NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: April 28, 2021
TIME: 6:00 P.M.
PLACE: COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
20 N. 3RD STREET
LAFAYETTE, IN 47901

AGENDA

Due to the public health emergency, public comment on agenda items may be submitted prior to the meeting at apc@tippecanoe.in.gov. Comments must include name and address to be heard. Comments may also be made live on the streaming platforms. Members of the public may watch and comment (one must have an account to make live comments on Facebook and YouTube) on the livestream of the meeting on https://www.facebook.com/TippecanoeCountyIndiana or https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCJleeA9ZQo9EilGdZTdjurQ

I. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Documents:

BZA MINUTES 03.24.2021.PDF

II. NEW BUSINESS

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. BZA-2052 FOX ACQUISITIONS, LLC:

   **Continued**

   Petitioner is requesting the following variances to construct a 5,500 sq. ft. building for the Blue Fox Heating and Cooling business in a GB zone:

   1. To reduce a side setback to 5 feet from the minimum requirement of 30 feet from the adjoining residential zone and use; (UZO 4-8-5) and
   2. To eliminate a required Type C (30’ wide) bufferyard along the western property line; (UZO 4-9-3)

   on property located at 1511 W 350 N (former location of The Wild Bird Shoppe), West Lafayette, Wabash 01 (SW) 23-5. Continued to the June meeting at petitioner's request. (First continuance)

Documents:
2. BZA-2053 CASEY GILES:  
**Continued**  
Petitioner is requesting a special exception to use an existing single-family house as a Transient Guest House (as defined in the ordinance). The proposed hours of operation are 24 hours a day, seven days per week. The property is zoned Agricultural (A) and is located at 7342 Abby Marle, in Tippecanoe 16 (SW) 24.4. 
(UZO 3-2) Continued to the May meeting to publish J & C legal ad.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS  
Discussion about in-person ABZA meetings.

V. ADJOURNMENT

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities. For more information visit www.tippecanoe.in.gov/ada
AREA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS OF TIPPECANOE COUNTY

MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING

DATE.................................................................................................................................................. March 24, 2021
TIME................................................................................................................................................ 6:00 P.M.
PLACE............................................................................................................................................. COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
...................................................................................................................................................... 20 N. 3RD STREET
....................................................................................................................................................... LAFAYETTE, IN 47901

Due to the public health emergency, the meeting was held virtually. Members of the public may watch the livestream of the meeting at https://www.facebook.com/TippecanoeCountyIndiana

MEMBERS PRESENT
Steve Clevenger
Ed Butz
Gary Schroeder
Tom Andrew
Michelle Dennis

MEMBERS ABSENT
Jen Dekker
Frank Donaldson

STAFF PRESENT
David Hittle
Ryan O’Gara
Rabita Foley
Larry Aukerman
Chyna Lynch
Eric Burns, Atty.

The Area Board of Zoning Appeals of Tippecanoe County public hearing was held virtually on the 24th day of March 2021 at 6:00 P.M., pursuant to notice given and agenda posted as provided by law.

Attorney Eric Burns called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Gary Schroeder moved to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2021 BZA public hearing. Tom Andrew seconded and the minutes, as submitted, were approved by unanimous voice vote.

II. NEW BUSINESS

Ryan O’Gara said all cases are ready to be heard.

Steve Clevenger introduced David Hittle as the new Executive Director for APC.

David Hittle thanked Steve for the introduction.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

Steve Clevenger read the meeting procedures.

Gary Schroeder moved that there be incorporated into the public hearing portion of each application to be heard this evening and to become part of the evidence at such hearing, the Unified Zoning Ordinance, the Unified Subdivision Ordinance, the Comprehensive Plan, the By-laws of the Area Board of Zoning Appeals, the application and all documents filed therewith, the staff report and recommendation on the applications to be heard this evening and responses from the checkpoint agencies. Tom Andrew seconded, and the motion carried by voice vote.

