

**LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**  
**FEBRUARY 23, 2021**

THE LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MET IN REGULAR SESSION ON **TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2021 AT 7:00P.M.** IN THE LAGRANGE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ROOM AT THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING

**CALL TO ORDER:** Tyler Young called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Tyler Young, Nick Wilson, Lynn Bowen, & Jim Bugg.

**ADOPT AGENDA:** Lynn Bowen made a motion to adopt the agenda, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried.

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** Lynn Bowen made a motion to approve the previous minutes, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried. The previous minutes were approved.

**COMMUNICATIONS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**DEVELOPMENTAL VARIANCE**

*(Public Hearing)*

**HEARTLAND RECREATIONAL VEHICLES, LLC ~ By: Randy Whiteman (21-V-06):** Lima Twp., Sect. 13, T38N R09E, zoned I-2. Located at 0155 W 750 N, Howe. Application is for proposed signage to exceed the maximum square footage on a parcel by 150 sq. ft.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition.

Randy Whiteman, 216 Lincoln Way, Osceola, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

***Developmental Variance***

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is to replace and update existing signage on the site and to add identifying signage on the existing manufacturing building. The new signage will be located in the same place and be the same size as the existing directive signage near the driveway entrances. The addition of the signage on the building will not cause any risk or harm to the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed signage is located in a primarily industrial area and the proposed replacement signage and additional wall mounted signage will not pose any risk to the neighboring landowners. The proposed signage will not intrude on neighboring landowners use and*

*enjoyment of the properties and should not have an adverse effect on property values. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

*Given the size, location, and distance of the main building from the roadway, it would be impractical/impossible to construct visible signage while meeting the requirements of the zoning ordinance. Therefore, Petitioners would be unable to construct the proposed new signage on their building without the variance requested.*

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The variance requested is minimal given the overall size and location of then existing manufacturing facility in relation to the neighboring roadway and the proposed signage does not interfere in any way with general public and/or neighboring area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**WELLER, RANDY ~ By: H & M Construction & Remodeling INC. (21-V-07):** Johnson Twp., Sect. 29, T36N R10E, zoned L-1. Located 1150 E 690 S, Wolcottville. Application is for 48% lot coverage in an L-1 zone.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Eddie Michels, H&M Construction, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared. Robbie Miller read aloud two letters of remonstrations which were submitted to the LaGrange County Plan Commission. The first letter was received from a collection of Westler lake residents and the second letter was from The Barkers of 1140 E 690 S, Wolcottville.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan and drainage.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal does not bring any unnecessary risk of harm to the surrounding properties or the general public. The lot coverage issue was created by the installation of a concrete drive and patio on the property, and the contractor has installed drainage and flow patterns to avoid runoff onto neighboring properties and to send runoff towards the lake.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed concrete addition installed at ground level on the property does not unreasonably intrude on the adjacent property owners and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of said land owners. Proper drainage and catch basins were installed during the*

*concrete installation, allowing for proper flow of the runoff to the lake, rather than neighboring landowners. Two individuals wrote letters citing to concerns regarding stormwater runoff and drainage.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Due to the size and layout of the lot in question, it makes it difficult to construct a driveway on the subject property without issues regarding lot coverage. Without the variance it would be difficult to construct a driveway and/or patio on the property without the variance requested.*
4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.  
*The proposed concrete addition is minimally intrusive to neighboring properties and the proposed total lot coverage is minimal in consideration of the lot size and the proposed usage.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

#### *LAND USE VARIANCE*

*(Public Hearing)*

**SCHLABACH, RAY & ELNORA ~ HONEYVILLE BARNS ~** By: Rob Yoder (21-LUV-05): Eden Twp., Sect. 09, T36N R08E, zoned A-1. Located West of 3750 S 950 W, Topeka. Application is for a proposed 6,016 sq. ft. building to manufacture mini barns.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Rob Yoder, 7740 W SR 120, Shipshewana, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed business details and the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

