

# HENDRICKS COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 17, 2025

6:30 PM

Hendricks County Government Center • Meeting Rooms 4 & 5  
355 S Washington St #G80  
Danville, IN 46122

**Members Present:** Rod Lasley (VC), Brett Smedley, Ron Kneeland, Anthony Hession

**Members Absent:** Walt O'Riley (C)

**Staff Present:** Tim Dombrosky, Planning Director; Leslie Dardeen, Recording Secretary

**Legal Representation:** Greg Steuerwald

A quorum was established, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Mr. Lasley assumed the role of chairperson as Mr. O'Riley was not present and read the Rules of Procedure for the meeting. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 20, 2025 meeting. Mr. Smedley made a motion to approve the October minutes. Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion. Motion of approval passed 4-0.

### New Business:

**VAR 16-25 Christopher Dowell** Variance from development standards to allow metal siding as the exterior on a principal dwelling on a 4.38-acre AGR-zoned parcel in Marion Township: Section 6, Township 15, Range 2W; Key No 09-1-06-52W 452-002; located on the north side of W US Hwy 36, apprx. ½ mile west of S CR 775 W; 8472 W US Hwy 36, Coatesville, IN 46121.

Mr. Dombrosky gave an overview of the petition and property:

- Zoned AGR
- Located in the western part of the county, west of New Winchester, in a newly platted subdivision
- Petitioner would like to use metal siding as the primary exterior covering material
- Plans will include windows on the garage doors as an extra architectural feature

Mr. Lasley invited the petitioner to address the board.

Ms. Ashley Dowell, 125 S Green St, Brownsburg, IN 46112, addressed the board:

- Presented pictures to the board showing the metal siding to be used and the potential garage door design

Mr. Lasley: Where is the septic field?

Mr. Dombrosky: The elevation of the property dictated the placement of the septic at the back of the parcel.

Mr. Hession: Who is building the structure?

Ms. Dowell: Helton Construction.

Mr. Lasley opened the public hearing.

Ms. Germaine Jones, 751 Willow Ridge Ct, Plainfield, IN 46168, addressed the board. She and her husband own the adjoining lot. They are in favor of the metal siding and support the petition.

Mr. Paul Bryant, 124 Green St, Brownsburg, IN 46112, addressed the board:

- Involved with the planning and construction of the home
- The metal was chosen for its longevity and wear durability

Mr. Lasley closed the public hearing as no one else signed up to speak.

Mr. Lasley: Are there any further comments or questions from the board?

Being none, he asked for a motion from the board.

Mr. Smedley made a motion to approve VAR 16-25 with conditions set by staff. Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion. Motion to approve VAR 16-25 carried unanimously.

**VOTE: For – 4      Against – 0      Abstained – 0      APPROVE**  
**VAR 16-25: Christopher Dowell**

## **Hendricks County Area Board of Zoning Appeals**

Findings of Fact/Law and Conditions of Approval

VAR 16-25

An application for the above noted development standards variance was filed in the office of the Hendricks County Department of Planning and Building (DPB). The application sought to vary development standards by allowing metal as a primary building material on a principal structure in an AGR/Agriculture Residential zoning district.

In accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 5-3-1 and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance (HCZO) Section 12.6 (C), the DPB staff published a legal notice in the *Danville Republican*. This notice advertised the public hearing scheduled in conformity with IC 36-7-4-920. The public hearing included the above variance on its agenda.

In accordance with Section 3.07 (D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Board, the applicant also sent courtesy notices to certain surrounding property owners of record and other interested persons. A copy of this courtesy notice and a list of those receiving them were made a part of the file for this variance.

The Board conducted the hearing as advertised and heard evidence and testimony on the above noted variance. Meeting in open session, the Board subsequently considered the above noted request and its relationship to the requirements of IC 36-7-4 and HCZO. A tape recording of this proceeding has been on file and available to the public in the DPB office since the date of the hearing.

In its deliberations, the Board weighed the evidence associated with the following requirements and made the following findings.

**IC 36-7-4-918.5 Variance from the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance.** A Board of Zoning Appeals shall approve or deny variances from the development standards (such as height, bulk, or area) of the zoning ordinance. A Variance may be approved under this section only upon a determination in writing that:

- (1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not have a negative effect on the community and not be injurious to 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 Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not be out of place or character with the surroundings. The variance will not negatively impact the surrounding properties.

- (3) The strict application of the terms of the Zoning Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet the standard. Excluding standard construction practices and materials creates an unreasonable standard.