BZA-2049 PURDUE CHRISTIAN CAMPUS HOUSE:
Petitioner is requesting a variance to allow 58.62 sq. ft. of signage instead of the maximum allowed 40 sq. ft. per sign-lot for the new Purdue Christian Campus House in an R3W zone. The property is located at 1000 W. State Street, West Lafayette, Wabash 19 (NW) 23-4. This case
was continued from the February meeting because The Lafayette Leader failed to publish the public notice.

Gary Schroeder moved to hear and vote on BZA-2049 PURDUE CHRISTIAN CAMPUS HOUSE. Tom Andrew seconded.

Ryan O’Gara presented the zoning map, site plan, and aerial photos. He said the site is in the middle of campus in the neighborhood known as The Island. The area is largely zoned R3W with some planned developments scattered around. In 2016, 8 variances were granted to build the new facility. There is a church, coffee shop, office and parking associated with this facility. The plan proposes three separate building signs that total 58.62 square feet for Greyhouse Coffee Shop and Campus House. It is staff’s opinion that this is a pedestrian oriented location in the heart of campus with heavy pedestrian traffic. There is no justification for the signage since we are not looking for signage that can be seen from far away in a vehicle. The blade sign projecting from the building and the lower scale signage will meet the eye line of pedestrians.

The findings of fact were presented with a staff recommendation of denial.

Steve Clevenger asked if the petitioner or his representative wanted to make a presentation and if there were any documents to share through GoToMeeting.

Tyler Ochs, 201 Main Street, Lafayette, 47901, representative for petitioner, said this is a unique, multiuse site. It will contain Campus House which had been at this location for 50 years and will add Greyhouse Coffee. They will operate independently of each other. If Greyhouse is open that does not necessarily mean the church is open. If the site had two buildings, they would be under the sign area allowance. The Greyhouse sign features its brand, which was developed in Lafayette and West Lafayette. For Campus House, we agree with staff to an extent that this is a heavy pedestrian area. We expect a lot of students to come through but we also expect an increase in vehicles as people drive to this location. The location of the new building creates a unique situation. When traveling form the west to the east to get to the building, the only access point is off Waldron Drive which is one-way. If someone misses the drive, they have to turn onto Russell Street to loop around. During the summer and fall, there is a lot of foliage that blocks visibility to the eastern sign for Greyhouse, which is why the blade sign is being requested.

Steve Clevenger said there will be a one-minute pause for citizen comment. After the minute passed, he asked Ryan O’Gara if any citizen comments had been received. There had not. He asked the Board to submit their ballots.

Eric Burns said he received the ballots and conducted a roll call vote to confirm each member’s vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes-Vote</th>
<th>No-Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Clevenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Butz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board voted by ballot 5 yes to 0 no to approve BZA-2049 PURDUE CHRISTIAN CAMPUS HOUSE.

BZA-2050 TIPPECANOE COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.:  
Petitioner is requesting a special exception to operate a shooting range (SIC 7997 – membership sports and recreation clubs), operating 7 days a week from 9 AM to dusk with reduced hours on Sundays. The 6.3 acres Agricultural-zoned property is located east of Conservation Club Road, Fairfield, Longlois Reserve (N1/2) 23-4. (UZO 3-2) Continued from the February meeting at petitioner’s request.
BZA-2051 TIPPECANOE COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.:  
Petitioner is requesting the following open use variances to build a new outdoor shooting range for members (SIC 7997- gun and shooting clubs) in an A zone:
1. To reduce the special setback to 50 feet from the minimum requirement of 300 feet from the north property line; (UZO 4-4-8)
2. To reduce the special setback to 145 feet from the minimum requirement of 300 feet from the south property line; (UZO 4-4-8) and
3. To reduce the special setback to 25 feet from the minimum requirement of 300 feet from the west property line; (UZO 4-4-8) on property located east of Conservation Club Road, Fairfield, Longlois Reserve (N1/2) 23-4. The subject property is the same as that involved in the special exception case BZA-2050 (Membership sports and recreation clubs, SIC 7997).

