

**DELAWARE-MUNCIE METROPOLITAN BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
SEPTEMBER - 2024 REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
AGENDA**

**DATE:** September 26, 2024

**PLACE:** Commissioners Court Room  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Delaware County  
Building

**TIME:** 6:00 P.M.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**ROLL CALL:**

|  |                         |                      |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|
|  | <b>Leslie Mathewson</b> |                      |
|  | <b>Matt Billington</b>  | <b>Mike Jones</b>    |
|  | <b>Ellen Brannon</b>    | <b>Sue Kaiser</b>    |
|  | <b>Delaney Fritch</b>   | <b>Allen Wiseley</b> |

**MINUTES:** Consideration of the August, 2024 regular monthly meeting minutes.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**BZA 48-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Bridon Properties, LLC**, 2050 East US Highway 224, Ossian, Indiana, requesting variances from the terms of the City of Muncie Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow creation of two lots through platting without meeting all of the performance standards for the existing commercial development on premises located at 1018 West Centennial Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

**BZA 49-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Loren and Austin Mansfield**, 10612 North Mansfield Drive, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 10 chickens and decreased distances between the chickens and neighboring homes in a residence zone on premises located at 10612 North Mansfield Drive, Hamilton Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

**BZA 50-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Sandra Walters and Shawn Smith**, 11501 South County Road 950 West, Daleville, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 30 goats on 2.02 acres on premises located at 11501 South County Road 950 West, Salem Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

**BZA 51-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Garden at Gethsemane GMC Inc.**, 4515 North Tillotson Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance from the terms of the City of Muncie Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow separation of the existing church and house onto two lots without meeting all of the performance standards including decreased parking for the existing church on premises located at 801 and 809 East Main Street, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

**BZA 52-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Elisabeth DeHart and Zhou Xuhua**, 4809 West County Road 400 North, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 10 horses and decreased distances between the horses and neighboring homes in a residence zone on premises located at 4809 West County Road 400 North, Hamilton Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

**REPORT FROM DIRECTOR:**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**DELAWARE-MUNCIE METROPOLITAN BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
SEPTEMBER - 2024 REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
MINUTES**

The Delaware-Muncie Metropolitan Plan Commission held its regular monthly meeting on Thursday, September 26, 2024 at 6:00 P.M., in the Commissioners Court Room of the Delaware County Building, Muncie, Indiana. Chairman Leslie Mathewson called the meeting to order.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**ROLL CALL**

Ms. Swackhamer called roll and the following members were present: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Absent: Ms. Brannon and Ms. Kaiser. Also present: Mr. Murphy, attorney for the Board.

**MINUTES:**

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve the August 2024 regular monthly meeting minutes. Ms. Fritch seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Motion approved, August 2024 minutes approved.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**BZA 48-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Bridon Properties, LLC**, 2050 East US Highway 224, Ossian, Indiana, requesting variances from the terms of the City of Muncie Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow creation of two lots through platting without meeting all of the performance standards for the existing commercial development on premises located at 1018 West Centennial Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Kathy Vannice, Ashton Land Surveyor, 325 W Washington St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared to represent the applicant. She stated that the variance was for a reduced setback and reduced road frontage for one of the parcels. She stated that the buildings were existing and those to the north were storage units, and the building to the south was used as a retail store. She stated that they wanted to split the parcel from the storage units in order to sell them, and that they were currently in poor condition and that they were in the process of repairing them.



Mr. Wiseley asked if there was any concern with the storage unit parcel only having 23' of road frontage.

Ms. Vannice stated that most entrances were 24' wide and there should be plenty of room. She stated that in the plat they would have a separate document for the ingress/egress maintenance agreement.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve BZA 48-24 the appeal of Bridon Properties, LLC with the hardship as stated in the application with the following conditions: 1) That the platting process be completed and recorded; and 2) That any future development on either parcel will meet the Ordinance Development Standards. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Voting against: None. Motion carried, BZA 48-24 approved.

