

**MINUTES
CITY OF COLUMBUS BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2025, 6:30 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
123 WASHINGTON STREET
COLUMBUS, INDIANA**

Members in Person: Charles “Chuck” Doup, Zack Ellison, Michael Kinder, Grant Hale, and Hillary Maple

Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Melissa Begley, Kyra Behrman, Desiree Aldrich, and Austin Whitted (Deputy City Attorney)

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting with a brief explanation of the board and its responsibilities.

Mr. Whitted (Deputy City Attorney) administered an oath to all in attendance who would be speaking.

OLD BUSINESS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

None

NEW BUSINESS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

CCU-2025-027: Cookie Paradise – A request by Trung Le for conditional use approval to allow a home-based business (cookie sales) in the RS3 (Residential: Single Family 3) zoning district per Zoning Ordinance Section 6.6(Part 1). The property is located at 3346 Cox Lane, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Behrman presented for the Planning Department.

Mr. Ellison asked if the number of vehicles was based on the hour or the day. Ms. Behrman stated she believes it was over the course of a day, but the applicant can confirm.

Trung Le represented the applicant. Mr. Le mentioned the Indiana Cottage Food Law, also referred to as Home Based Vendor (HBV). The law can be found on the Indiana General Assembly website under the following codes - IC 16-42-5.3 (Chapter 5.3. Home Based Food Products) Code 16-42-5.3-2 (Home based vendor). Mr. Le stated that finding this law is what prompted he and his wife to start Cookie Paradise. He added that their cookie business falls into the requirements listed in the law. Mr. Le stated that they average approximately 30 cars over the course of an average Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. which are the hours they are open for business. He added that the average customer stops for approximately 5 minutes to purchase cookies then leaves. Mr. Le stated that the most vehicles he has had parked in front of his house was 3 at a time.

Mr. Kinder asked if the applicant was using his trailer on the property. Mr. Le stated that he uses a tent on the lawn or inside his garage (when weather is bad) to sell cookies from the house. He only uses the trailer for special events off the property.

Mr. Doup asked if the applicant was okay with the conditions of approval recommended by the staff in the staff report. Mr. Le stated that he is okay with not having any events or other vendors on his property, other than the sale of his cookies. He is okay with the staff condition of 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, but he is not okay with only allowing customers on Saturday. They do have some customers

during the week who pick up special orders, and they would not be able to successfully run their business without those customers.

Mr. Ellison asked about the Cottage Food Industry regulations for Indiana. Mr. Whitted stated that it is part of the Indiana Statute for the Food Industry, allowing for less restrictive regulations for home-based businesses. This request is regarding the use of your land in terms of the thresholds between using as residential versus commercial. This board does have authority regarding the regulations of land use, and that is why this request is on the docket.

Mr. Whitted asked Mr. Le if he had his home-based vendor certificate, which is required by the state law for this type of business. Mr. Le stated that he does.

Mr. Doup asked the applicant if he would need pick-up hours during the week as well as on Saturdays. Mr. Le stated that he needed time during the week for customers to pick up special orders. Mr. Le added that they have started offering free delivery during the week for Columbus area clients, so the weekly pick-up customers are minimal.

Mr. Kinder stated that the Saturday cookie sales are different than the weekly cookie orders, so those order pick-ups should not be limited to Saturday only. Mr. Kinder asked what the staff's reasoning was for the Saturday 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. hours of operation recommendation. Ms. Behrman stated it was so as not to disturb the neighborhood early in the morning or later in the evening. Ms. Begley stated that she understood those to be the hours the applicant currently uses.

Mr. Ellison stated that it appears the applicant's business has become successful. He asked at what point the applicant would need to move to a storefront. Mr. Le stated that it would not be for several years down the road, as a commercial bakery is a considerable investment for a young family that is new to this country.

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

Renata Nunez, whose address was not provided, participating in-person, stated she was in full support of approval for this request.

Sarah Harrison, 3740 Briar Hill Way, participating in-person, stated she was in full support of approval for this request.