Gary Schroeder moved to hear BZA-2050 TIPPECANOE COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB INC. AND BZA-2051 TIPPECANOE COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB INC. together and vote on separately. Tom Andrew seconded.

Larry Aukerman said he had a letter to read from a neighbor of the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club after he finished his presentation.

Larry Aukerman presented the zoning map and site plan. Larry said the property to the south of the site is owned by Brenneco Contractors. Larry said the petitioner also owns property to the west and to the east of the site across Conservation Club Road. He said this is where the organization membership has a building and a picnic shelter. Larry said farther to the southwest is the soccer and basketball club and even farther to the southwest is the cemetery. Larry said this is off Conservation Club Road which is off Schuyler Avenue or Old State Road 25 going out toward the interstate. Larry said there are some residential properties and a veterinarian clinic along Schuyler Avenue. Larry said the site is currently used as a farm field, but the petitioner has started moving in some soil on site for the mounding system. Larry showed on the site plan that the petitioner is proposing a mound with an entrance off Conservation Club Road, a new parking lot, and a future building where they would have additional office space to possibly collect a charge for using the shooting range. Larry showed photos of the site from the southeast corner looking to the northwest, and also from Conservation Club Road on the left looking to the north, and on the right looking to the south.

Larry showed on the site plan that the petitioner is proposing a shooting range at the southeast corner of the site shooting toward the northwest and toward the west. He said the petitioner is planning to operate 7 days a week during daylight hours. Larry said staff had discussed how to enforce the of the hours of operation and decided the best way was to just allow shooting during the daylight hours.

Larry said staff has discussed the variances. The first variance is along the north property line and would reduce the 300-foot setback to 50-feet. The second variance is along the south property line and would reduce the 300-foot setback to 145-feet. The third variance is along the west property line and would reduce the 300-foot setback to 25-feet. Larry said the petitioner also owns an open field to the west and there are open fields to the north. Brenneco Contractors owns the site to the south.

Larry said staff recommendation on all three variances is denial because the setbacks are in place for public safety. He said there is not enough room on the site to meet the setback requirements and because of this staff feels that this is not an adequate site for the shooting range.

Larry asked if Steve Clevenger had a preference as to whether he read all the ballot items for the variances and the special exception together or if he should read the ballot items for the variances first and then read ballot items for the special exception second.
Eric Burns suggested it makes sense to read the three variances first and then read the special exception.

Steve Clevenger said that is fine with him because if the variances are denied then the board cannot approve the special exception since it is tied to the site plan.

Larry read the ballot items for the three variances. He said granting these variances will not be injurious to the health and safety or the general welfare of the community. He said the shooting lanes will aim to the north, shooting from the south. He said the reduced setback in this direction will not impact the neighbors to the north because the adjacent use is farmland. Additionally, this area is heavily wooded. The petitioner owns the adjacent property to the west and there is a large power line that bisects the property. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will be affected in a substantially adverse manner. The nearest homes to the site are around 500-feet to the south. The other homes in the area are approximately 700-feet across the Wildcat Creek. If the required 300-foot setbacks were in place, the additional distance would provide a noise buffer. Without the required setbacks the proposed use could adversely affect the closest residents. Terms of the zoning ordinance are being applied to situations that are common with other properties in the same zoning district. There is no peculiarity associated with this acreage, the topography of the land or the layout of lot that makes the setback variances necessary. The property is simply too small for the requested use. The zoning ordinance will not result in an unusual hardship. Defined in the zoning ordinance, a lot that is too small to meet the setbacks does not constitute a hardship. The hardship involved is self-imposed. He said using a larger site or the petitioner’s adjacent property would eliminate the need for these variances. The variance lot does not provide the minimum relief needed to alleviate the hardship. There is not adequate information about the outdoor shooting range provided by the petitioner to verify the minimum relief. Without knowing the exact details on the layout of the shooting range staff cannot say that the variances requested would meet the minimum relief. With that information in mind staff recommends denial of all three variances.

