

# AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF EVANSVILLE AND VANDERBURGH COUNTY

Regular meeting held at 4:00 P.M. in Room 301  
Civic Center Complex - Administration Building  
Evansville, Indiana

September 14, 2006

## ROLL CALL

**Ms. Stevens:** I would like to call the September 14, 2006 meeting of the Area Plan Commission of Evansville and Vanderburgh County to order. Will the secretary please call the roll?

### Members Present:

Derek Dunigan, Bill Jeffers, Joe Kiefer, Lynn Lowe, Cheryl Musgrave, Phil Offerman, Bill Pedtke, Curt Wortman, Stacy Stevens

### Members Absent:

Greg Charnes, Roger Herrin, Mike Lockard, Jack McNeely

### Area Commission Staff Present:

Brad Mills, Executive Director; Beverly Behme, Zoning Administrator; Janet Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Joe Harrison, Jr., Counsel

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Ms. Stevens:** Is there a motion to approve the August minutes? (Motion was made and seconded.) The minutes of the August meeting are approved.

## REZONINGS

**Ms. Stevens:** For rezonings, it takes seven affirmative votes to recommend approval of a petition or seven negative votes to recommend denial of a petition. In the event that there are not seven votes, it still goes forward to the City Council or County Commission with no recommendation. The City rezonings considered tonight will be heard by the City Council on October 9, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. in Room 301. The County rezonings considered tonight will be heard by the County Commissioners on September 26, 2006 after the regular 3:30 County Commission meeting in Room 301.

The Area Plan Commission has established the following guidelines to be followed for both rezonings and subdivisions. Mr. Mills will begin each presentation. As each case is

called, the petitioner and the remonstrators who intend to testify will please stand and be sworn in at the beginning of the process. If your name is not on the petition, those who plan to testify need to please fill out the sheets in the back of the room. All testimony must begin by stating your name and address for the record.

The petitioner or person appearing for the case being heard will have a maximum of 10 minutes for the presentation of evidence, statements, and arguments in support of the petition. Then there will be a total of 10 minutes for the remonstrators. This testimony will be followed by a five minute rebuttal period for the petitioner as a summation of the case. Any request for additional time must be voted on by the Board. A timer will be used to help enforce the time limits. Both petitioners and remonstrators should organize their testimony to adhere to these guidelines.

When there is a group of individuals remonstrating against a petition, we strongly encourage the group to designate a spokesperson. If it is necessary for more than one remonstrator to speak, the group should meet out in the hall before the Area Plan Commission discussion of the agenda item, to coordinate the information presented, so that each speaker addresses a different issue of concern. In order to expedite the meeting, remonstrators should refrain from repeating the same concerns already expressed by another speaker about a particular development proposal. The Plan Commission appreciates the cooperation of all participants with these guidelines.

If the Commissioners have questions about issues that we feel have not been sufficiently addressed by the applicant, we have the option to request a continuance until the information needed to sufficiently answer our concerns is available or provided by the applicant or technical staff.

The following petitions will not be heard tonight:

Docket No: 14-S-2006    Green River Oaks  
CONTINUED TO OCTOBER BECAUSE OF NO DRAINAGE APPROVAL.

Docket No: 15-S-2006    Theater Commons  
CONTINUED TO OCTOBER BECAUSE OF NO DRAINAGE APPROVAL.

If you are here on either of these petitions, you may wish to leave at this time. Now, let's move on to the first rezoning item on the agenda tonight.

**Mr. Harrison:** Mr. Mills, on all the petitions here this afternoon, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is true and accurate so help you God? (Mr. Mills has been sworn in.)

## **COUNTY REZONING**

Docket No: 2006-22-PC VC-12-2006 Petitioner: Hugh Hazelwood

Address: (Complete legal on file.) 8100 Pollack Avenue

Nature of Case: Petitioner requests to rezone from an R-1 zone to a C-4 zone with a use and development commitment.

**Mr. Mills:** Hugh Hazelwood is requesting to change the zoning of a portion of his property located at 8100 Pollack Avenue from R-1 to C-4 with a Use and Development Commitment. This is a 0.2 acre site located on the north side of Pollack Avenue, just west of Indian Mounds Boulevard. This petition (prior to this current amendment) was heard at the July 13, 2006 Area Plan Commission hearing and was recommended for denial (0 YES – 10 NO- 2 ABSTENSIONS). On July 18, 2006, the Vanderburgh County Commissioners voted to send this petition back to the Area Plan Commission to allow further amendment to the use and development commitment. The new use and development commitment limits the site to a single C-4 use, a home and business improvement company. The commitment limits use of the site to office and storage of equipment, vehicles, and work related non hazardous materials. All storage will be contained within opaque fencing. There will be no display of materials, no direct sales from the site, no semi-trailers allowed on the premises, and the existing 2400 sq ft building shall not be enlarged. This site on Pollack Avenue was the former location of Knight Township Fire House # 7. The original block garage on this site was built in the mid 1930's, and was certified as a legal non-conforming commercial, neighborhood retail use by the Area Plan Commission in 1982. In December, 1989, the fire house was established on this site by approval of a special use permit by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The legal nonconforming commercial classification was abandoned by the owner of the site upon conversion to the public building use (fire station.) Two additions were made to the fire station during their occupancy of the site. This is a request to rezone the vacant site to C-4 with a use and development commitment to allow reestablishment of a commercial use within the commercial building on the site. Pollack Avenue at this location has no curbs or sidewalks, and the property is currently graveled to the street. Commercial use of the site will require review and compliance with Site Review Committee recommendations. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates this area as residential and undeveloped. Surrounding area is completely agricultural and residential.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Those persons have been sworn in.)