Sean Jones, whose address was not provided, participating in-person, stated he was in full support of approval for this request.

John Kozar, whose address was not provided, participating in-person, stated he has seen increased traffic on Cox Lane, but not because of the cookie sales, it is because of the Windstar Woods subdivision traffic cutting through. He was in full support of approval for this request.

Stephanie Klinker Jones, whose address was not provided, participating in-person, stated she was in full support of approval for this request.

Louis Fuentes, whose address was not provided, participating in-person, stated he was in full support of approval for this request.

Julia Federle, Chow Down Columbus Facebook Page facilitator, 327 Flatrock Dr., participating in-person, stated she has approximately 50 Cottage Home bakers on her Facebook page that all work out of their homes, like Mr. Le does. She fully supports approval of the request without any alterations to how the business is currently conducted.

Tom Dell, 1063 Hummingbird Lane, participating in-person, stated he was in full support of approving this request.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Doup asked if the Cottage Law exempts the business from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Whitted stated that they are only exempt from the restrictions that are associated with Commercial Bakeries, but not exempt from land use requirements. Mr. Le stated that he does see conflict in how the State Cottage Law is written and the local ordinance requirements. Mr. Le went on to say that our local ordinance is restricting his ability to run his home-based business according to the state law regulations. He suggested that the ordinance be closely compared to the state law for compliance going forward.

Mr. Ellison stated that 2 public input letters were received before the start of the meeting: 1 from Brandy Wilds and 1 from Julia Federle, both in support of approval of this request.

Ms. Begley stated that she sees where someone might think this process is punitive, but the intent is to understand how someone is using their property in a way that is not just residential. It is to ensure that the use is something that blends with the neighborhood, so as to ensure that everyone in the neighborhood can have peaceful enjoyment of their property. The guidelines are in place to help vet those home-based businesses and confirm that the business is compatible with that particular neighborhood. She added that it is the board's purview to decide on a case-by-case basis what is appropriate and what is not based on the state-mandated criteria.

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the request including the following conditions: 1. The cookie stand retail sales shall be limited to Saturdays only between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. customer special order pick-up during the week is permitted. 2. Events will not be allowed on the property. 3. The cookie stand and retail sales will not involve the use of a trailer or truck on the road or on the property. He stated the following concerning the findings: Agreeing with the staff findings that criteria #1 and #2 have been met as outlined in the staff report. In regards to criteria #3, he stated that it has been met in that there is ample allowed street parking with a road width that does not impede any local traffic, and the sale of cookies does not reach any injurious noise levels to harm the peaceful enjoyment of the neighborhood. Regarding criteria #4, he stated that the increased car traffic for the home based business will be consistent with the character of the zoning district in which it is located and the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CDS-2025-023: Matt Munger – A request by Matt Munger for a development standards variance from Zoning Ordinance Section 3.8(C) to allow a building addition to encroach 13 feet into the front setback. The property is located at 620 Terrace Lake Drive, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Behrman presented for the Planning Department.

Matthew Munger represented himself. He stated that due to regulations from the homeowners' association, he is not permitted to put up a shed to store needed maintenance items for his property. He needs to enlarge the garage to accommodate those items as well as his vehicles.

Mr. Ellison asked if there were any restrictions on an attached garage. Ms. Behrman stated that if the garage is attached to the house, there are no size restrictions. Mr. Ellison stated that what they are reviewing and voting on for this request is not the size or look of the addition, but whether or not the encroachment into the setback is allowable.

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

Tom Dell, 1063 Hummingbird Lane, participating in-person, stated he supports approval of this variance request.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Maple asked if the homeowners' association had a design review for the expansion. Mr. Munger stated that there was not a specific design review, but there was verbiage stating that it should be aesthetically pleasing and include landscaping. He added that he happens to be the President of the Terrace Lake Homeowner Association. He added that he holds himself accountable to uphold the rules that are in place.