Steve Clevenger asked why there is not a variance request for the eastern property line.

Larry Aukerman said the 300-foot setback in only required for the side and rear property lines.

Steve Clevenger asked the petitioner if he had a presentation to make.

Tyler Ochs, attorney with Ball Eggleston, PC, 201 Main Street Lafayette, IN 47901, representative for the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club, said the petitioner is requesting three variances as well as a special exception. Tyler Ochs asked Eric Burns whether he should lay out their arguments for the three variances as well as the special exception.

Eric Burns said that was up to Tyler Ochs, but the board will be dealing with the variances first and then move to the special exception.

Tyler Ochs asked that if it was okay with the board, he would like to present his arguments for the variances and the special exception together because they overlap even though they will be voted on separately.

Steve Clevenger said that was fine.

Tyler Ochs said the site is tucked back near Wildcat Creek and the Conservation Club. Tyler said what is unique about the property is it is heavily covered to the north and east by flood plain. Tyler said he would address the variances first. He said the point of setbacks for a gun range is for public safety. He said that the petitioner certainly understands and appreciates that, however they feel that the proposed setbacks do not cause any potential injury to the general public. Tyler said the petitioner owns the land to the west and he could have included that property in the proposed site. He said while that would have alleviated the need for the buffer, they felt that by containing the gun range to one lot there will be no worry of the gun range being extended farther than that lot. He said the petitioner thinks of this as a natural buffer zone that keeps the gun range farther away from the cemetery and the Legacy Sports
complex to the west. Tyler said the area to the east is not really an issue and the area to the north is significantly flood plain that would not allow any structures or buildings to exist there. He said that area is all farmland and flood plain, so it is essentially unbuildable. The general public aspect for that area is not a concern. Tyler said the only concern is the property to the south which is not owned by the petitioner but is used as a GB zone. Tyler said this property is owned by Brenneco and Greg and Debbie Brenneman are the owners of that company. He said a letter of support from them will be read into the record stating that the setback has no implication on their land. Tyler said the gun range is designed for all shooting to be strictly toward the north and there will be no public safety issue with stray bullets going to the south. He said that is why the Brennemans are on board with the project.

Tyler said delving into the special exception that the site is going to consist of dirt mounds and berms that will enclose the property with a gate to enter into the site. He said the dirt will be 13 feet high on the shooting side which is a pretty significant height and that is standard with state regulation. Tyler said that there is nothing in the zoning ordinance that regards the specifics of the project. He said the intent of the berms is to provide safety for the public as well as to reduce noise. He said he knows staff has concerns about noise, but the petitioner is confident the design of the project will reduce any noise to the south. Tyler said with the guns discharging to the north and into the berms the noise will go up and to the north where there is only flood plain and agricultural land. He said this will cause a reduction of noise to the south and to the west where there are buildings. He also said because there is significant tree coverage and other buildings surrounding the property the noise will be reduced. Tyler said the attenuation charts show that the noise levels will be diffused by the design of the project and will be closer to 80 decibels than to 140 decibels and that level is lower than the noise level from State Road 25 or from the nearby tire plant. Tyler said based on the design of the project the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club has taken steps to significantly reduce noise from the gun range.

The last point Tyler made was that there is a significant need for an outdoor gun range close to Lafayette for both the public and for law enforcement. Tyler said there are five law enforcement agencies in Tippecanoe County: Lafayette Police Department, West Lafayette Police Department, Tippecanoe County Sheriff’s Department, Purdue Police Department and the Indiana State Police. He said right now the only place they have to practice shooting is at Purdue where there are restrictions on the length they can shoot, and that restricts the type of guns they can shoot. They are required to get certification on certain types of weapons such as rifles. He said currently there is no place in Tippecanoe County where law enforcement can do that, and they need to drive 30 or 35 minutes to get this type of certification. Tyler said DNR and other organizations are in favor of this project because it gives them another option of places to shoot and helps them to get certifications without having to drive too far. Tyler said the petitioner plans to hold Wednesdays open strictly for law enforcement agencies. The petitioner would like to support law enforcement as much as possible.