**HCZO 12.6 (E) Development Standards Variance; Conditions. The Board may impose such reasonable conditions upon its approval as it deems necessary.**

The Board imposed the following conditions in furtherance of the Indiana Code and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance:

1. The petitioner shall be responsible for obtaining the required permits

For all the foregoing reasons, the Board APPROVED this request for a development standards Variance on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025.

AREA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA

Walt O'Riley

Walt O'Riley  
Chairperson

Tim Dombrosky

Tim Dombrosky  
Secretary to the Board

**SE 03-25 Grant & Cazeo Henry** Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on a 6.39-acre RB-zoned parcel in Washington Township: Section 34, Township 16, Range 1E; Key No 12-1-34-61E 305-002; located southeast of the intersection of E CR 150 N and N CR 600 E; 1507 N CR 600 E, Avon, IN 46123.

Mr. Dombrosky gave an overview of the petition and property:

- Zoned RB and near the Town of Brownsburg boundaries
- Petitioner would like to construct an ADU on the property, as an addition to an existing accessory building
- ADUs are only permitted by Special Exception in the RB district

Mr. Lasley: Will there be a separate address?

Mr. Dombrosky: The standard conditions of a shared address and driveway are included in my findings.

Mr. Lasley invited the petitioner to address the board.

Mr. Dombrosky took questions from the board as the petitioner was running late to the meeting.

Mr. Smedley: Is there an issue with using different exterior materials for the addition than what's currently on the accessory structure?

Mr. Dombrosky: No.

Mr. Lasley opened and closed the public hearing as no one had signed up to speak.

Mr. Lasley: Are there any more comments or questions from the board?

Being none, he asked for a motion from the board.

Mr. Hession made a motion to approve SE 03-25 with conditions set by staff.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion. Motion to approve SE 03-25 with conditions carried unanimously.

**VOTE: For – 4      Against – 0      Abstained – 0      APPROVE**  
**SE 03-25: Grant Henry**

**Hendricks County Area Board of Zoning Appeals**  
Findings of Fact/Law and Conditions of Approval

**SE 03-25**

An application for the above noted special exception was filed in the office of the Hendricks County Department of Planning and Building (DPB). That application sought to permit an **Accessory Dwelling** in an area zoned as RB (Single Family Residential). Acting in its role as staff to the County Board of Zoning Appeals (Board), the DPB staff subsequently created a file containing all documentation of the request and made that file available for public inspection in the County Government Center.

In accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 5-3-1 and the County Zoning Ordinance (HCZO) Section 12.7, the DPB staff published a legal notice in the *Danville Republican* advertising the public hearing scheduled in conformity with IC 36-7-4-920. The public hearing included the above special exception on its agenda.

In accordance with Section 3.07 (D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Board, the applicant also sent courtesy notices to certain surrounding property owners of record and other interested persons. A copy of this notice and a list of those receiving them were made a part of the file for this Special Exception.

The Board conducted the hearing as advertised and heard evidence and testimony on the above noted Special Exception. Meeting in open session, the Board subsequently considered the above noted request and its relationship to the requirements of IC 36-7-4 and HCZO. A tape recording of this proceeding has been on file and available to the public in the DPB office since the date of the hearing.

In its deliberations, the Board weighed the evidence associated with the following requirements and made the following findings.

**IC 36-7-4-918.2 Exceptions and uses. A Board of Zoning Appeals shall approve or deny all: (1) Special Exceptions; ... from the terms of the Zoning Ordinance, but only in the classes of cases or in the particular situations specified in the Zoning Ordinance.**

**HCZO Section 12.7 authorizes the Hendricks County Board of Zoning Appeals to approve Special Exceptions.**

**HCZO Section 12.7 (D)(1). In addition to the special requirements for permitted Special Exception uses as specified in Section 12.7 (D)(2) ... the Board of Zoning Appeals ... shall find adequate evidence showing that the use at the proposed location:**

**A. Is in fact a permitted Special Exception use ... [in] the zoning district involved.**

The Board finds that an accessory dwelling is in fact a Special Exception in the RB Residential Zoning District.

**B. Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the County's Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The use meets Comprehensive Plan goals for infill residential development.

**C. Will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area;**

The Board finds that the proposed use will meet this standard. The use will not substantially change the appearance and character of the property and will not affect the essential character of the area.

**D. Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services ... or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. Public facilities and infrastructure are either private or will be provided at expense to the owner. Other public services adequately serve the area, and the use does not represent a significant increase in demand.

**E. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost of public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The property changes will not result in significant changes to the existing demand for services.

**F. Will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, or odors;**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The use will not be disruptive and detrimental to the surrounding area as the activity is not detrimental.

