 10am and no later than 9pm.**

**2) The business operator shall obtain and maintain all City, state, and county permits and licenses as may be required.**

**3) Address licensing and ceiling tile issues identified by Rock County Health Department at its July 21st, 2025 inspection.**

**4) Any substantial changes to the business model shall require a review of the existing conditional use permit.**

**5) Any changes to signage, outdoor lighting, and/or building facade are subject to approval from the Historic Preservation Commission. "Tattoo" neon sign to be moved from the front window.**

**6) Use cannot create a public nuisance as defined by local and state law.**

**7) The Conditional Use Permit is recorded with the Rock County Register of Deeds.**

*Motion by Becker, seconded by Barnes. Motion passed unanimously.*

**C. Public Hearing and Review of Rezoning Application RZ-2025-03 to rezone parcels in the Windmill Ridge 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition subdivision from R-1 to R-2**

**1. Review Staff Report and Applicant Comments**

Spranger explained that the rezoning was to satisfy a condition of the land divider's agreement that asked for either total density of 10 units on the parcels at build out or rezoning to R-2, which would enable either single family or duplex units. That would give the developer flexibility on responding to market demand for certain kinds of units, and could potentially exceed 10 units at build out. Applicant Dave Olsen agreed that they were seeking flexibility.

**2. Public Hearing**

Duggan opened the public hearing at 6:20pm. There were no comments. Public Hearing closed at 6:21pm.

**3. Plan Commissioner Questions and Comments**

Becker asked if they were intended to build each unit one at a time or all at once. Olsen replied one at a time.

Alderperson Lathrop asked why we didn't demand the density in either scenario. Mayor Duggan reiterated that in the case of existing developments, the City was trying to remain flexible.

**4. Motion to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-04 by Becker, seconded by Scarmon.**  
*Motion passed unanimously.*

**D. Public Hearing and Review of Rezoning Application RZ-2025-01 to rezone certain parcels in the Capstone Ridge subdivision from R-1 to R-2**

**1. Review Staff Report and Applicant Comments**

Spranger read the entirety of her report, noting that while it was long there were enough moving parts to both the rezoning request and development agreement that Plan Commission and the public would be better off hearing the history and reasoning for decision making in whole. She noted that the criteria to find the rezoning application compliant with City Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan did not include some of the provisions found in the Development Agreement, also being discussed at this evening's meeting, it would be hard not to discuss the two in tandem. Typically a development agreement is negotiated along with a preliminary or final plat. Capstone Ridge is unique in that the area has been platted for nearly 20 years, and that the proposed development agreement being discussed tonight was to supersede any existing agreements negotiated by the City, the most recent of which was in 2011.

**2. Public Hearing**

Duggan opened the public hearing at 6:47pm.

- Nancy Greve, 571 Hosanna Heights, spoke about recognizing the affordable housing opportunity and expressed her desire that the engineers involve follow their stormwater benchmarks in order not to create adverse effects on existing land owners. She also

would like to see some green space kept and feels this is a good opportunity to make a good community neighborhood.

- Dan Janes, 8106 Cemetery Road, was involved with the platting of this subdivision, as it was on land he formerly owned. At that time he was involved with what parameters were set about housing type and quantity. He is still involved with the development of the land, as he owns several lots within the subdivision, and encouraged anyone with concerns to talk to him.
- John Paquin, 221 Genesis Drive, lives at the very end of Genesis Drive, which was supposed to have a hammerhead turn around. There is no sign in that location. He has been there the past 17 years and it has never been addressed. Would also like the dead end signs put up to deter traffic until roads can be completed.
- Ericka Adams, 256 Noah's Arc Court, has trouble accessing East Main Street at its intersection with Water Street. She wonders how that will be affected with more traffic. Also wanted to know when Cemetery Road would be widened with gutters.
- Sharon Thompson, 257 N Water Street, lives next to retention pond. Wanted to know if the ponds would be expandable and if three or four-plexes would be allowed with the R-2 zoning change. (Spranger interjected and reiterated a point she previously made, which was that none of the lots in the subdivision could meet the City's requirements for minimum lots size and green space needs that are needed for three- and fourplex housing units.)
- Gary Thompson, 257 N Water, questioned if the developers could rent out the homes to anyone. (The developers replied that they would rather sell the units individually.)
- Nora Roberts, 208 Genesis Drive, asked why none of the lots closer to Cemetery Road were chosen for R-2 zoning. She would prefer if duplexes were placed further from existing homes.
- Rebecca Jorge, 217 Genesis Drive, reiterated a request to preserve green space and cited traffic as another concern. She asked if the rest of the streets would be curbed with gutters as part of this development.
- Troy Pagenkopf, 200 Genesis Drive, raised questions about utility and service constraints associated with increased population.
- Dan Cobb, 561 Hosanna Heights, asked what would keep the developers from not finishing the work this time around. Echoed concerns about traffic and losing green space.

At this time a small discussion regarding park and open space occurred. Becker asked if retention ponds could be made into an amenity or educational opportunity. Dan Janes suggested land by the water tower, already owned by the City, could be used for nearby park land.

- Jill Johnson, 206 Noah's Arc Court, echoed concerns about the Water/East Main intersection and congestion at Countryside Park during events. Whether or not this development goes through, she suggests a fix for the Water/East Main intersection. There are no sidewalks heading south on Water Street. Asks if a signalized crosswalk is possible.
- Andy Gorman, 209 Noah's Arc Court, does not agree with the bulk rezoning and thinks the rezoning goes against the Comprehensive Plan.
- Mark Brusberg, 248 Noah's Arc Court, echoes concerns about Water Street not being barricaded or otherwise controlled north of the plat. He suggested they were not given

proper noticed and cited a section of the City's Subdivision code that mentions covenants.

Public Hearing closed at 7:28pm.

**3. Plan Commissioner Questions and Comments**

- 4. Motion to recommend Common Council Approve Ordinance 2025-04 by Duggan, second by Lathrop. Motion passed unanimously.**

**E. Review, Discussion, and Motion to Recommend Common Council Approve the 2025 Capstone Ridge Subdivision Development Agreement**

Plan Commission did not feel they needed further discussion of the development agreement. Alderperson Lathrop asked if he could add language to the document on page 9, paragraph O where if reasonable changes were requested by City staff regarding public improvements, that the applicant return to Plan Commission and Common Council for review and approval. Verbal consent of Commission. **Motion to recommend approval by Duggan, seconded by Barnes. Motion passed unanimously.**

**8. Discussion.**

**9. Community Development Report. None.**

**10. Next Meeting Date:** Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

**11. Adjourn.**