Tyler also said from a general public standpoint there will be gun safety classes taught and training so that people who own guns can do so safely. He said we are in a time when gun ownership is a hot button topic, but this will allow people who do own guns the opportunity to learn to use them safely.

Tyler said they have spoken with neighbors in the area and most of them are in favor of the project but there are some people who are not in favor of it. He said the petitioner has taken steps to restrict the use of certain types of guns at the range. This includes certain types of sniper rifles which produce sounds so significant that it would disturb neighbors. He also said even though the hours of operation would be from dawn to dusk he thought in the summer time the ending hours would probably be more along the lines of 8:00 p.m. rather than 10:00 p.m. or dusk. He said they want to be good neighbors.

He said the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club was incorporated in 1935 and they have been at this location for over 60 years. He said this project will further their mission of having sportsmen and land owners work together and gives them the opportunity to potentially make some money to help keep the club above water financially. He asked that all three variances and the special exception be granted.

Larry Aukerman read the letter of support from Greg and Debbie Brenneman, owners of Brenneco Plumbing, 2780 Conservation Club Road, Lafayette, IN 47905.
Steve Clevenger asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the petition.
Larry Aukerman said there was no one in the meeting room.
Steve Clevenger asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition.
Steve Clevenger said anyone on social media should feel free to comment at this time.
Steve Clevenger said he would take questions from the board members.
Tom Andrews asked if Brenneco owned the property to the south of the project.
Tyler Ochs said that was correct.
Tom Andrew asked if the Conservation Club owned the property to the north.
Tyler Ochs said the Conservation Club owned the property to the east and to the west of the project.
Tyler said everything to the north is flood plain and agricultural.
Steve Clevenger asked how loud the shots would sound at the cemetery.

Tyler Ochs said the petitioner had one of their members go out to the cemetery while a shot was fired from the Conservation Club. He claimed the shot could not be heard at the cemetery. Tyler said their charts indicate the noise from the gun range heard at the cemetery would be less than the noise heard from the trucks on State Road 25 near the I-65 exit. He also said there is a tire plant abutting the cemetery that has a lot of semi-truck traffic and the noise level from that plant will affect the cemetery more than the noise from the gun range. Tyler said his clients completely understand the importance of the cemetery and they will be happy to work with the cemetery if they need to reserve times when shots cannot be fired. Tyler said based on the noise research they have done they are confident the shots will not be a problem for the cemetery.

Steve Clevenger asked Larry Aukerman to point out where nearby houses are located. He asked if the closest houses were on the other side of the Brenneco buildings.

Larry Aukerman said yes.

Steve Clevenger said his other concern was with the dawn to dusk hours of operation. He said even though the petitioner has said that shooting would not be allowed up until dusk in the summer time the board has no control over that.

Tyler Ochs said the hours of operation would end at 8:00 pm or dusk whichever occurred first. He said in December the hours of operation would end at dusk which would be close to 5:00 p.m.

Gabe Quaglio, petitioner, 7550 Foxtail Lane, Lafayette, IN 47905, said they did agree 8:00 p.m. would be the end of the hours of operation. He said there will be people monitoring the gun range and if anyone violates that rule, they will lose their membership and be ejected from the gun range and will not be able to come back.

Steve Clevenger asked Ryan O’Gara, Rabita Foley and Eric Burns if this was something a commitment could be submitted for.

Eric Burns said it would not be a formal commitment as in the statute, but that it was made clear in the record that the latest any firing would occur would be 8:00 p.m. He said in other words the hours of operation would be from dawn to dusk or 8:00 p.m., then that would be the last moment that any firing could happen.
Tyler Ochs said that was correct and he also said in the updated petition they agreed the hours of operation would not start until 9:00 a.m. Tyler said the hours of operation would be from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. unless dusk occurs prior to 8:00 p.m. Then it would be whenever dusk occurs.

Eric Burns asked staff it these hours of operation were clear to them and they could make this part of the amendment to the petition. Eric said he wanted to make sure the hours of operation were clear to everyone.