**BZA 49-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Loren and Austin Mansfield**, 10612 North Mansfield Drive, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 10 chickens and decreased distances between the chickens and neighboring homes in a residence zone on premises located at 10612 North Mansfield Drive, Hamilton Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Loren Mansfield, 10612 N Mansfield Dr., Muncie, Indiana, appeared. She stated that she would like to keep 10 chickens as a hobby and to have fresh eggs and for meat. She stated that she had provided a list of signatures of surrounding neighbors that were in support.

Ms. Mathewson stated that the application indicated that Ms. Mansfield had already had the chickens for a while.

Ms. Mansfield stated that since they were in the county, she thought she could have the chickens and got them last year. She stated that she then received the letter and found out she could not have the chickens so they were rehomed. She stated that her children were very sad that they no longer had the chickens, and that the store bought eggs were just not the same quality.

Ms. Mathewson asked if at that time any of the neighbors had complained about the chickens.

Ms. Mansfield said no, she had no complaints until she received the letter.

Ms. Mathewson asked if this would be for 10 hens and no roosters as stated in her application.

Ms. Mansfield stated yes.

Ms. Fritch asked if she currently had 10 chickens.

Ms. Mansfield stated that she had none since she had rehomed the chickens she had.

Ms. Fritch asked if she would be bringing those chickens back to the property.

Ms. Mansfield stated no, they would be starting over.

Ms. Fritch asked if they would be egg laying chickens or meat chickens.

Ms. Mansfield stated that they would be dual purpose chickens.

Ms. Mathewson asked if this would be for personal use or if they planned to sell the eggs or chickens for meat.

Ms. Mansfield stated that they would be for her household.

No one appeared in opposition.

Ms. Swackhamer addressed a letter of opposition that was received and had been included in the Board's packet.

Ms. Fritch stated that the applicant had mentioned names of those in support and asked if they had that list.

Ms. Mathewson stated that was also in the packet.

Mr. Jones asked where Ms. Quinlan, the individual who wrote the letter of opposition, lived in relation to Ms. Mansfield.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that the email mentioned she lived 2 doors down but did not indicate which direction.

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve BZA 49-24 the appeal of Loren and Austin Mansfield with the hardship as stated in the application with the following conditions: 1) That approval is for 10 hens and no roosters; 2) That the variance is for the applicant only and will not transfer with the property; and 3) That there be no business use of the property. Ms. Fritch seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Voting against: None. Motion carried, BZA 49-24 approved.

**BZA 50-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Sandra Walters and Shawn Smith**, 11501 South County Road 950 West,



Daleville, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 30 goats on 2.02 acres on premises located at 11501 South County Road 950 West, Salem Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Sandra Walters, stated that she lived in Scotts Michigan, and was under to contract to purchase the property at 11501 S CR 950W, Daleville, Indiana. She stated that she hoped to relocate to this area, and that she had provided the board with as much information as she could regarding the goats. She stated that she wanted to make sure she would be in compliance with the county ordinance before she closed on the sale of the property. She stated that they were Nigerian Dwarf goats, and that the females had to be under 22.5" and the males had to be under 23.5", so they would be under 2' tall. She stated that she had provided pictures to show that the goats were small even compared to children. She stated that the herd she currently had was on just under an acre of ground. She stated that they were fed hay all year round and she had also described that in her packet.

Ms. Mathewson asked if Ms. Walters anticipated continuing to have 30 goats, maybe as one passes away would it be replaced.

Ms. Walters stated yes, she would respect that limitation but that she would have up to 30 goats. She stated that as she gets older the herd may even get smaller. She stated that if they had one that did not show it would be championship quality they may sell that one and replace it with a young one.

Ms. Mathewson asked if the intention was to build some buildings and pens for those animals.

