City of Columbus – Bartholomew County
Planning Department

123 Washington Street
Columbus, Indiana 47201
Phone: (812) 376-2550
Fax: (812) 376-2643

CITY OF COLUMBUS, INDIANA
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

USE VARIANCE
FINDINGS OF FACT

Case Reference Number: BZA-26-11

Applicant: MAC Property Group

Filing Date: February 17, 2026

Hearing Date: March 24, 2026

Location: An area directly south of 2346 North County Road 200 West

Variance Requested:
A variance from Zoning Ordinance Section 3.5(A) to allow a contractor's workshop/office in a AP (Agriculture: Preferred) zoning district. The applicant is proposing to expand their contractor's workshop/office by expanding the lot to incorporate an additional 1 acre into the existing half acre property. The applicant is also proposing to construct a 43 ft by 180 ft. (a 7,740 square feet) building on the expanded property.

Board Action Taken:
Request Approved by a Vote of: 4 to 1

Commitments:
The approval was subject to the following commitments which address the long-term use of the property:

1. There shall be no outdoor storage of materials, refuse, or equipment, other than employee vehicles or vehicles and trailers associated with the business.
2. All drives and parking areas shall be paved,
3. No new driveway access to 200 West shall be provided.

The Columbus Board of Zoning Appeals acted under the authority of Indiana law as follows: Indiana Code Section 36-7-4-918.4: a board of zoning appeals shall approve or deny variances of use from the terms of the zoning ordinance. The board may impose reasonable conditions as a part of its approval.

In its deliberations, the Columbus Board of Zoning Appeals weighed the evidence associated with the following criteria and made the findings listed below. These written findings shall be considered the official findings of the Board and shall supplement any spoken findings offered at the time the Board's decision was made. Any distinctions between these written findings and those that were spoken serve only to clarify any paraphrasing or commonly understood language used in the spoken findings through the use of technical content of identical meaning.

Criteria #1: *Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance, Section 12.3(D)(2)(a), the approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.*

Finding: The business, with the expansion, will generate minimal traffic and noise. The County Highway Department and the County Fire Inspector do not have any concerns with the use. This criterion has been met.

Criteria #2: *Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance, Section 12.3(D)(2)(b), the use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.*

Finding: The nearest residence is directly to the north and has co-existed with the business for 40 years. With the expansion occurring to the south of the existing building, the adjacent neighbor should have little to no adverse affects. Any other residences are much farther away and approval of this request should not affect the use and value of the adjacent area. This criterion has been met.

Criteria #3: *Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance, Section 12.3(D)(2)(c), the need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved.*

Finding: The adjacent property was originally developed for commercial use under Bartholomew County's jurisdiction and it is logical to expand the site, since there is abundant space, rather than move to another location. It is necessary to the business and the applicant is willing to comply with the commitments and creates a need peculiar to the property. This criterion has been met.

Criteria #4: *Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance, Section 12.3(D)(2)(d), 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.*

Finding: The property is located outside the City's boundaries in an area that is used for agricultural and rural residential. The expansion would generally be compatible with the surrounding area. Strict enforcement would effectively prevent the reasonable continuation of the property's functional use, despite its suitability and compatibility with surrounding rural and agricultural activity and creates an unnecessary hardship when applied to the property. This criterion has been met.

Criteria #5: *Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance, Section 12.3(D)(2)(e), the granting of the variance does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan.*

Finding: The Comprehensive Plan encourages a business-friendly climate which will foster growth in the commercial sector, while protecting the character of neighborhoods. The expansion does not appear to have a negative affect on surrounding properties, and should not interfere substantially with future growth in this area. The Comprehensive Plan supports industrial development only in planned business parks, rather than individual lots, however this site is unique in that it is requesting an expansion rather than a new business use. Further, the plan calls for the preservation of farmland, however this small 1 acre expansion is at the edge of a drainage area with ponding and not ideal farmland and therefore the expansion does not interfere substantially with the comprehensive plan. This criterion has been met.

These findings of fact have been adopted by the Columbus Board of Zoning Appeals on the _____ day of _____, 20___.

_____

Chairperson

Secretary