Tyler Ochs said if he needed to make a motion to get that formally on the record he could do so.

Eric Burns said that Tyler Ochs should make the motion to amend the petition for those hours of operation.

Tyler Ochs motioned to amend the petition so that the hours of operation are 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and if dusk occurs prior to 8:00 p.m. then that becomes the end time.

Eric Burns asked if that was still for 7 days a week.

Tyler Ochs said that was his understanding unless Gabe Quaglio has anything to differentiate from that.

Gabe Quaglio agreed that it is 7 days a week.

Eric Burns said there needs to be no formal action by the board to accept the hours of operation because the petitioner has now committed to them. Eric said if the board votes in favor of the petition they are voting on exactly what the petitioner has agreed to which is 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. unless dusk comes earlier. Eric asked if there were any questions from the board about that.

Steve Clevenger said that sounded good to him. Steve also asked Ryan O’Gara to time one minute for comments from social media.

Michelle Dennis asked how many stations the gun range would operate simultaneously.

Tyler Ochs said initially there would be 6 stations operating at a time but eventually they want to work up to around 10 stations. Tyler said from their conversations with local law enforcement, that number is standard for other shooting ranges.

Steve Clevenger asked if there would be any shotgun activity such as shooting clay pigeons where people would be shooting up in the air. Steve said he was concerned with the road back behind the shooting range even though it is not well traveled.

Steve Burkhalter, petitioner, 2799 Conservation Club Road, Lafayette, IN 47905, said all shooting would be to the north and within the 10 to 15-foot range so the pellets would not impact anything significant.

Ryan O’Gara read public comments from social media.

Steve Clevenger asked if there were any further comments.

Gary Schroeder said he had a follow up question about shotguns and maybe shooting in the air. Gary asked that if the special exception were granted, if it would be fair to assume that all activities would be contained to the site and that no projectiles would leave the site. Gary asked that if a situation arose where projectiles were leaving the site, if there was any enforcement action that could be taken against the special exception to either eliminate the special exception or to bring the gun range back into compliance.
Tyler Ochs asked if Gary was referring to bullets being discharged and going over the mounds or if he was referring to trap and skeet shooting on the premises.

Gary said he was referring to bullets going over the top of the berms. Gary said that is a possibility. He asked about enforcement that all activity be contained and if it is not, whether some action can be taken to either bring them back into compliance or to remove the special exception.

Tyler Ochs asked Eric Burns if he could put anything on the record regarding that and that the number one priority for the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club, its members and the board is safety. Tyler said if there is ever a situation with projectiles leaving, which they do not think will be the case based on the size of the mounds and the type of guns that will be used, he does not think there will be any issue with bringing that back into compliance. He said they will either potentially add more dirt to increase the size of the mounds or do whatever is necessary to ensure that safety is being complied with. Tyler said at the end of the day safety is their number one issue and they want to be a good neighbor. He said they want to provide a need for the community but at the same time it is all about safety.

Eric Burns said it would not be a statutory commitment but by making a commitment on the record, the vote will be dependent on the statement. Eric said when they get to the special exception the petitioners should specify that no projectiles will leave the premises. Eric said clearly if projectiles were going onto someone else’s property then law enforcement will be out there making sure that does not happen. He said on the other hand, if projectiles leave the property and go onto their own property then that is not as clear. He said law enforcement might well take the position that there is nobody out there and it is your property, so we don’t care. Eric said he believes that if the petitioners are willing to make the commitment that no projectiles will leave the property that can become a specific finding and an amendment to a special exception. Eric said it would be more appropriate in the special exception than in any of the variances.

Tyler Ochs asked for Gabe Quaglio’s approval on that and he also asked Eric Burns if he preferred Tyler wait until after the variance vote to make that motion.

Eric Burns said no, he thinks that the more information the board has at the moment is probably helpful for them to make their decision.

Gabe Quaglio said he was okay with Tyler making that commitment on the record. He said they are 100% positive that no projectiles will ever leave the premises.