Ms. Walters stated that she had provided a map that outlined her plan, and those buildings would be the second phase. She stated she had talked to Mr. Daniel and that he had explained the need for a variance and she wanted to show the Board her vision. She stated that she planned to have the buildings match the existing barn, and she wanted the property to look like a show place. She stated that she included the inside layout of the 24' x 40' barn to show the milking parlor and feed room and also the lean too that would be for hay storage.

Mr. Billington asked about the compost area and how waste removal would be handled with 30 goats on 2 acres.

Ms. Walters stated that the compost area would be fenced in with privacy fencing to maintain a nice visual aspect to the property. She stated that the goats produce wasted hay, so they use a low waste hay feeder and then it would be composted in that area.

Ms. Fritch stated that she wanted to commend Ms. Walters for putting so much into her presentation, and she just wanted to get a clear understanding of all of the information. She asked how many goats would be in her base group to breed and then get rid of the babies.

Ms. Walters stated that 30 would be her maximum and that would be the core group of goats. She stated that as they had babies, they would be sold in the springtime. She stated that this process had helped her discover different zoning laws per county, so as she sells the goats she will make that clear to people to help them.

Ms. Fritch asked if the base herd was 30, and they were producing baby goats, wouldn't that mean she would have more than 30 at some times.

Ms. Walters stated that they weighed 2-3 pounds when they were born and that they usually were sold at 8-10 weeks and weigh close to 12 pounds at that time. She stated that if they decided to keep one of the babies, they would need to sell one from the base group.

Ms. Fritch asked approximately how many babies could be born each year.

Ms. Walters stated that this year she had 30 litters and that was 61 kids, and she never wanted to have that many litters again. She stated that here they would maybe have 12-16 litters for around 25-30 kids.

Ms. Fritch asked how long the rehoming process for each goat usually takes.

Ms. Walters stated that she usually sold them between 8-10 weeks old, and that it would be a maximum of 6 months before they were sold. She stated that most of the time they were reserved prior to birth, so that process went pretty smoothly.

Mr. Jones asked if they had 16 litters and might be kept for up to 6 months, then the number of 30 goats would be larger.

Ms. Walters stated that she did not intend to keep them the 6 months and that she did have some other options in the area to move them if needed. She stated that her intent was to sell them at weaning age.

Ms. Fritch stated that the way the variance request was worded, it was for 30 goats maximum, and that was not accurate for what was being described.

Ms. Walters stated that she had discussed this with Mr. Daniel and that would be the maximum of the core group. She stated that in order to show them, they have to be in milk, and that was why they had to breed. She stated that she had been doing this for 10 years, and had a good idea of how she needed to sell them. She stated that she had to sell 80 this year to get down to this smaller number.

Ms. Fritch stated that in order to approve a variance, they would need to be careful of the language and include the baby goats.

Mr. Murphy stated that they cannot do more than what the applicant had requested. He stated that his concern is that a goat is a goat regardless of the age.



Mr. Billington stated that if they approved the 30, she would be out of compliance as those goats had babies.

Mr. Murphy stated it would be a short-term problem, but still a problem.

Ms. Fritch stated that was a concern since she would be going in and out of compliance.

Mr. Daniel stated that he did not know if this would help, but that the ordinance did address kennels. He stated that dogs over 4 months old would be considered an adult.

Mr. Murphy stated that he understands that, and did not believe it directly related to this situation. He stated that the Board could decide on the request as presented, and another request could be made at a later time. He stated that the second option was that the request could be revised, and heard at the next meeting. He stated that he would interpret this as 30 goats being the maximum, and that the Board could not approve more than requested.

Mr. Jones asked if there was a modification would that be heard at another meeting.

Mr. Murphy stated yes.

Ms. Walters asked if approved, would she be permitted to bring the 30 goats to the property and then apply for another variance for a different number.

Mr. Murphy stated yes.

Ms. Walters stated that she had a contingency that she would not purchase the property if she could not get the variance so she wanted to be clear.

Ms. Mathewson stated that the application addressed a doe kid, and asked if that was included in the 6 goats that were 6 months and younger.