#### *Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is to construct a 6,016 sq. ft. auxiliary structure in order to operate a mini barn manufacturing business in an A-1 zone. Petitioner's property is located in a predominantly rural area with minimal neighboring structures. The proposed site location does not pose any risk to the public and is likely a safer option than the existing business location.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed building will be located well off the roadway and will utilize screening around the business in order to prevent interference with the roadway or the neighboring*

- landowners use and enjoyment of their properties. Petitioner has been operating the business directly across the street for several years without issue. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The location of the subject property as it currently sits within an A-1 zone would prevent Petitioner from operating a mini barn manufacturing facility as proposed.*
  4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Petitioner would be prohibited from operating the proposed mini barn manufacturing facility at this location without the requested variance, thereby requiring Petitioner to continue operations at his current home location at a detriment.*
  5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The comprehensive plan encourages economic growth and rural-based cottage industries similar to that which Petitioner is proposing. The proposed usage is not dissimilar from other rural businesses in the surrounding area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**MILLER, MARLIN & MARILYN ~ OLD TOWN OAK ~** By: Rob Yoder (21-LUV-06): Eden Twp., Sect. 29, T36N R08E, zoned A-1. Located 9785 W 700 S, Topeka. Application is for a proposed 9,900 sq. ft. building to manufacture baby furniture.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Rob Yoder, 7740 W SR 120, Shipshewana, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is to construct a 9,900 sq. ft. auxiliary structure to operate a baby furniture manufacturing facility in an A-1 zone. The proposal provides for an adequate driveway and turnaround for deliveries. Traffic flow on the adjacent roadway should not be affected. The proposal poses no risk to the community.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed location of the manufacturing facility has been designed to allow for adequate turn around for customers and deliveries. The Petitioner also proposes screening in order to avoid any unnecessary nuisance or intrusion on the public or neighboring landowners. The surrounding area is primarily rural and there are minimal neighboring structures near the proposed site. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The unique characteristics and the geographical location of the property, as it currently sits in an A-1 zone, would prevent the Petitioners from operating the proposed manufacturing business at said location and place a limitation on the property's usefulness.*
4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Petitioners would be prohibited from operating the manufacturing business at this location without the requested variance requiring Petitioners to relocate said business and find another suitable location away from their home.*
5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The comprehensive plan encourages rural family-based businesses and the proposed plan is not dissimilar from those in existence in the surrounding area. The comprehensive plan also encourages a diverse economy and promotes growth in the county economy with the small business owners.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**MULLET, BENJAMIN ~ WAGGING TAIL PETS ~** By: Benjamin Mullet (21-LUV-07): Van Buren Twp., Sect. 24, T38N R08E, zoned A-1. Located 6115 N 675 W, Shipshewana. Application is for a proposed commercial dog breeding facility with up to 19 breeding females.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition.

Susie Troyer, 2675 E 025 W, LaGrange, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance. Ben Mullet was unable to obtain all the required signatures from neighboring properties for approval of the kennel, therefore the petition was brought to the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition at length.

Due to an administrative error, the petition will be heard again at the March 16, 2021 LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

*(Public Hearing)*

**CARTY, GARY & JANE ~** By: Gary Carty (21-LUV-08): Clay Twp., Sect. 31, T37N R09E, zoned S-1. Located 5980 W 185 S, Topeka. Application is to bring existing duplex in an S-1 zoning district into compliance with the LaGrange County Zoning Ordinance.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition.

Gary Carty, 7055 W 100 N, was present as the petitioner. Mr. Carty explained to the board the property was purchased in October 2020 and when he went to pull an electrical permit it was discovered the property was not properly zoned for a duplex.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is to continue the use of a duplex in an S-1 zone and bring said use into compliance with the zoning ordinance. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties and does not increase traffic or create hazardous conditions for the public.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed duplex has been in existence and utilized as such for several years without any issue or complaint from adjacent landowners. The residential structure meets setback requirements and does not interfere with neighboring landowners' use and enjoyment of their properties. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The unique geographical location of the existing duplex residential structure, as it currently sits in a S-1 zone, would prevent the continued use of the property as a duplex rental property as proposed, thereby limiting the property's maximum usefulness.*
4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Petitioners would be unable to continue the use of the existing duplex on the lot as it currently exists, due to the zoning that exists on the property. Strict application would require the Petitioners to rezone their property or to cease the use of the second dwelling on the property.*
5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The proposed variance, as requested, is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and will not interfere with the S-1 zoning and the neighboring area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested

*(Public Hearing)*

**YODER, DANIEL & IRENE ~ HEARTLAND BIKE SHOP ~ By: Hand to the Plow Surveying (21-LUV-09):** Eden Twp., Sect. 36, T36N R08E, zoned A-1. Located 6125 W 800 S, Topeka. Application is to operate a retail bike shop in an A-1 zone.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition.

Clayton Evans, Hand to the Plow Land Surveying, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Evans reviewed the business information to the board.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor. Mr. Young asked if there was anyone who would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the petition.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is to operate a bike shop with retail sales in Petitioner's existing auxiliary structure in an A-1 zone. The business will have minimal deliveries and Petitioner expects patrons to be primarily by buggy or bicycle. The property allows for safe flow of traffic and sufficient turn around. The proposed business poses no risk of harm to the general public.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The existing building blends well with neighboring properties and there is minimal traffic at the location. Petitioner's proposed business will cause minimal noise and intrusion upon neighboring landowners. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The location of the subject property as it currently sits within an A-1 zone would prevent Petitioner from operating with retail sales of bikes and bike accessories as proposed.*

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Petitioner would be prohibited from operating the proposed retail sales of bikes and bike accessories at this location without the requested variance requiring them to cease said sales at this location.*

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The comprehensive plan encourages economic growth and rural-based cottage industries similar to that which Petitioner is proposing. The proposed usage is not dissimilar from other rural businesses in the surrounding area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**YODER, ADAM & DORA ~ YODER, JOHN & RUTH ~ ELITE NUTRITION ~ By: Adam Yoder (21-LUV-10):** Eden Twp., Sect. 36, T38N R08E, zoned A-1. Located at 4945 N 675 W, Shipshewana. Application is to operate an agribusiness exceeding the maximum footprint by 18,160 sq. ft., the maximum number of employees by 3. The business is also on more than 3 acres and the owner does not reside on the property.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Adam Yoder, 4875 N 675 W, Shipshewana, was present as the petitioner. Mr. Yoder explained to the board the business grew much quicker than anticipated and is a family ran business.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan at length.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is to operate an agribusiness on Petitioner's property located in an A-1 zone. The property location and layout allows for safe flow of traffic and sufficient turn around. The proposed business poses no risk of harm to the general public.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The existing buildings blend well with neighboring properties and there has been existing businesses at this location for several years without issue. Petitioner's proposed business will create minimal noise and intrusion upon neighboring landowners. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The location of the subject property as it currently sits within an A-1 zone would prevent Petitioners from operating the proposed agribusiness with retail sales as proposed.*
4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Petitioners would be prohibited from operating the proposed agribusiness with retail sales at this location without the requested variance. The existing business location and the existing use of the property would be frustrated without the proposed variance given that it has operated as a business site for several years.*
5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The comprehensive plan encourages economic growth and rural-based cottage industries similar to that which Petitioner are proposing. The proposed usage is not dissimilar from other rural businesses in the surrounding area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**BELL, TIMOTHY & LISA ~ By: Lisa Bell (21-LUV-11/21-V-04):** Johnson Twp., Sect.30, T36N R10E, zoned L-1. Located at 6925 S 095 E, Wolcottville (back lot). Application is for a proposed second accessory building in an L-1 zone. Also for the buildings to exceed the foot print of the residence by 1,448 sq. ft.

Robbie Miller introduced and reviewed the petition.

Tim Bell, 18406 Lochner Road, Spencerville, was present as the petitioner. Mr. Bell explained to the board the accessory building would be used for personal storage of larger items such as his boat.