**Mr. Shively:** My name is Les Shively. I am pinch-hitting for Mr. Johnson, who was here before you the last time you heard this matter. I will try not to repeat the items that he presented. This was certified as legal non-conforming in 1982. Then when my client was approached about allowing the Knight Township Fire Department to make this a facility for them, it went for a special use and they abandoned the legal non-conforming commercial designation. Then with the November tornado last year, the building could no longer be used by Knight Township Fire Department and left the building. My client was left with a

building unproductive, not producing any income. My client listened very intently to the concerns raised by the remonstrators. That is why we asked to amend this request to add the use and development commitment. Mr. Mills went through it. I would like to emphasize a couple of items. Basically, this would be limited to the express purpose of allowing this particular type of business to have office space, store their vehicles and equipment and a certain amount of outside storage with no sales displays, no retail customer interaction to take place. It would be limited to this proposed tenant. So this is the only C-4 use that would be allowed. There would be outside storage. But there would have to be opaque fencing, which we have committed to. No sales display or customer activity. No semi trailers would be allowed on the premises. The existing building, and I think this was a concern raised last month, was the concern about expanding. We have committed that that footprint will not change. I know the Plan Commission members know how these use and development commitments work, but these commitments become part of the ordinance if it is approved, and they can't be changed without having to go through the rezoning process, and they run with the land. So if my client would sell this property, these commitments would be binding on future owners. We hope and think we have addressed all these concerns. This is a very unique situation. This is a building that doesn't lend itself to too many uses. This is an opportunity for my client to make it productive in a very limited and specialized way. He searched long and hard to find this unique tenant that would fit in this location. I would be happy to answer any questions. Mr. Hazelwood is here as well.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any questions?

**Mr. Kiefer:** This is the only use it can have, only one use and one use only?

**Mr. Shively:** Yes. Mr. Hazelwood lives next door. This is a unique piece of property. That is one reason why we have to do it in this manner, and also it gives further assurance to the fact that Mr. Hazelwood is very cognizant to what he is living next to. But you are right. No other use can be in this building.

**Mr. Dunigan:** He could have a sign up to 300 square feet? Do you know what kind of plans there are for signage?

**Mr. Shively:** The only signage we are aware of is the signage that would identify it as a place of business. But we can't advertise products or anything of that nature. So I think by default, that pretty well limits the signage to identifying the name of the business.

**Mr. Dunigan:** When I imagined 300 square feet on that building, I would think it would be the majority of the building.

**Mr. Shively:** I don't think they are going to need 300 square feet to identify to the UPS or whoever brings products there to them. The name and address is all you will probably see. They can't advertise anything.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any remonstrators?

INAUDIBLE PORTIONS-MICS TURNED OFF

**Mr. Shively:** But there will be smaller type delivery vehicles. Not full 18-wheelers. No semis will be parked or kept there. You can go into a neighborhood and see a UPS or Federal Express truck making deliveries. I suspect that will be the kind of trucks making the deliveries. But we want it to be clear that there will be no semi trailers or that type of vehicles stored on the premises.

INAUDIBLE QUESTION-MIC TURNED OFF

**Mr. Shively:** Most of what they have is an aggregate material, sand, rock material. So those would be delivered in smaller, bedded vehicles, not by semi trucks.

INAUDIBLE-MIC TURNED OFF

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any remonstrators?

**Mr. Roberts:** My name is Mike Roberts. I live at 11229 Rainard Drive. I am the president of the Friends of Angel Mounds. I spoke last time. Like Mr. Shively, I do not intend to go over all the points that we did last time. I would just like to say that we see no real difference from what occurred last time. This is a more limited use. But it is a C-4 zoning request, which we object to. We don't want to see any C-4 zoning anywhere on Pollack Avenue or Lynn Avenue around the corner. I would like to remind the Board that last time this was voted down 10-0. One of the members of the Board said it is one of the worst cases of spot zoning they have ever seen. I don't think that has changed. We appreciate the fact that he has a piece of property he would like to develop. But this was built in the 1930's and it does not fit in that neighborhood at all. We believe that nothing has changed from the last time. Thank you.

**Mr. Offerman:** If you owned that property, what would you do with it? Any ideas?

**Mr. Roberts:** I would at least investigate whether it was feasible to make some type of residential facility out of it. I don't know if that can be done or not. I do recognize the fact that this puts him in a difficult position with this property. But I could point out to you that this is true all over Evansville that are properties that no longer fit into the neighborhood they are in. But that doesn't mean they should be zoned a certain way, or even exist any more.

**Ms. Musgrave:** This is a question for the attorney. Is it possible to incorporate all prior testimony at the former hearing into this one and make it part of the record here?

**Mr. Harrison:** So long as there is a motion to that affect.

**Ms. Stevens:** (Motion and second.) Voice vote. Any other questions?

**Ms. Mills:** My name is Cheryl Mills, 8200 Pollack Avenue. I really don't object to this commitment going in. It is across the street from my house. I am afraid that if something doesn't go into this property, then the property will become run down. If we can just have a certain business like what he is saying, that would be a lot better than the property just sitting there and deteriorating and weeds growing up. I know the Knight Township Fire Department was a good neighbor and hopefully we can get another good neighbor like that. That is my main concern. Jo Ketzell, she is my neighbor also, she has no objections.

**Mr. Shively:** Commercial use was established in the 1930's. It continued until 1982, long after Indiana University and those people involved with Angel Mounds started utilizing the facility for the State historic site. The Fire Department's use was already established. The use and development commitment limits it to this particular use only. More importantly, I went out there and took some pictures from the entrance as you turn off Pollack into Angel Mounds. You can't even see INAUDIBLE.... Mr. Hazelwood is retired, on a fixed income. The income he derived from the Knight Township Fire Department helped him some. He would like to be able to do that again. He has more than met the neighbors half way. One of the neighbors has already attested to that on behalf of herself and her other neighbor. When you make these decisions, you try to balance the competing interests. I would suggest that in doing that, Mr. Hazelwood has done that. He has done his part, met his burden, worked with these people. He has made commitments that will run with the land. It really isn't going to change the fact that since the 1930's, it has been some sort of non-residential commercial operation. The building is not going to expand in size. I think this is a good compromise. I would hope you would see it that way and recommend to the Commissioners that they approve this rezoning with the use and development commitment and any other commitments that were made in the minutes that Ms. Musgrave made reference to.

**Ms. Stevens:** Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made and seconded.) Call the roll.

**Ms. Musgrave:** (During roll call.) I will abstain because this will come before the Commissioners. I would encourage the remonstrators to be in attendance at that meeting for that is the final action.