**G. Will have vehicular approaches to the property, which shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The existing entrance provides adequate access.

**H. Will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. There will be no substantial loss in natural, scenic, or historic features with the approval of the business.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Board APPROVED this request for a Special Exception on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025.

AREA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA

Walt O'Riley

Walt O'Riley  
Chairperson

Tim Dombrosky

Tim Dombrosky  
Secretary

**VAR 17-25 Bennie Buchanan** Variance from development standards to allow a front building setback of 45' instead of the required 65', and to reduce the required square footage of a principal dwelling from 1500 sq ft to 1387 sq ft on a .88-acre AGR-zoned parcel in Liberty Township: Section 9, Township 14, Range 1W; Key No 07-2-09-41W 100-010; located apprx. 1/4 mile north of W US Hwy 40 on S CR 100 W; 6487 S CR 100 W, Clayton, IN 46118.

Mr. Dombrosky gave an overview of the petition and property:

- Zoned AGR, smaller rural homestead
- Original home was destroyed in a fire
  - Was non-conforming because it did not meet the setback
- Petitioner wants to replace the original home with a modular home
  - Will not be on the same footprint, therefore considered a "new build"
  - Will not meet front setback or square footage requirements
- Petitioner has agreed to revise site plan to allow for a 50' setback instead of the originally requested 45' setback

Mr. Lasley: What is the square footage minimum?

Mr. Dombrosky: 1500 square feet. The proposed modular is 1387 square feet.

Mr. Lasley invited the petitioner to address the board.

Ms. Merrilee Manning, 1527 S Bloomington St, Greencastle, IN 46135, speaking on behalf of Mr. Bennie Buchanan, addressed the board:

- The original house was 52' from the center of the road
- Meeting the required setback would put the new house too close to the existing garage

Mr. Lasley opened and closed the public hearing as no remonstrators were present.

Mr. Lasley: Are there any more comments or questions from the board?

Mr. Hession: When was the house fire?

Mr. Buchanan: Early September 2025.

Being no further questions, he asked for a motion from the board.

Mr. Smedley made a motion to approve VAR 17-25 with conditions set by staff. Mr. Hession seconded the motion. Motion to approve VAR 17-25 carried unanimously.

**VOTE: For – 4      Against – 0      Abstained – 0      APPROVE**  
**VAR 17-25: Bennie Buchanan**

## **Hendricks County Area Board of Zoning Appeals**

### Findings of Fact/Law and Conditions of Approval

VAR 17-25

An application for the above noted development standards variance was filed in the office of the Hendricks County Department of Planning and Building (DPB). The application sought to vary development standards by allowing a reduction of the front setback and a variance from the 1,500 square foot minimum dwelling size in an AGR/Agriculture Residential zoning district.

In accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 5-3-1 and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance (HCZO) Section 12.6 (C), the DPB staff published a legal notice in the *Danville Republican*. This notice advertised the public hearing scheduled in conformity with IC 36-7-4-920. The public hearing included the above variance on its agenda.

In accordance with Section 3.07 (D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Board, the applicant also sent courtesy notices to certain surrounding property owners of record and other interested persons. A copy of this courtesy notice and a list of those receiving them were made a part of the file for this variance.

The Board conducted the hearing as advertised and heard evidence and testimony on the above noted variance. Meeting in open session, the Board subsequently considered the above noted request and its relationship to the requirements of IC 36-7-4 and HCZO. A tape recording of this proceeding has been on file and available to the public in the DPB office since the date of the hearing.

In its deliberations, the Board weighed the evidence associated with the following requirements and made the following findings.

**IC 36-7-4-918.5 Variance from the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance. A Board of Zoning Appeals shall approve or deny variances from the development standards (such as height, bulk, or area) of the zoning ordinance. A Variance may be approved under this section only upon a determination in writing that:**

- (1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not have a negative effect on the community and not be injurious to 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 Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not be out of place or character with the surroundings. The variance will not negatively impact the surrounding properties.

- (3) The strict application of the terms of the Zoning Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet the standard. The Zoning Ordinance desires to permit the reuse and value of small non-conforming lots on well and septic. The other locations of the lot are not feasible for the home to be rebuilt.

**HCZO 12.6 (E) Development Standards Variance; Conditions. The Board may impose such reasonable conditions upon its approval as it deems necessary.**

The Board imposed the following conditions in furtherance of the Indiana Code and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance:

1. The petitioner shall be responsible for obtaining the required permits

For all the foregoing reasons, the Board APPROVED this request for a development standards Variance on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025.