Motion: Mr. Doup made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with staff findings that criteria #1 and #2 have been met as outlined in the staff report. Regarding criteria #3, he stated that based on the location of the home, an expansion is forced to encroach into the setback; therefore, criteria #3 has been met according to applicant testimony. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 4 in favor and 1 opposed. Mr. Kinder voted no.

CUV-2025-004: Chad Suverkrup – A request by Chad Suverkrup for a use variance to allow a storage building to be located in the RS2 (Residential: Single Family 2) zoning district per Zoning Ordinance Section 3.9(A). The property is located on the east side of 150 West, approximately 700 feet south of Victory Lane, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Aldrich presented for the Planning Department.

Chad Suverkrup represented himself. He stated that he was looking to develop the lot, which no longer seems suitable for a single-family residence or a commercial site.

Mr. Ellison asked where the front of the proposed storage facility would be facing. Mr. Suverkrup stated it would face 150 West. He added that the building would be positioned in the southeast corner of the lot.

Mr. Whitted asked if the applicant owned the adjoining property to the south. Mr. Suverkrup stated that he owns the residential property immediately to the south and the commercial property south of the residential.

Mr. Hale asked how the staff determined that this would adversely affect the neighboring properties. Ms. Begley stated it was based on the usage. She added that a storage building is not very residential-friendly, and a storage building could entice a commercial user, which is not permitted in a residential zoning district. Ms. Begley stated that it is also removing a viable residential property in this area.

Mr. Ellison stated the Comprehensive Plan marked this area for commercial. Ms. Begley stated that it has to be looked at with blurry lines, as it is not a hard and fast line. She added that it is for the Board to sort through.

Mr. Ellison asked the applicant if he had received the staff report and read the staff's comments regarding the criteria. Mr. Suverkrup stated that the storage building would be for his own private use and the driveway would be paved, not stone. He stated that there would be enough room to turn around on the site, so there would be no reason to back out onto the road from the site.

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

Tara Schoettmer, 4890 North Indianapolis Road, participating in-person, stated she is concerned about the property not being used for residential. She stated she was concerned with increased traffic, light and

sound pollution of any use other than residential, especially on 150 West. She opposes approval of the request.

Brian Schoettmer, 4890 North Indianapolis Road, participating in-person, stated he was also concerned with traffic, light, and sound pollution. He opposes approval of the request.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Suverkrup stated that he would be the only person accessing this site, so there would be no notable increase in traffic on 150 West. He stated that on average, he would only access the site twice a week. He stated that there would not be any spotlights on the site. He added that he may put a light over the garage doors, but that would be the only lighting.

Mr. Doup asked if the applicant wanted to build this for personal storage use or commercial storage use.

Mr. Suverkrup stated that it would be for his personal use only.

Mr. Kinder asked if the request was approved, then it would stay with the property and potentially be used for commercial storage in the future. Ms. Begley stated that it would.

Mr. Ellison asked the Schoettmer's where their house was located on the map. Mr. Schoettmer had Ms. Aldrich pull up the slide showing the surrounding properties, and then he pointed out where his property was located.

Mr. Ellison asked if this site would have light lumens restrictions. Ms. Begley stated that there were no lumens regulations for residential properties. Mr. Ellison asked if it were commercial, would there be lumens regulations. Ms. Begley stated that there would.

Mr. Kinder asked what the specific reason was that this site was not compatible with a residential build. Mr. Suverkrup stated that there has not been a home built in this area for over 50 years, and a new home would be out of place with the rest of the neighborhood. He added that there are no nearby amenities, parks, and it is very difficult to access US Highway 31 to go south. He added that there is also a lot of noise from the railroad tracks, and the traffic noise from being between Indianapolis Road and US Highway 31.

Ms. Begley added that the storage building would be required to have 90-degree cutoff light fixtures.

Ms. Maple stated that the very commercial look of the building in a residential area is bothering her. She asked the applicant if he would be open to giving it a more residential look so that, in the event he sells the property, someone could attach a single-family dwelling to the storage building for garage use to the home. Mr. Whitted stated that, unfortunately, a design alteration was not in the scope of the Board of Zoning Appeals' purview for a Use Variance request.