Ayes: Mr. Dunigan, Mr. Kiefer, Mr. Offerman, Mr. Wortman, Ms. Stevens

Nays: Mr. Jeffers, Ms. Lowe, Mr. Pedtke

Abstention: Ms. Musgrave

There being 5 affirmative votes, 3 negative votes and 1 abstention, Docket No: VC-12-2006 goes forward with no action.

## **CITY REZONINGS**

Docket No: 2006-27-PC R-2006-15 Petitioner: Greg Meyer

Address: (Complete legal on file.) 1105 Stanley Avenue

Nature of Case: Petitioner requests to rezone from an M-2 zone to an R-1 zone.

**Mr. Mills:** Greg Meyer is requesting to downzone his property located at 1105 Stanley Avenue from M-2 to R-1. Mr. Meyer's property is a 0.3 acre lot located on the south side of Stanley Avenue, just east of New York Avenue. This is a request to downzone this small M-2 zoned site to bring the existing residence into conformance with zoning code restrictions and to remove the legal nonconforming status designation and the accompanying legal nonconforming restrictions from the site. This downzoning to R-1 is consistent with the adjacent residential neighborhood development and is appropriate to the small size of the lot which makes the provision of adequate on-site parking for commercial use of the site difficult. This site is located in an older area of very mixed zonings and uses. This residence is in an area designated by the Comprehensive Plan as an area of industrial and commercial development. Immediately adjacent properties are M-2 zoned residential dwellings. This downzoning to R-1 is consistent with the existing use.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Mr. Meyer has been sworn in.)

**Mr. Meyer:** My name is Greg Meyer, 5388 Woodridge Drive, Newburgh.

**Ms. Stevens:** Do you have anything to add to what Mr. Mills said?

**Mr. Meyer:** The reason I pursued this was I found a neighbor across the street and I remodeled for a resale. With financial institutions today, it was limited at an M-2. But an R-1, it is very available through many financial companies to do hundred percent financing. It is a whole lot more for residential people to get taxes, insurance, things like that.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any questions? Are there any remonstrators? (None.) Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made and seconded.) Call the roll.

Ayes: Mr. Jeffers, Ms. Lowe, Ms. Musgrave, Mr. Offerman, Mr. Pedtke, Mr. Wortman, Mr. Dunigan, Ms. Stevens

Nays: None

Abstention: Mr. Kiefer

There being 8 affirmative votes and 1 abstention, Docket No: R-2006-15 goes forward with a recommendation for approval.

Docket No: 2006-28-PC R-2006-16 Petitioner: HK Partners

Address: (Complete legal on file.) 1212 Lincoln Avenue

Nature of Case: Petitioner requests to rezone from a CO-2 zone to a C-4 zone.

**Mr. Mills:** Les Shively is representative for HK Partners and this request for a change in zoning from CO-2 to C-4 for the property located at 1212 Lincoln Avenue. This is a 0.72 acre site located on the north side of Lincoln Avenue, between Lewis Avenue and Highway 41 North. This 0.72 acre site was formerly the location of a medical office building. The Evansville Surgery Center was constructed on the site in 1984, and expanded with an addition in 1994. When the addition was made to the office building, two new parking lots were added to the site within the existing C-4 zoned strip west of Fares Avenue. The former office building on this site was razed in December, 2004. At that time all existing paved parking lots and access drives were kept intact. There is one existing curb cut onto Lewis Avenue and one curb cut onto Fares Avenue located on the northern part of the site. Access to this site should be limited to Lewis and Fares only. Due to close proximity of the Highway 41 intersection, access should be kept as far from Lincoln Avenue as possible. Evansville MPO notes that the 2030 Transportation Plan calls for widening of Highway 41 between I-164 and Lloyd Expressway; this future widening could impact this site. Access for this proposed new use will be determined by site Review at the time of submission of plans for the development of the site. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map designates a commercial strip along the east side of Highway 41 between Lincoln Avenue and Walnut Street. This site was rezoned to CO-2 to accommodate an office building, a use considered a compatible buffer between the adjacent heavy commercial zoning to the west and the residential development adjacent to the east and north of the site. This is a request to rezone the CO-2 to C-4 to allow general commercial use of the site.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Those persons have been sworn in.)

**Mr. Shively:** My name is Les Shively, representing H & K, the petitioner. H & K stands for Hahn and Kite. That may sound familiar to you. It is Gene Hahn and Paul Kite, the ones that took the Washington Square Mall and breathed new life into that commercial facility. They are wanting to do a similar type of project here. As you can see, the land is vacant. When I first got this rezoning, I knew right where it was. But I found out there is not a building there any more. But there is already two C-4 properties there now. We plan to construct one building around 12,500 square feet. It will most likely be a build to suit for one particular tenant. There may be more than one. But the concept of a strip center will probably not be the case. The height of the building will be around 15 feet. We also have petitioned the City Council to vacate certain public right-of-ways that are not being used for ingress and egress so that we will be able to have the most off-street parking to make it a very functionable location. The property is vacated. Because it is vacant property, it produces a whopping \$2216.79 per year. This project envisions over and above what they paid for the land investment and improvements of about two million. In using the County Assessor's website rate, in Knight Township within the City, the

estimated additional property taxes annually would be \$67,800 a year. This is a good project for not only my clients, but also for the community that depends on property tax dollars. In regard to the comments by EMPO certainly makes sense. I think that was very similar to the conditions for ingress/egress that were imposed upon the prior use by the Evansville Surgical Center. Those byways and cuts and stuff are in place and we will abide by those recommendations. Safe and functional ingress/egress makes the property more marketable for the tenant. I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any questions?

**Mr. Shively:** We sent a letter out to the neighborhood association. The only person I have heard from is Lamar Outdoor Advertising. They have a billboard and want to make sure the building won't obstruct their billboard. We assured them we will work with them to that degree.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any remonstrators?