Ms. Walters stated yes. She stated that she had included pictures of those younger goats.

Ms. Mathewson stated that the Board would be moving forward with the request for 30 goats, and that Ms. Walters would need to ask for the additional goats.

Mr. Murphy stated yes, that was what he understood from her statement.

Ms. Walters stated that the kidding season was usually March and April, so that gave her time to request another variance. She stated that she had been asked if the goats were noisy, and she asked some of her neighbors that question, and she had some letters from those people.

Ms. Fritch asked if she currently had this system on 1 acre.

Ms. Walters stated that she owned more than 1 acre, but that was all that the goats had fenced in for them.



Ms. Fritch asked if the amount of waste produced was sustainably composted on that 1 acre or elsewhere.

Ms. Walters stated that it was sustainable and that they mostly produced hay waste. She stated that where she lived in Michigan, they had some churches that used the waste for gardens, and that she had not looked into that in this area yet.

Melanie Witcowski, 15915 Concert Way, Noblesville, Indiana, appeared. She stated that she was Ms. Walters daughter, and had been involved in the farm her entire life and that she had been able to experience 4H because of that. She stated that 4H is much bigger in Indiana than it was in Michigan, and that she had been researching the opportunities that this would bring to the community. She stated that she had lived in Indiana for 18 years and that was why her mom was moving here, and that her children had used goats from this herd for 4H as well. She stated that her oldest child was autistic, and that this had helped them grow so much. She stated that this was a wonderful 4H opportunity and would love to see how others would benefit.

Sarah Stultz, 13100 W CR 300S., Yorktown, Indiana, appeared. She stated that she also owned Nigerian Dwarf goats and that she wanted to give her support to Ms. Walters. She stated that she was a highly respected breeder and that she would never have a problem selling hers.

Heidi Keinholtz, real estate agent for Ms. Walters, appeared. She stated that she received many calls from people wanting to move to Indiana because of the low cost of property. She stated that it had been a pleasure to work with Ms. Walters and that it was great that she wanted to become a Hoosier.

No one appeared in opposition.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that a packet had been received in the office today, and that it contained 3 letters of support and that the Board members had been given this as well.

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve BZA 50-24 the appeal of Sandra Walters with the hardship as stated in the application with the following conditions; 1) That the maximum number of goats will be 30 and an additional variance will be needed if that number is to increase; and 2) That the variance is for the applicant only and will not transfer with the property. Ms. Fritch seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Voting against: None. Motion carried, BZA 50-24 approved.

#### **BZA 51-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Garden at Gethsemane GMC Inc.**, 4515 North Tillotson Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance from the terms of the City of Muncie Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow separation of the existing church and house onto two lots without meeting all of the performance standards including

decreased parking for the existing church on premises located at 801 and 809 East Main Street, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Chip Alexander, 4515 N. Tillotson Ave., Muncie, Indiana, appeared to represent the applicant. He stated that they had 2 campuses, 1 on McGalliard and the other location at 809 W. Main Street. He stated that the purpose of the request was based on separating the parsonage from the church. He stated that they no longer use the parsonage and would like to sell that property and that there would not be enough parking. He stated that there were 4 parking spaces near the parsonage, and that there were 7 spaces south of the church. He stated that the church was attended by mostly those who walked or rode bikes to services and that they had very few people driving. He stated that they were required to have 1 space for every 6 seats in the church, and that they had approximately 30-35 people in attendance, and that it was very rare that they would have a parking issue.