Tyler Young asked if anyone was in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan at length.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is for the construction of a second auxiliary structure located on a back lot zoned L-1. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties and does not increase traffic or create hazardous situations to the public. The lot has ample space on the property to not affect the roadway or neighboring landowners.*



2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The new construction proposed would be aesthetically pleasing to neighboring properties and may also increase their value. Petitioner's back lot is of sufficient size to house the proposed auxiliary structure without encroaching on or interfering with neighboring landowners. The proposal meets all setback requirements. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The geographical location of the property as it currently sits in an L-1 zone would prevent the Petitioners from having the proposed auxiliary structure, without the removal of the existing auxiliary structure located near Petitioner's residence.*
4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Strict application would prevent Petitioners from building the auxiliary structure as proposed and utilizing the full potential of their property.*
5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The proposed variance and the proposed auxiliary structure requested is not in conflict with the comprehensive plan.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

#### *Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is for the construction of a second auxiliary structure on Petitioner's backlot property to provide additional personal storage. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties, does not increase traffic or create hazardous situations to the public and meets all of the setback requirements. No risk is posed to the community or public.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed structure is a new detached garage, making the current vacant back lot more aesthetically pleasing to neighboring properties and would likely enhance neighboring property values. The proposed structure fits within the appropriate setbacks thereby not intruding on adjacent landowners use of their properties. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Petitioners would be unable to build the auxiliary structure as proposed without the variance requested, unless Petitioners were to increase the size of the existing home by 1,448 sq. ft. The strict application would place a limitation on the usefulness and value of Petitioner's property.*
4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.  
*The proposed construction is minimally intrusive, is placed within the required setbacks, and does not infringe on neighboring properties or the general public.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**MILLER, MIKE/MILLER, MAYNARD & ESTHER ~ SHIPSHE FARM SUPPLY ~ By: Rob Yoder (21-LUV-12):** Newbury Twp., Sect. 09, T37N R08E, zoned A-1. Located East of 2380 N 925 W, Shipshewana. Application is for a proposed retail store selling agricultural feed, seed and agricultural equipment.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Rob Yoder, 7740 W SR 120, Shipshewana, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Yoder explained the details of the business to the board.

Tyler Young asked if anyone was in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan and existing business at length.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is to operate a business selling agricultural feed and equipment to the public on Petitioner's property zoned A-1. The proposed business will have a minimal effect on the surrounding area, given that the business is currently in operation on an adjacent property without issue. The proposed location of the retail facility is located well off of the road allowing for the safe flow of traffic and sufficient turn around.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed site for the retail facility is located in a rural area, located well away from any neighboring structures and/or landowners. The retail sale of agricultural feed and equipment will not interfere or infringe upon adjacent landowners' use and enjoyment of their properties. The retail sales at the site will not affect the neighboring areas in a substantial way. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The location of the subject property as it currently sits within an A-1 zone would prevent Petitioners from operating the retail facility without the variance requested.*

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

*Petitioners would be prohibited from operating with retail sales at this location without the variance. A business of this sort is difficult to operate without retail sales.*

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

*The comprehensive plan encourages rural agricultural businesses in A-1 zones similar to that which Petitioner are proposing. The proposed retail sales of agricultural feed and equipment would encourage the growth and provide a much-needed service to the county.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 23rd day of February, 2021, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Nick Wilson made a motion to adjourn, Lynn Bowen seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

LAGRANGE COUNTY, INDIANA  
ANTI-DISCRIMINATION NOTICE STATEMENT

The County of LaGrange does not illegally discriminate because of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, or age with regards to admission, participation, or treatment in its facilities, programs, activities, or services, as required by Title III and Title VI of the American Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and their related statutes, regulations, and directives. The County has established an Anti-Discrimination Compliance Division to ensure compliance with these laws. If you would like more information concerning the provisions of these laws and about the rights provided thereby, or if you have a suggestion on how the County can better meet the needs of persons protected thereby, please contact the Division at 300 E. Factory St., LaGrange, IN 46761 or by telephone at (260)499-6352.

**LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tyler Young, President

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Nick Wilson, Vice President

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn Bowen, Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Bugg, Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rich Sherman, Alternate Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Freeman Miller, Alternate Member