**Mr. Bitz:** My name is Paul Bitz, 514 Lewis Avenue. I would like to say that I think Mr. Shively handled the original zoning that went on that property. The petitioner at that time said if they got a doctor's office, they would never be back in for anything else. As far as the tax dollars, it goes to the County. They had a 10 year old building they tore down three years ago that was probably worth a million dollars. So they weren't too interested in putting property tax on the rolls of the people of Vanderburgh County. We are proud of our neighborhood. We have the Little Sisters of the Poor, the St. Benedict's Cathedral and School. We have the Islamic Center, Memorial High School, a Lutheran church, and the Methodist Temple. We have U of E. Now, let's talk about commercial developments. You will see on this map that within a mile and a half, we have the following: 87 commercial businesses, three strip centers. In fact, the petitioner has a 24 hour market about five blocks away. We have four food and service stations, three Subway shops, McDonalds, Burger King, Captain D's Fish, Rally's, a pizza shop, and 55 additional commercial outlets. I know they bought Washington Square Mall. I was involved in the original building of that mall. They have a lot of vacancies they ought to work on. When this group came in for zoning for this property, they agreed then if they got that, that they wouldn't be back. Here we go again, another piece of property being zoned commercial, which we have over 475 pieces of property commercial that are for sale or lease now. The intersection has a traffic count of over 48,000 vehicles a day. Everyone knows there was a plan to improve the intersection like the intersection at Washington and Walnut. I am sure everyone is aware that there is talk about an overpass at Washington for Bosse High School, which will cost millions of dollars. Do we need another one at Lincoln? They say in the future they will have to make Highway 41-A a through road through the City. Then we can pay them a handsome price for the property. I am not speaking about something I don't know. I was chairman of the highway committee and the senate for eight years. So I know a little about the highway practices in the State of Indiana. The northeast corner, everyone knows we are known as stoplight city, so why not let them know us as a food mart city. As far as vacating the alley and zoning, I guess you know that property diverts back to the property owner. That is an argument between lawyers.

The right to use this property for a specific purpose, and when this discontinues, it reverts back to the property owner. The City cannot zone this property because it doesn't own it. There is court law that proves this point. I feel sure that when you took the oath to serve on this board, you agreed to serve the taxpayers and the laws of the City of Evansville and the State of Indiana. There can be only one decision in this case, and that is to turn it down. As you can see, there are plenty of commercial outlets. In closing, I would like to thank each and every one for letting us have this time to present our petition. Thank you.

**Ms. Stevens:** I would like to read this into the record. "In regard to rezoning of property located at 1212 Lincoln Avenue from C-2 to C-4: We the following citizens of the City of Evansville located in Vanderburgh County, and residents of Lewis Avenue do hereby sign our names to this petition stating that we are opposed to any change from the zoning of C-2, which property is now so designated." There is about a page and a half of signatures.

**Mr. Bitz:** I would also like to say that the Little Sisters of the Poor uses that area to come around and walk the older people. That piece of property, I don't know where the engineer was that day when they looked at it, but that's too close to the State property and the intersection is dangerous. It is not over a half a block where they want to put it and that traffic going back and forth on Lincoln and Highway 41.

**Ms. John:** My name is Carrie John, 507 Lewis Avenue. This is my first home. It doesn't look like much but I have put a lot of work in it trying to fix it up. I have experience in properties that abut up to retail facilities. The sound of dumpsters being emptied by BFI at 4:00 in the morning will wake up the neighborhood. The loitering and trash, the homeless people come to dig through the trash cans for aluminum cans and other things. It wouldn't be very pleasant to have in the neighborhood. Lewis Avenue, a lot of people don't have driveways. So they park on the street. For a good part of the day that street is down to one lane traffic. We already have a problem with people that cut through there between Lincoln and Walnut to try to skip a light. I can't imagine how much more dangerous it would be if we put in a shopping center. If you go through the neighborhood on any given day, you will see people walking their dogs, and pushing strollers. I don't think the neighbors object to making money out of their land. We just want to see it kept as the other businesses are in the neighborhood, a non-retail type of entity, an office, doctor or dentist office. I realize there is a lot of property tax money at stake, but I hope you won't put the interests of the individuals who live there and pay property taxes also behind those of a business. Thank you.

**Ms. Shively:** First of all, the area in question is at or almost at the intersection of Highway 41, a major artery, six lane highway. There is no way this property will ever be used for residential. There is an opportunity to make it productive. The type of commercial that will go there will most likely be a neighborhood oriented concept. The reason the C-4 is required is because of the size of the building that will be there. I don't know what Mr. Bitz is talking about. I have never represented Evansville Surgery Center. The first time I have ever been involved professionally with this property. There is no such commitment that we represented or the prior owners represented that it would never change. So I

don't know where that comes from. It certainly doesn't come from me. The Mayor has been very outspoken the last couple years about the concept of brownfields, taking parts of the community already established within the City limits and trying to use them rather than going to green sites. In the commercial area, this is the same type of analogy. This is exactly what would occur at this location. The same reason Mr. Kite and Mr. Hahn got involved with Washington Square, they believe in these types of projects. A lot of investment has been made there. You make it productive. It is already there, viable. There are people that will patronize those tenants. This is consistent with that type of approach. The businesses that Mr. Bitz referred to are businesses at Weinbach and Lincoln that you can't even see in this photograph. I don't know what that have to do with anything. Those are neighborhood businesses. One of those is a business I go to get my hair cut. The U of E bookstore, the Subway that serves the students. He talked about Methodist Temple. That is the church I grew up in. That is east of Weinbach. This is not going to affect Methodist Temple. I don't think you will find any names of the trustees of Methodist Temple opposed to this situation. There are things that can be done. The last person who spoke had some concerns. We will be happy to look at landscaping and fencing. We would invite her and her neighbors to be there at the Site Review when this is laid out when we know more about the tenants. All those things can be addressed and can peacefully co-exist. Neighborhood commercial areas have thrived in this general area without affecting the quality of those in the proximity. But this is not a spot zoning. This is not in the middle of a residential oasis. This is at Highway 41 and Lincoln Avenue and it is a wonderful opportunity, a development to be done by two individuals who have come together again to revitalize an established area of this community. It is already adjacent to C-4 properties. You have commercial uses across the street. This is consistent with what happens at these particular corners. This is a good zoning. It is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. These are responsible developers. Just approving the rezoning is the first step. It will have to go through Site Review. The impact on this community, everybody wants to see the combination sewers eliminated. That costs money. Unless we change the laws in how we fund local government, property taxes are a big part of that. This will infuse the capital necessary that will improve these neighborhood. This is a good request. We ask that you give a favorable recommendation so this project can move forward.