Pastor Tony Collins, 2409 W. Riggin Rd., Muncie, Indiana, appeared. He stated that he had been with the church for 8 years and had been the pastor for the past 1 ½ years. He stated that the church was built in 1912 for a community church, and then became a destination church. He stated that now, the people that attended services were homeless or lived around the property and attended services every week. He stated that they did not attend every Sunday, but they participate throughout the week to be part of that community. He stated that they provide meals several times each week and that when you come through the doors, you become part of the family. He stated that most of the people that come here don't have a family and that they were very happy to part of the church. He stated that currently they were working with 6 people that have had their lives changed entirely, and there are several more it has been happening to. He stated that he did not intend to live at the parsonage because he did not want people knocking on his door 24/7, so they no longer needed that building. He stated that if they sold the parsonage, those proceeds would be a great benefit to the church because grants were difficult to get for remodeling the facilities. He stated that the church was 112 years, and that money could be of great use for repairs.

Mr. Alexander stated that they believe that they had a true hardship and that they were not going to hurting the community since those parking spaces were not needed. He stated that they had 4 commuters to the church at this time and 7 spaces were available.

Wayne Powers, 825 E. Washington St., Muncie, Indiana. He stated that he was not really in opposition, but that he would like more information. He stated that as a resident that had invested heavily in the Emily Kimbrough District, he had concerns about the impact on the community from changes through development. He asked if the property was split, what would the zoning restrictions be on that property with the parsonage, and could it be used commercially or only residentially.

Ms. Mathewson stated that it was currently zoned Variety Business, so it could be used as residential and some types of commercial use.



Ms. Mathewson stated that the property was on a corridor street and that the ordinance would require that if it was converted from single-family to commercial use, it would have to meet those standards or apply for variances. She stated that it could be used as a single-family residence as is, but that the zoning does allow for more uses if those standards were to be met.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that splitting the property also did not affect the zoning since it was currently zoned Variety Business Zone.

Ms. Mathewson asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition, and seeing none, asked the applicant if they would like to address any concerns that had been mentioned.

Stephanie Cooper, 1700 W. Riggin, Rd., Muncie, Indiana, with ReMax Reality appeared. She stated that she had a couple that had been checking with her, and that they were really excited to buy this property and fix it up. She stated that they were from Utah, but were familiar with Indiana and were ready to live here full time. She stated that she was confident that it would continue to be a home, and that she was doing her best to sell it to good people.

Mr. Powers asked for clarification that as the zoning exists, to be anything other than residential, more variances would be needed and require another meeting.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that there could be business there now, if they followed and met the standards. If they could not meet those standards they would need to apply for variances.

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve BZA 51-24 the appeal of Garden of Gethsemane GMC, Inc with the hardship as stated in the application. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Voting against: None. Motion carried, BZA 51-24 approved.

**BZA 52-24 Jurisdiction: Board of Zoning Appeals**

Being a public hearing on the matter of an application filed by **Elisabeth DeHart and Zhou Xuhua**, 4809 West County Road 400 North, Muncie, Indiana, requesting a variance of use from the terms of the Delaware County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to allow keeping 10 horses and decreased distances between the horses and neighboring homes in a residence zone on premises located at 4809 West County Road 400 North, Hamilton Township, Delaware County, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Elizabeth DeHart, 708 N. Mulberry St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared. She stated that the property had an existing barn where the horses would be kept. She stated that the maps provided did show the area where the horses would be housed and also in pasture. She stated that there were stalls in the barn so the horses would not constantly be in pasture, they would be inside during bad weather or at night. She stated that she wanted to

mention that they would be adding a 5-10' secondary perimeter fencing for more security. She stated that they had also been in talks with 2 companies for waste removal since there was a creek towards the back of the property and they wanted to be as environmentally friendly as possible.

Ms. Mathewson asked if this would be for 10 horses.

Ms. DeHart stated yes, 10 would be the maximum.

Ms. Fritch asked if there was a concrete plan for the waste removal at this time.

Ms. DeHart stated that they had Best Way set up as a back up since they had an organic compost bin that could be left at the property and removed and replaced as needed. She stated that she had just starting talking with Scrape Cycle and that they were very interested in the manure for composting as well.

Mr. Wiseley asked if they were set up to go with Best Way if Scrape Cycle did not work out.

