

City of Evansville Plan Commission
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, October 7th, 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	Anne Kolasch
Aldersperson Abbey Barnes	A	Ted Gries
Susan Becker	A	Roger Berg
John Gishnock	P	Scott Mallon
Mike Scarmon	P	
Eric Klar	A	

- 3. Motion to approve the agenda, by Lathrop, seconded by Scarmon. Approved unanimously.
- 4. Motion to waive the reading of the minutes from the September 3rd, 2025 meeting approve them as printed by Lathrop, seconded by Scarmon. Approved unanimously.
- 5. Civility Reminder. Duggan affirmed the City’s commitment to conducting meetings with civility.
- 6. Citizen appearances other than agenda items listed. None.
- 7. Action Items

- A. Review and Possible Amendment to Site Plan SP-2024-02 on parcel 6-27-862 (60 N Union, Culver’s Restaurant)
 - 1. Review Staff Report and Applicant Comments

Spranger gave the update on the finished site plan. She was under the impression that a masonry wall would be visible from the street, blocking the view of cars in the parking lot. There was a wall built as shown on the site plan, but when considering grade most of the wall is below the ground and out of site. It was technically built according to the submitted plans. The issue is that the wall was a necessary part of the site design to achieve a shielded/screened view of the parking lot from Union Street. This shielding of parking lots is to be a feature of new development along Union Street as sites redevelop. The application is coming back for Plan Commission’s assessment on how to remedy the situation. The applicant, Scott Mallon, is present, and does not feel the wall is necessary and that it could be

a safety hazard if built 24” higher from its current location. The area behind becomes steep as it transitions to a stormwater pond.

2. Plan Commissioner Questions and Comments

Plan Commissioners concur that renderings submitted by the applicant depicted a wall, which suggested a wall would be visible. They also acknowledged that the wall was built according to plans that they approved. Discussion turned to how landscaping could achieve the spirit of the zoning intent.

3. Possible Motion to Amend Site Plan SP-2024-02

- 4. Motion by Duggan, second by Lathrop, to amend the site plan for SP-2024-02 to allow for 3 evergreen trees planted in front of the parking area, to stand in for a masonry while to provide screening effect of the parking lot. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Public Hearing, Review, and Action on Rezoning Application RZ-2025-05 and Site Plan Application SP-2025-01 for parcel 6-27-801 (129 N Madison Street)

1. Review Staff Report and Applicant Comments

Spranger described the building expansion and explained the need for the rezone to allow for the site plan. The existing building and lot are existing and non-conforming to the B-1 zoning district. The B-2 zoning district is an appropriate implementing district for the future land use designation of the parcel. (*Note: during the meeting Spranger stated the future land use designation of the site was Historic Neighborhood. It is in fact Central Mixed Use, but the B-2 zoning district is still the recommended implementing district for that category.*) The current building has a zero lot line on its northern property line. The proposed expansion would extend the building to the western property line. There would still be 15 feet from the building to Park Drive. There are additional issues with the quasi-on street parking along the property’s southern boundary, but the intention is to address these when the City reconstructs Park Drive, which is scheduled in 2028. Spranger feels the switch to the B-2 district is appropriate, as the building is sited on the property in a way that is more akin to other downtown properties versus the B-1, whose intent is to blend in businesses within a neighborhood. Applicant Roger Berg was present and elaborated on the building design and purpose, which is to expand his offices for real estate and development.

2. Public Hearing

Public Hearing opened at 6:25PM. Ted Gries, 27 Grove Street, feels that the B-1 zoning district is the more appropriate district to remain in. He questions how the building would fit in with the design guidelines of the B-2 zoning district. Anne Kolasch, 39 Mill Street, began to discuss road projects on her street and was redirected to follow up with the City engineer who is charge of that project. Public hearing closed at 6:39PM.

3. Plan Commissioner Questions and Comments

There was hearty debate about the appropriateness of the rezone, including alternative ways to allow for the site plan to continue with a rezone. Spranger explained that a variance was considered, as the site has some unique qualities that could qualify it for a hardship, but that a variance would need to address several of the violations the building faces as it currently sits in the B-1. Variances also run with the property, which means a variance granted today would have to be honored in the future. Gishnock acknowledged the uniqueness of a property with three street sides, and stated his opinion that the building was an improvement of what had been there historically. Duggan inquired about what businesses could be put in its place if the zoning district changed; Spranger replied that it was very similar to the B-1. Scarmon discussed the possibility of the City vacating right-of-way when Park Drive is reconstructed, which could enlarge the property and address setback issues. Lathrop was concerned about

the possibility of long-term redevelopment that could result in a building inappropriate to its surroundings, citing the possibility that four stories could be built in this location. Plan Commission members stated there was no opposition to the site plan, but wanted to ensure the rezoning was consistent and did not create an adverse effect on future development.

4. Motions

1. Motion to Recommend Approval of Ordinance 2025-11

Motion made by Duggan, with a request to take roll call. Final vote was 3-1 with Lathrop dissenting. Motion failed, per Section 94-40 of the City of Evansville Municipal Code, which states “all actions shall require the affirmative approval of a majority of all the members of the plan commission.”

2. Motion to Approve Site Plan, subject to conditions as written in staff report

Plan Commission took no action, as there was confusion on how the vote of the rezoning ordinance impacted the conditions stated in the site plan.

8. Discussion. None.

9. Community Development Report. None given.

10. Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, November 4th 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

11. Adjourn at 7:12pm.