**Mr. Jeffers:** A question for staff. On our staff field report, it shows the only adjacent or nearby property that is C-4 is Fares Avenue parking lot at Highway 41. Was that for the office building?

**Mr. Mills:** Yes.

**Mr. Jeffers:** So that C-4 actually served the CO-2 use.

**Mr. Shively:** There was a reference made to the vacation. The reason we are vacating the right-of-ways that are not necessary for public ingress and egress, is so that we will have more land to use to develop this property properly, expand the off-street parking for one, and lay out the building in such a way that it is a good fit at this location.

**Mr. Pedtke:** As far as access is concerned, the report says there is access to Lewis and Fares. Are there plans that would tell us which of those two...

**Mr. Shively:** The discussions I had and the way this...they are basically buying all of that yellow area. This is the only thing that isn't C-4. The discussions I had with the client is that Fares would be the access point. They wouldn't be using Lewis I don't believe. But that would have to be reviewed by Mr. Mills, and in terms of what we are going to put there. But the logical place would be to use Fares.

**Ms. Musgrave:** It is designed to be a strip center. Which direction would be front?

**Mr. Shively:** Most likely it will not be a strip center. It will probably be one user. It will probably be, I am familiar with the retailer they are talking with and they tend to angle their buildings. I am speculating here. So they sort of look symmetrical and sort of angle their facilities so they have maximum visibility.

**Ms. Stevens:** Can you address Ms. Johns' concerns about the dumpsters and such. I do think that is a genuine concern for people living right across the street.

**Mr. Shively:** What I would suggest we do in that regard is that when we go to Site Review and know what the layout of the building is going to be, we would be required to notify Ms. Johnson and whoever else is identified when we will be at Site Review and send them a site plan so they can make their input. This particular type retailer does a nice job.

**Mr. Kiefer:** Will he be willing to do a use and development commitment, because C-4 would include all kinds of nasty things. Is he flexible to work with the neighbors?

**Mr. Shively:** Yes. An adult book store can't go there without, well, first of all, INAUDIBLE.... It could never go there because of the close proximity of St. Ben's school and church. That is not the type of retail we are looking for. INAUDIBLE....we want to do this thing right.

**Mr. Kiefer:** My desire as a Council member would be to get together with the neighbors and....

**Mr. Shively:** We intended to do that. We sent all the adjacent land owners, the neighborhood association, as much information as we had. This is the first we are hearing about specific concerns.

**Mr. Jeffers:** Being familiar with the particular tenant that you are 85 percent sure is going in there, how much traffic does that potential tenant generate out of their parking lot which I assume the ingress/egress will be Fares Avenue onto Lincoln at the intersection where the traffic already stacks up at the stop light.

**Mr. Shively:** We would be happy to have a combination of Fares depending on what the transportation people say. I don't know the specific traffic counts. But it is a type of retail that is nothing like a Wal-Mart situation.

**Mr. Jeffers:** Is it similar or the same as a 24 hour pharmacy?

**Mr. Shively:** I would say close to that. It is not a fast food or anything like that. If there are some concerns, we will take any directive that you think is appropriate. These can be difficult situations. There are a lot of contingency things. One of the first things they want to know is where are they on the zoning and when you work with these types of tenants or buyers, it is a competitive situation. So they are looking for sites that are ready.

**Ms. Stevens:** We can't require that you send out the notices for Site Review. But I would think that would be an appropriate thing to do for the neighbors. What is the will of the Commission as far as having Mr. Shively come back with more information? Is there a motion for approval?

**Mr. Kiefer:** My recommendation is, unless he needs something tonight, if you have time, can you meet with the remonstrators and work something out that would be agreeable?

**Mr. Shively:** I don't know either. I know it is a competitive market. You never know when that situation is going to break. I have never found it is conducive in this atmosphere to negotiate. I didn't hear from Mr. Bitz any interest in negotiating something out. So I don't know what we can do in that regard. But you raise a good question about the ingress/egress and about dumpsters. Those are things that can be addressed.

**Mr. Jeffers:** Councilman Kiefer, does the City Council prefer in cases like this, it is really the first C-4 in the northeast corner of the quadrant here, would you prefer a use and development commitment to accompany the petition?

**Mr. Kiefer:** I would think they would. I probably would just because knowing the situation and where it is located. I am sure there is multiple C-4 that could go there, a lot of uses. Maybe narrowing it down would really help out.

**Mr. Shively:** If we would amend with a use and development commitment, give me a time line when we could come back?

**Mr. Mills:** I don't have the calendar here on what the deadline is.

**Mr. Harrison:** If they want to do a use and development commitment, he probably has to get that done in the next couple days.

**Mr. Shively:** Here's what I would request. I would like to request to amend to include a use and development commitment and hopefully get it filed by next Wednesday so we can be on for next month.

**Ms. Stevens:** We have a motion and second for a continuance. Continuance fees will be waived. (Voice vote.)

Upon unanimous voice vote, Docket No: R-2006-16 is continued to the October APC meeting.

#### TAPE CHANGE

Docket No: 2006-29-PC R-2006-17 Petitioner: Rebecca Keplinger

Address: (Complete legal on file.) 1312 N. Main Street

Nature of Case: Petitioner requests to rezone from a C-4 zone to an R-2 zone.

**Mr. Mills:** Rebecca Keplinger is requesting to downzone this property located at 1312 N Main St from C-4 to R-2. This is a 0.13 acre lot located on the west side of North Main Street, between Florida and Tennessee Streets. This is a request to downzone this small C-4 zoned site to bring the existing residence into conformance with zoning code restrictions and to remove the legal nonconforming status designation and the accompanying legal nonconforming restrictions from the site. This downzoning to R-2 is consistent with the adjacent residential neighborhood development and is appropriate to the small size of the lot which makes the provision of adequate on-site parking for commercial use of the site difficult. This site is located in an older area of very mixed zonings and uses. This residence is in an area designated by the Comprehensive Plan as an area of commercial strip development along the North Main Street corridor. Most of the residences which remain along both sides of this commercial strip are zoned C-4. This downzoning to R-2 is consistent with the existing use.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Ms. Keplinger has been sworn in.)