Mr. Whitted asked if the site has been actively on the market for sale as a residential home site. Mr. Suverkrup stated that he has not tried to sell the property at all.

Motion: Mr. Hale made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with staff findings that criteria #1 has been met. He finds that criteria #2 has been met based on the applicant's testimony that the building would not negatively affect the surrounding properties. He finds that criteria #3 has been met in that it is not feasible to develop as a residential property, with it being surrounded by Industrial properties, a railroad, and high traffic roads, with no sidewalks. He finds that criteria #4 has been met because of the hardship of developing a residential lot due to the difficulty of finding a buyer or renter under the existing conditions surrounding the property. He finds that criteria #5 has been met in that the Comprehensive Plan is misguided in classifying this area as residential based on its proximity to industrial businesses and high traffic roadways.

Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 4 in favor and 1 opposed. Mr. Kinder voted no.

CDS-2025-026: David Gonzalez Medina – A request by David Gonzalez Medina for a development standards variance from Zoning Ordinance Section 3.9(C) to allow an accessory structure to be located 1 foot from the property line, 4 feet less than the required 5-foot rear setback. The property is located at 2603 Washington Street, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Aldrich presented for the Planning Department.

David Gonzalez Medina represented himself. Mr. Medina stated that he just wants to rebuild the lean-to so that he can use the garage for his vehicle and the lean-to structure for his other items.

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

No one from the public attending in person requested to speak.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Medina added that many of his neighbors currently have accessory structures that encroach into the setback, so this would not be out of the norm for this area.

Motion: Ms. Maple made a motion to approve the request agreeing with staff findings that all criteria have been met. Mr. Kinder seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CDS-2025-028: JR Promotions– A request by JR Promotions for development standards variances from 1) Zoning Ordinance Section 10(G)(6) to allow a freestanding sign to be located off-premises from the business it is serving, 2) Zoning Ordinance Section 10 (Table 10.1) to allow a freestanding sign to be 1,344 square feet in size, 1,269 square feet larger than the 75 square foot maximum sign area, 3) Zoning Ordinance Section 10(Table 10.1) to allow a freestanding sign to be 50 feet in height, 40 feet taller than the 10 foot maximum height, and 4) Zoning Ordinance Section 10(I)(3)(c) to allow a freestanding sign to be 100 percent changeable copy, 60% greater than the 40% changeable copy maximum. The property is located on the east side of International Drive, 1,340 feet south of Deaver Road, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Begley presented for the Planning Department.

Mr. Kinder asked if these criteria were the same as the billboard request that came before the board a few years ago. Ms. Begley stated that it was the same criteria.

Jeff Rocker and Richard Sprague represented the applicant. Mr. Rocker explained that the billboard is not an off-premises sign. He stated that the billboard is, in itself, the business. He explained what the billboard would look like and would include any required landscaping. Explained that the sign would be set up for self-regulated lumens and would not, at any time, exceed the requirements determined by the City of Columbus Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Ellison asked who classified the site as a wetland. Mr. Sprague stated that the Indiana Department of Natural Resources classified the area as a wetland.

Mr. Ellison stated that the City of Columbus has a history of no billboards in its jurisdiction because they are overall unsightly. However, for approval of a billboard, it has to advertise something.

Mr. Kinder stated that he realizes that the argument is that the billboard is the business, but the billboard's business is off-premises advertising, which is not allowed, as regulated by the Zoning Ordinance. Mr.

Rocker stated that the majority of the things that will be advertised on the billboard are not businesses. He stated that the local events, lost adults or children, and community advisory announcements are not businesses; they are requirements that the state or local governments ask or pay to have on the billboards to promote community awareness. He added that there will, of course, be some paid advertisements as well. Mr. Rocker stated that the reason why the Ordinance does not state that there may not be any billboards in the City of Columbus's jurisdiction is that it would be unconstitutional to do so. Mr. Rocker stated that he believes Columbus is better than that and will choose to do the right thing regarding billboards.