Ms. DeHart stated that she did not have anything official at the moment since they had not purchased the property, but yes, they would be the alternative to Scrape Cycle.

Mr. Wiseley asked how many of the 10 acres would be for pasture area.

Ms. DeHart stated that 5-9 acres was a separate parcel and that would be the majority of the pasture area. She stated that they would be removing some of those trees to clear out that area and sectioned into different paddock so that they could rotate the pasture area accordingly.

Ms. Fritch asked if Ms. DeHart had 10 horses now, or if this was a variance to allow up to 10 total.

Ms. DeHart stated that she currently had 6 horses and that 2 of those were brood mares, and that they only breed when they had a reservation for one and it would be sold within 2 years of being born.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Wiseley made a motion to approve BZA 52-24 the appeal of Zhou Xuhua and Elizabeth DeHart with the hardship as stated in the application with the condition that the variance is for the applicant only and will not transfer with the property. Ms. Fritch seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Billington, Ms. Fritch, Mr. Jones, Ms. Mathewson, and Mr. Wiseley. Voting against: None. Motion carried, BZA 52-24 approved.



## **REPORT FROM DIRECTOR:**

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she had provided the Board with a report of building permits, inspections, and complaints for the year to date. She stated that revisions to the Floodplain Ordinance had been in process, and that DNR had approved that draft and the ordinance will be heard at the Plan Commission meeting in October. She stated that the county was part of the NFIP (National Flood Insurance Program), and benefits the residents that had those insurance policies. She stated that the end of the fiscal reporting had been wrapping up on the transportation side of the office, including the Annual Completion Report and List of Obligated Projects which were 2 major documents that need to be submitted to INDOT. She stated that the updated ADA Plan was still underway, and that those RFQ's will go out in October, and that the County, Yorktown, and Selma take part in this and contribute to the cost. She stated that this was a required document in order to receive federal grants. She stated that the TIP was in process, and that she had a list of projects from INDOT and were in the process of selecting from the list of local projects for 2026-2030. She stated that the Regional Transportation Safety Action Plan was in the selection process and that they consultant would be selected next week. She stated that she had provided the list for BZA and MPC Business as of year to date for review. Ms. Swackhamer reported that the properties at 6500 & 6504 E. Jackson that had been discussed had been turned over to Mr. Fouch, and he had sent letters to those property owners since their variance had expired and they were vacant. She stated that on September 3, 2024 the County Commissioner's had placed a moratorium on any solar application being submitted, and that was in place until March 1, 2025. She stated that there can still be discussion with solar companies and with the public, but that nothing can be submitted. She stated that she had provided information for another educational workshop being offered by the Center for Energy Education and that this workshop was specifically geared towards public officials and community leaders, not just open for the public. She stated that they would also be offering another session later in October, but that the times were not posted yet.

Mr. Jones asked if the first meeting was open to the public or not, because it would be a sore spot with the public.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she would check but that the first session was invite only, but she did not know how they would monitor that.

Ms. Fritch stated that might be answered through the RSVP for the session.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she was going to have a packet that she could email to the Board once she received that. She stated that she would be attending the session that was later in October.

Mr. Wiseley stated that anyone who could go should.

Ms. Swackhamer reported that the budget hearings had lasted longer than everyone thought, but that we were getting to the end.

Mr. Jones stated this year had been a little different than years past.

Mr. Wiseley stated that this would be his last BZA meeting.

Ms. Mathewson stated that she wanted to thank Mr. Wiseley very much for his knowledge and help on the Board.

Ms. Ingermann stated that Mr. Wiseley's first Plan Commission meeting was the large solar meeting. She stated that he did a wonderful job of running the meeting and keeping things on topic, and that he would be missed.

Ms. Mathewson stated that he would be missed. She stated that the Plan Commission had a dual member that served on BZA as well.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she appreciated Mr. Wiseley and for his guidance he had provided to her.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

---

Leslie Mathewson, Chairman

---

Kylene Swackhamer, Secretary