**Ms. Keplinger:** My name is Rebecca Keplinger, 1312 N. Main. We are asking to rezone in order to get financing for the home. They asked us to downzone it.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any questions? Are there any remonstrators? (None.) Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made and seconded.) Call the roll.

Ayes: Ms. Lowe, Ms. Musgrave, Mr. Offerman, Mr. Pedtke, Mr. Wortman, Mr. Dunigan, Mr. Jeffers

Nays: None

Abstentions: Mr. Kiefer, Ms. Stevens

There being 7 affirmative votes and 2 abstentions, Docket No: R-2006-17 goes forward with a recommendation for approval.

Docket No: 2006-30-PC R-2006-18 Petitioner: Spurling Development, LLC  
Address: (Complete legal on file.) 2000 N. Green River Road  
Nature of Case: Petitioner requests to rezone from a C-4 zone to a C-2 zone.

**Mr. Mills:** Morley & Associates is the representative for Spurling Development LLC. This is a request to downzone 2.98 acres of the site located at 2000 N Green River Road from C-4 to C-2. The site is located on the north side of Theater Drive, just west of Green River Road. In 2005, Mr. Spurling initiated a rezoning which resulted in 12.4 acres of C-4, 5.07 acres of C-2, and 9.03 acres of R-3. This rezoning is a request to downzone an additional 2.98 acres of the C-4 tract to C-2. The effect of this downzoning is to expand the C-2 zoned portion of the site, allowing the flexibility to develop as either commercial or multi-family residential use, a use not permitted within the existing C-4 classification. All of this site (C-4, C-2, and R-3 tracts) are included within the subdivision plat "Theater Commons Subdivision", scheduled to be heard by the Area Plan Commission later on this same agenda this evening. This site is located at the edge of an area designated as commercial on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map. Areas adjacent east and south are commercial, north is agricultural, and west is a single-family residential subdivision. This downzoning from the existing heavy commercial designation to the C-2 designation is consistent with the overall development plans for the area.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Mr. Wallace has been sworn in.)

**Mr. Wallace:** My name is Matt Wallace, the project representative from Morley and Associates. The Spurlings acquired this property after the last rezoning in 2005. At that time, they were looking for a potential commercial user near the Green River Road portion and had planned to some apartments in the western portion of the property. The apartments they are interesting in building are similar in nature to the existing apartments they have at Lakeside Manor. The site is south of and behind the existing Schnucks on N. Green River. So these are very nice looking, single story facilities. All the units have a garage. They will be for 55 years and older tenants. I would like to add that my dad lives there and really enjoys it. The commercial part out front, we filed a subdivision plat, Theater Commons, and it was to be heard this evening. Mr. Keepes did not have adequate time to review the drainage so we are continued to next month. As you can see, there are seven commercial lots, six of which front on to Green River Road. The large lot would be for the apartments. We have filed the apartment site plan with Sub Review also and have already been heard. There were no real comments as far as density of overall layout of the property. We need this portion of the property to be downzoned to C-2 to complete this lot so it can all be for the apartment use. I will be glad to answer any questions.

**Mr. Dunigan:** Will those lots fronting Green River access the interior street only?

**Mr. Wallace:** Yes. That is a condition of the plat.

**Mr. Jeffers:** The 50 foot wide by 590 foot strip that runs north and south, why is that included?

**Mr. Wallace:** Previously, the rezoning that we filed, we tried to do our best guess at the apartment area and how much we would need for commercial. The original intent was to try to find a single user or a few larger users. So we were trying to give a large chunk along Green River to accommodate a large user. No such user was located and they want to go ahead and do more apartments and only a single row of commercial lots. So we came back a 300 foot lot depth off of Green River, stuck in our 60 feet of right-of-way, and then we had a gap between the C-2 and C-4 lot. So the entire lot at the apartments will all be C-2 and R-3.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any remonstrators? (None.) Is there a motion for approval? (Motion was made and seconded.) Call the roll.

Ayes: Ms. Lowe, Mr. Musgrave, Mr. Offerman, Mr. Pedtke, Mr. Wortman, Mr. Dunigan, Mr. Jeffers, Ms. Stevens

Nays: None

Abstention: Mr. Kiefer

There being 8 affirmative votes and 1 abstention, Docket No: R-2006-18 goes forward with a recommendation for approval.

## **SUBDIVISIONS**

**Ms. Stevens:** The rezoning portion of the meeting is now over and we will now hear the proposed subdivisions that are on our agenda. As stated earlier, the Area Plan Commission is the sole authority on subdivisions. State law and our Subdivision Control Ordinance dictate the issues the Plan Commission can consider when reviewing a subdivision application. Unlike a rezoning, consideration of a subdivision is limited to whether it complies with the standards and requirements in the local Subdivision Control Ordinance. If a subdivision application meets the requirements set forth in the Subdivision Control Ordinance, the Area Plan Commission must approve the primary plat. Indiana Courts have indicated that Plan Commissions have no discretion in this regard, and that our role in reviewing and acting on subdivisions is purely ministerial.

Seven affirmative votes are needed to approve a subdivision plat and conversely, seven negative votes are required to deny a plat. In the event that there are not seven votes for or against, this is considered a no action vote and the plat returns to the next APC meeting for consideration.

The guidelines for testimony on subdivisions will be the same as those explained at the onset of this meeting. Petitioners and remonstrators should remember that the only testimony the APC can consider are facts that prove whether the plat complies with the

specific standards in the Subdivision Control Ordinance. Copies of the Subdivision Control Ordinance are available in the Area Plan Commission office in Room 312 or on our website at [evansvilleapc.com](http://evansvilleapc.com).

Now let's move on to the first subdivision on the agenda tonight.

16-S-2006 Stonegate Estates

Part of Section 9, T5S/R10W Scott Township Map CO-180

Location: Located on Browning Road, 0.5 miles north of Boonville-New Harmony Road.