Mr. Whitted stated that the board should be looking at this as content-neutral. The board should not be looking at what is being advertised, but whether there are traffic concerns, issues with lighting, height, size, and clutter in the area. The board can consider public safety and the overall public good of the billboard.

Mr. Kinder stated that regardless of what his personal feelings are, it is his and the other board members' obligation to ensure the sign meets the state-provided criteria for developmental standard variances. It doesn't matter about any previous cases, as each determination is on a case-by-case basis, referring to those state-required criteria.

Mr. Rocker stated that he understands the criteria must be reviewed, but so far, he has only heard discussion that Bartholomew County does not want billboards, not any discussion specific to the criteria. He added that the practical difficulty for this site is a dedicated wetland that limits the viable uses for the site, and that the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) regulates safety along the Interstates with stringent requirements for billboards. Therefore, the sign would not be injurious to the community, but would be something beneficial to the community.

Mr. Sprague stated that this site has been looked at for development by several entities, including Sunright America, but because of the wetlands, it is not financially feasible to build on. He added that the billboard would generate tax dollars for the city.

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

Tom Dell, 1063 Hummingbird Lane, participating in-person, stated he supports approval of this request.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Kinder requested that if this billboard were approved, the Developmental Standard prohibiting off-premise signs would still be in effect, ensuring that no local business or event would be able to advertise on this billboard. Mr. Whitted stated that, according to the Zoning Ordinance, that was correct.

Mr. Sprague stated that the purpose of the sign business is to promote events and happenings in Columbus to draw in more visitors to the community, and that would include advertising local events and businesses, as well as emergency notifications.

Mr. Ellison asked how many billboards would fit along the Walesboro area. He stated that if one is allowed there will be requests for others.

Mr. Whitted stated that the board should not be looking for hypotheticals, they should be considering what is in front of them and if it meets the criteria as outlined in the ordinance.

1) Zoning Ordinance Section 10(G)(6) to allow a freestanding sign to be located off-premises from the business it is serving.

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to deny the request for an off premise sign. Mr. Kinder stated the following with regard to the findings: Criteria #1 has been met in that the approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community, given the regulations by INDOT for signs along the interstate. However, he agrees with staff findings that

criteria #3 has not been met. Mr. Ellison seconded the motion. The motion failed with a voice vote of 2 in favor and 3 opposed. Ms. Maple, Mr. Hale, and Mr. Doup voted no.

Motion: Mr. Hale made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with the staff findings that criteria #2 has been met. Mr. Hale stated that criteria #1 has been met based on the applicant's testimony regarding INDOT's sign regulations for interstate signs, and criteria #3 has been met as the practical difficulty for this property has not been self-imposed. Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 3 in favor and 2 opposed. Mr. Kinder and Mr. Ellison voted no.

2) Zoning Ordinance Section 10 (Table 10.1) to allow a freestanding sign to be 1,344 square feet in size, 1,269 square feet larger than the 75 square foot maximum sign area.

Motion: Mr. Hale made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with the staff findings that criteria #2 has been met. Mr. Hale stated that criteria #1 has been met based on the applicant's testimony regarding INDOT's sign regulations for interstate signs, and criteria #3 has been met as the practical difficulty for this sign size is the requirement to have 2 sides within 2 feet of each other imposes the larger dimensions and the practical difficulty. Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 3 in favor and 2 opposed. Mr. Kinder and Mr. Ellison voted no.

3) Zoning Ordinance Section 10 (Table 10.1) to allow a freestanding sign to be 50 feet in height, 40 feet taller than the 10-foot maximum height.

Motion: Mr. Hale made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with the staff findings that criteria #2 has been met. Mr. Hale stated that criteria #1 has been met based on the applicant's testimony regarding INDOT's sign regulations for interstate signs, and criteria #3 has been met as the practical difficulty for this property is due to the wetlands making it not suitable for other types of development. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 3 in favor and 2 opposed. Mr. Kinder and Mr. Ellison voted no.