AREA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA

Walt O'Riley

Walt O'Riley  
Chairperson

Tim Dombrosky

Tim Dombrosky  
Secretary to the Board

**VAR 18-25 Logan Keck** Variance from development standards to allow a front building setback of 82.6' instead of the required 100' for construction of a pole barn on a 1.3-acre AGR-zoned parcel in Middle Township: Section 17, Township 16, Range 1E; Key No 10-3-17-61E 440-014; located on N CR 500 E, apprx. 1/8 mile south of E CR 450 N; 4384 N CR 500 E, Danville, IN 46122.

Mr. Dombrosky gave an overview of the petition and property:

- Zoned AGR
- Parcel is north of the B&O trail
- Petitioner wants to build an accessory structure, but will not meet the required front setback of 100'

Mr. Lasley invited the petitioner to address the board.

Mr. Logan Keck, 4384 N CR 500 E, Danville, IN 46122, addressed the board:

- Would like to utilize the existing building site and driveway for the new pole barn
- The barn would have an 82' setback

Mr. Lasley: What's the purpose of the barn?

Mr. Keck: Personal storage, vehicles and lawn equipment primarily.

Mr. Dombrosky: I'd like to add that CR 500 is a "collector road" which has the biggest setback requirement we have for county parcels. In this case, the proposed setback presents no issues with sight clearance or traffic interference.

Mr. Lasley opened and closed the public hearing as no remonstrators were present.

Mr. Lasley: Are there any more comments or questions from the board?

Being no further questions, he asked for a motion from the board.

Mr. Hession made a motion to approve VAR 18-25 with conditions set by staff. Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion. Motion to approve VAR 18-25 carried unanimously.

**VOTE: For – 4      Against – 0      Abstained – 0      APPROVE**  
**VAR 18-25: Logan Keck**

## **Hendricks County Area Board of Zoning Appeals**

Findings of Fact/Law and Conditions of Approval

VAR 18-25

An application for the above noted development standards variance was filed in the office of the Hendricks County Department of Planning and Building (DPB). The application sought to vary development standards by allowing a reduction of the front setback in an AGR/Agriculture Residential zoning district.

In accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 5-3-1 and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance (HCZO) Section 12.6 (C), the DPB staff published a legal notice in the *Danville Republican*. This notice advertised the public hearing scheduled in conformity with IC 36-7-4-920. The public hearing included the above variance on its agenda.

In accordance with Section 3.07 (D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Board, the applicant also sent courtesy notices to certain surrounding property owners of record and other interested persons. A copy of this courtesy notice and a list of those receiving them were made a part of the file for this variance.

The Board conducted the hearing as advertised and heard evidence and testimony on the above noted variance. Meeting in open session, the Board subsequently considered the above noted request and its relationship to the requirements of IC 36-7-4 and HCZO. A tape recording of this proceeding has been on file and available to the public in the DPB office since the date of the hearing.

In its deliberations, the Board weighed the evidence associated with the following requirements and made the following findings.

**IC 36-7-4-918.5 Variance from the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance.** A Board of Zoning Appeals shall approve or deny variances from the development standards (such as height, bulk, or area) of the zoning ordinance. A Variance may be approved under this section only upon a determination in writing that:

- (1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not have a negative effect on the community and not be injurious to 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 Board finds that the proposal will meet this standard. The structure will not be out of place or character with the surroundings. The variance will not negatively impact the surrounding properties.

- (3) The strict application of the terms of the Zoning Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.**

The Board finds that the proposal will meet the standard. The Zoning Ordinance desires to permit the use and value of non-conforming lots on well and septic. The other locations of the lot are not feasible for such a structure.

**HCZO 12.6 (E) Development Standards Variance; Conditions.** The Board may impose such reasonable conditions upon its approval as it deems necessary.

The Board imposed the following conditions in furtherance of the Indiana Code and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance:

1. The petitioner shall be responsible for obtaining the required permits

For all the foregoing reasons, the Board APPROVED this request for a development standards Variance on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025.

AREA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA

Walt O'Riley  
Walt O'Riley  
Chairperson

Tim Dombrosky

Tim Dombrosky  
Secretary to the Board

**Other Business:**

Mr. Lasley asked if there was any further business to discuss.

Mr. Dombrosky responded that the proposed schedule for the 2026 BZA meetings is the last item on the agenda.

Mr. Lasley asked if anyone had any questions or issues with the schedule.

Being none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Hession made a motion to approve the 2026 BZA schedule.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the 2026 BZA schedule passed unanimously.

Being no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.