**Mr. Mills:** Stonegate Estates 16-lot residential subdivision on a 48.7 acre site located on the west side of Browning Road between Schlensker Road and Boonville-New Harmony Road. The site is zoned Agricultural and is currently wooded. The Subdivision Review Committee reviewed this plat on August 8, 2006. This proposed plat shows a subdivision entrance road extending west off Browning Road connecting to a north/south street that cul-de-sacs at both ends. Sidewalks are required unless waived by the County Commission.

The County Engineer comments are as follows:

- 1) Revise the "Road Grade" Note to state that the road grades shall not exceed 10 %.
- 2) 2) Add a note to the plat that states that lots shall only access internal streets.

The Evansville MPO comments are as follows:

Though auxiliary lanes on Browning Road do not appear to be warranted by the MPO's *Access Management Manual*, if provided, they will enhance the safety and efficiency of the access and the adjacent street traffic. Also, the use of clear zones at the entrance will help to increase visibility for vehicles exiting the development and for the on-street traffic approaching the entrance. Access design details and/or location should be accordance with the Evansville MPO's *Access Management Manual*.

On September 5, 2006 preliminary drainage plan approval for this subdivision was granted by the County Drainage Board. A portion of this site lies within the 100-year floodplain. The Building Commission requires that the minimum flood protection grade (FPG) elevations of 438 ft. for structures on the affected lots be shown on the plat.

Water is available by extension to the site. Septic systems will be used for waste disposal.

County Health Department comments are as follows:

A dye test is required for any existing dwelling.

A soils analysis is required on any new lot.

The base of the OSDS mound or the bottom of trenches must be above the 100 year flood elevation.

At the Subdivision Review Committee meeting a representative of the Health Department recommended that an approved location for septic field beds on Lots 1, 2 and 16 be

established and shown on the recorded plat. Show the building setback line and frontage dimension for this line on Lot 7 (the north cul-de-sac). Staff recommends that the Stonegate Estates plat be approved with the conditions listed on the staff field report as the plat otherwise complies with the Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of the Subdivision Code.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Those persons have been sworn in.)

**Mr. Poff:** My name is Keith Poff with SiteCon, Inc. I am representing the developers on this project. The staff report summarizes the information. The developer does agree to INAUDIBLE PORTIONS...

**Mr. Jeffers:** I apologize that I did not catch this during the review. Note #8 Storm Drainage Maintenance, item D. Strike "City Engineer's office" and put in "County Engineer/County Surveyor office". These are little AutoCad scraps that I should catch and I didn't catch these. In Note F, the last four words, strike "Board of Public Works" and insert "Vanderburgh County Drainage Board". If you could include those along with the other five conditions.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any other questions? Are there any remonstrators?

**Ms. Lamb:** My name is Laura Lamb. I live at 14001 Bickmeier Road. I am here with father, Ray Knoll, who lives at 13900 Bickmeier Road. We are abutting property owners to this subdivision. My back 40 acres is the northern boundary to the subdivision. Part of our agricultural ground is to the west of this subdivision. We don't really have an opposition to the subdivision itself, but we are asking for some special considerations. Along the north side, my specific considerations, when we bought that property, the line was very ambiguous and we have had some problems with people wandering from adjacent properties. Even though we have had the property surveyed by Mr. Poff and his company, I would like to see some kind of above ground monumentation to make it obvious for our neighbors and ourselves where the property line is there. I would be willing to work with them on the kind of monumentation, as long as it is visible and not underground. They usually bury them. It is not an obvious fence row. They are kind of sporadic old rusty fences. So it is not an obvious property line.

**Ms. Stevens:** When you say above ground monumentation, which I like that, does that mean a fence or a post?

**Ms. Lamb:** It could mean a fence. It means like at a property corner, there may be a pipe sticking out of the ground set in concrete or something that is not easily pulled out.

**Ms. Stevens:** Have you already discussed this with them?

**Ms. Lamb:** I have not. This is the first time I have brought this up. There may be a comment that was circulated from my father who has been talking to the developer about a green space and we have offered 40 feet of our property along our north line and their north line and their west line to match a 45 foot green space on their property. The light brown areas there are actually native grass plots that we have worked with DNR to plant and these grasses are sometimes six feet tall. People that are used to a subdivision setting may look at those and call them weeds. But they are very nice except through the winter they are kind of dried up and may not be presentable for a subdivision. But we like them. So we are thinking maybe this green space would deter any complaints about weeds.

**Mr. Pedtke:** The above ground monumentation, are you asking for permission to do that yourself?

**Ms. Lamb:** No. We are asking that if they are marking the subdivision boundary for the lots that they create monumentation that is above ground. I am guessing they have to mark the corner of the property with some kind of marker.

**Mr. Poff:** What the surveyor is required to set at the lot corners is a minimum five-eighths inch iron rod ...INAUDIBLE...

INAUDIBLE

**Mr. Poff:** At this time, I would like to say my client hasn't agreed to that. INAUDIBLE....

**Ms. Musgrave:** We passed that this year which led me to think we might want to make that wildlife area or...

**Ms. Lamb:** Actually, we had been discussing setting it aside as a conservation area.

**Ms. Musgrave:** Because then that way, no weed complaints would apply.

**Ms. Lamb:** We have tillable acreage there too. But at certain times of the year when you are planting or harvesting, it gets kind of dusty. People also complain about that.

**Ms. Stevens:** So you really will abut six of the new neighbors. So you are to the north and west.

**Ms. Lamb:** I am not sure if the County has a setback requirement for septic system, but I would hope it would be further away from a property line than 45 feet.

**Mr. Jeffers:** I do not know. Does the weed ordinance govern agricultural property? Agricultural applications such as grass and hay fields aren't covered.

**Ms. Lamb:** The property that is currently planted in the native grass is actually set aside.

**Mr. Jeffers:** As far as the survey markers, if those iron t-bar fence posts are placed right on the line, they are co-owned by you and the property owners in the subdivision. If one of those property owners finds them objectionable, they can remove them. So I would suggest that after SiteCon establishes the property corners, that you, on your side of the line place witness markers of your choosing. Then you will know that the property corner lies two inches east of that marker. Then they are your markers and no one can mess with them.