4) Zoning Ordinance Section 10(I)(3)(c) to allow a freestanding sign to be 100 percent changeable copy, 60% greater than the 40% changeable copy maximum.

Motion: Mr. Hale made a motion to approve the request, agreeing with the staff findings that criteria #2 has been met. Mr. Hale stated that criteria #1 has been met based on the applicant's testimony regarding INDOT's sign regulations for interstate signs, and criteria #3 has been met based on the testimony that, other than a changeable copy sign, this area of wetlands is not suitable for development. Ms. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 3 in favor and 2 opposed. Mr. Kinder and Mr. Ellison voted no.

CCU-2025-028: BarCons – A request by BarCons Federal Credit Union for conditional use approval to allow an office use in the CN (Commercial: Neighborhood) zoning district per Zoning Ordinance Section 3.18(B). The property is located at the southwest corner of Stratton Circle and Talley Road, in the City of Columbus.

CUV-2025-005: BarCons – A request by BarCons Federal Credit Union for a use variance to allow a drive-up window to be located in the CN (Commercial: Neighborhood) zoning district per Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1(C) and (Table 6.1). The property is located at the southwest corner of Stratton Circle and Talley Road, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Behrman presented for the Planning Department.

Mr. Kinder asked if there was a list of what qualifies as necessity, personal, and specialty goods and services. Ms. Behrman highlighted all 3 lists.

Mr. Ellison asked if the access to the lots was a city road or a private drive. Ms. Behrman stated that it was a platted access easement.

Desiree Lucenti with New Ground, Baris Saner with New Ground, and Stacey Foster with BarCons Federal Credit unit represented the applicant. Ms. Foster stated that, in her opinion, financial assistance is a necessary service to the community and BarCons is committed to helping, especially the underserved members of the community, become financially healthy.

Mr. Ellison asked if this would be a second branch. Ms. Foster stated that they lease the building they are currently in, and the owners have put that property up for sale. The Stratton Circle location would be their only branch, and they would own this property.

Mr. Saner stated he agreed with Ms. Foster that assistance with loans and other banking needs is a personal service. He added that the bank will have a patio and include a community room. The design will also promote bicycle and pedestrian access for the surrounding community. Mr. Saner stated that this property has been for sale for over 2 years with no interest from commercial or retail developers, indicating that those uses may not be viable at this location. Mr. Saner went on to address all of the criteria items listed in the staff report for the Conditional Use and the Use Variance.

Mr. Kinder asked what the operating hours were for the drive-thru. Ms. Foster stated they will be open Monday through Thursday from 9 am to 5 pm, Friday from 9 am to 6 pm, and Saturday from 9 am to 12 pm; they will be closed on Sunday

Mr. Ellison opened the meeting to public comment.

Tom Dell, 1063 Hummingbird Lane, participating in-person, stated he is in full support of approval for this request.

Mr. Ellison closed the meeting to public comment.

Motion: Mr. Doup made a motion to approve CCU-2025-028, agreeing with the staff's finding that criteria #1 and #2 have been met as stated in the staff report. He added that criteria #3 and #4 have been met as defined in the applicant's testimony that this request fits in with the character of the surrounding neighborhood and businesses. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve CUV-2025-005, agreeing with the staff's findings that criteria #1 and #2 have been met. Based on the passed conditional use variance for a financial institution, of which a drive-up is an essential part of their function, criteria #3 & #4 have been met. Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

FINDINGS OF FACT

CCU-2025-021: B&P Firearms

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the findings. Mr. Doup seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CDS-2025-020: Tyson & Becky Hall

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the findings. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CCU-2025-025: Izzy & Ollie

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the findings. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CCU-2025-026: Walk Off Warehouse

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the findings. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

CDS-2025-022: Walk Off Warehouse

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to approve the findings. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the September 23, 2025 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Doup made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURNMENT: 9:37 p.m.

Motion: Mr. Kinder made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Maple seconded the motion. The motion passed with a voice vote of 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

Zack Ellison, Chairperson

Charles Doup, Secretary