**Ms. Stevens:** I would like to read in for the record from Mr. Ray Knoll of 13000 Bickmeier Road. His comment was: "My daughter and I own real estate that abuts this proposed subdivision on the entire west and part of the north side thereof. We are currently negotiating a green space buffer area with the developer, Mr. Elpers, and his attorney. No agreement has been recorded by the parties in respect to this green space. However, we hope this will be resolved shortly. We believe the APC should be cognizant of the ongoing negotiations." I will entertain a motion for approval, subject to the following conditions: 1. Revise the plat prior to recording to show the minimum flood protection grade (FPG) elevation of 438 feet for structures on affected lots. 2. Revise the "Road Grade" note on the plat prior to recording to state that the road grades shall not exceed 10 percent. 3. Add a note to the plat prior to recording that states: "Access: All lots shall access internal streets only." 4. Revise the plat prior to recording to show the building setback line and frontage dimension along this line for Lot 7. 5. Document that the Health Department has approved the soil analyses for all lots and show the approved locations for septic field beds on Lots 1, 2, and 16 on the recorded plat. 6. Correct the notes addressed by the County Surveyor on the plat.

Ayes: Mr. Dunigan, Mr. Jeffers, Mr. Kiefer, Ms. Lowe, Ms. Musgrave, Mr. Offerman, Mr. Pedtke, Mr. Wortman, Ms. Stevens

Nays: None

There being 9 affirmative votes, Docket No: 16-S-2006 is approved.

### **VACATED SUBDIVISION**

#### 1-V-2006 Durchholz Minor, Vacation Plat of Part of Lot 1

Part of Section 13, NE T06/R10W Knight Township Map CO-232

Location: Located on Colonial Garden Road, one-quarter mile north of Old Boonville Hwy.

**Mr. Mills:** The Durchholz Minor Vacation Plat of Part of Lot 1 is a request to vacate the northern .82 acre portion of Lot 1 of the existing Durchholz Minor subdivision. The remaining acreage for Lot 1 is 1.5. This lot has sewer available. It is located on the west side of Colonial Garden Road north of Old Boonville Highway. The applicant is committing to reconnect the portion of the Lot to be vacated back with the larger adjacent parent parcel owned by the Durchholz family. This was continued at the September APC meeting as there was no representative for the applicant present. Staff recommends that

the Vacation of a portion of Lot 1 in Durchholz Minor Subdivision be approved with the following conditions as the plat complies with the Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of the Subdivision Code: 1. Remove from the plat, the unnecessary General Notes that do not apply. 2. After the vacated plat has been recorded, provide a recorded copy of the new deed that combines the vacated parcel with its parent parcel.

**Mr. Harrison:** All those who will speak on this petition, raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is true and accurate so help you God? (Mr. Durchholz has been sworn in.)

**Mr. Durchholz:** My name is Bob Durchholz, 2900 Colonial Gardens Road. If you have any questions, I am here to answer them.

**Ms. Stevens:** Are there any questions? Are there any remonstrators? (None.) Is there a motion for approval, subject to the following conditions: 1. Remove from the plat, the unnecessary General Notes that do not apply. 2. After the vacated plat has been recorded, provide a recorded copy of the new deed that combines the vacated parcel with its parent parcel.

Ayes: Mr. Offerman, Mr. Pedtke, Mr. Wortman, Mr. Dunigan, Mr. Jeffers, Mr. Kiefer, Ms. Lowe, Ms. Musgrave, Ms. Stevens

Nays: None

There being 9 affirmative votes, the vacation plat for Docket No: 1-V-2006 is approved.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

**Mr. Harrison:** On your desks are some Findings of Fact and Determination regarding the replat application on the agenda last month for Oakwood Lot 8. I would ask that the Commission approve these. A lawsuit was filed regarding the approval of the replat application. However, I was advised by Mr. Shively that it might be resolved with the applicant who was granted the replat. Apparently there has been some resolution. We are not a party to it. But we have to do this in accordance with State law. Any time there is a denial, we have to do it. Or if there is an approval and a situation that will lead to litigation, we have to do this. I would ask that you approve this.

**Ms. Stevens:** (Voice vote.) Upon unanimous voice vote, the Findings of Fact are approved.

**Mr. Mills:** On your desks, you have a copy of a zoning ordinance that we brought before you late last year in regard to parking for off-campus student housing. Commissioner Musgrave has been dealing with the other two Commissioners on some parking issues with Eagle Village on the west side near the USI campus. She asked to bring this back before the Plan Commission for consideration. I have given you the same thing we gave

you in the past and see if it is the Commission's desire to form a committee to review this and make any recommendations to the Plan Commission members.

**Mr. Pedtke:** I was on the committee last time. We have some stumbling blocks. One was defining off-campus student housing. Second was not to create a disadvantage to multi-family housing to this type of zoning as far as parking requirements are concerned. Multi-family requires on space per three units, in addition to four visitor parking. I think that may be where our problem is. It may be as simple as adding that extra requirement to the INAUDIBLE ...student housing. I think that maybe one meeting of a committee would be in order and then bring it back to next month's meeting.

**Ms. Stevens:** So is there a committee already in place, or is this a different committee?

**Mr. Pedtke:** There was already a committee in place. We met one time but it was never voted to disband. I think it was myself. I think Michael Lockard was on it. I think Cheryl was there.

**Ms. Stevens:** I would serve on that.

**Mr. Mills:** Great. I will get together with you and try to set up a time so we can meet on this.

**Mr. Jeffers:** I am not on that committee, but I have a little heart burn with group homes, community residential facilities, and similar facilities being lumped in with sororities, fraternities, and other off-campus student housing because we had one situation where a group home came in and it was housing for a population that did not drive.

**Ms. Musgrave:** My intention is to restrict this change to only off-campus student housing. So we will have to word it to make that specific.

**Mr. Jeffers:** I don't want elderly housing, disability housing, etc., to lumped in with that.

**Ms. Musgrave:** Do you think you take the comments and change this for our first meeting or second meeting of this group?

**Mr. Harrison:** Yes, I will meet with you and we can work on it.

Meeting adjourned.

---

Stacy Stevens, President

Attest:

The undersigned secretary certifies that the foregoing are minutes and not intended to be a verbatim transcript. Audio tapes of the proceedings are on file in the Area Plan Commission office.

---

Bradley G. Mills, Executive Director

---

Karen Yokel, Transcriber