Tyler Ochs motioned that in the event that projectiles were to ever leave the premises the Tippecanoe County Conservation Club will take all necessary action to prevent any projectiles from leaving the shooting range.

Eric Burns said it was not important to make the statement about what they are going to do as long as the special exception is amended to say that no projectiles shall leave the premises. Eric said if the petitioners are willing to commit to that then he is very comfortable.

Tyler Ochs motioned to amend the special exception so that no projectiles leave the shooting range.

Eric Burns asked Tyler Ochs to follow up with an email to staff about both the amendments for the record.

Steve Clevenger said there is concern about noise at the cemetery. He asked Tyler Ochs if there was anything that can be done to address that concern such as increasing the height of the mound or planting more trees. Steve said he is not asking for a commitment, but he is just asking if there are any ideas the petitioners have about that if there does end up being a noise issue.

Tyler Ochs said the petitioners want to maintain a good relationship with everyone in the area. Tyler said they are committed to making this work for everyone. Tyler said they have talked about multiple options from restricting the types of guns that are used to reserving time windows where no shots are occurring,
to potentially raising the height of the berms to reduce the noise. Tyler said they are confident based on
their research, based on the location and based on the direction of the firing that sound is not going to be
an issue with the cemetery. Tyler said if they are wrong and there is a noise issue with the cemetery,
they are certainly open to raising the height of the mounds or any other ideas to accommodate the
cemetery. He said they appreciate the cemetery and want to make sure that loved ones have an
opportunity to pay their respects.

Steve Clevenger asked if there were any more comments from the board or if there were any more social
media comments.

Ryan O’Gara said there were no more social media comments.

Steve Clevenger asked if firing ranges were allowed in the city limits of Lafayette if the city were to annex
the area at some point.

Eric Burns said that Rabita Foley indicated that is allowable. Eric said that citizens cannot shoot a firearm
in their own backyard in the city limits. Eric said if it is an organized shooting range that is a whole
different matter.

Steve Clevenger said there will be a one-minute pause for citizen comment. After the minute passed, he
asked Ryan O’Gara if any other citizen comments had been received. There had not. He asked the Board
to submit their ballots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance #1 Yes-Vote</th>
<th>No-Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Clevenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Butz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance #2 Yes-Vote</th>
<th>No-Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Clevenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Butz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance #3 Yes-Vote</th>
<th>No-Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Clevenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Butz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steve Clevenger asked Tyler Ochs if he wanted to rebut anything.

Tyler Ochs said no he did not.

The Board voted by ballot 5 Yes to 0 No to approve all 3 variances for BZA-2051 TIPPECANOE COUNTY
CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.
Steve Clevenger called for the vote for the special exception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Exception</th>
<th>Yes-Votes</th>
<th>No-Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Clevenger</td>
<td>5-Yes</td>
<td>0-No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Butz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board voted by ballot 5 Yes to 0 No to approve the special exception for **BZA-2050 TIPPECANOE COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.**

Steve Clevenger stated that unless any member has an objection the chair will order the findings of each member casting a vote for the majority decision of the Board to be the collective findings of the Board in support of the decision of the Board. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

None.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Gary Schroeder moved for adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chyna Lynch/ Diana Trader
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

David Hittle
Executive Director
BZA-2052
FOX ACQUISITIONS, LLC
(variances)

STAFF REPORT
April 22, 2021
REQUEST MADE, PROPOSED USE, LOCATION:
Petitioner, represented by attorney Kevin Riley, is requesting the following two variances:

1. To allow a side setback of 5 feet instead of the required 30 feet;
2. To allow no bufferyard along the western property line instead of the required 30-foot wide bufferyard.

The property houses an HV/AC business. If approved, an existing storage building will be removed and replaced with a new 50’ x 110’ building only 5 feet from the western property line. The required 30-foot wide bufferyard would also be in this location where this commercial property abuts a residential property. The site was most recently home to The Wild Bird Shoppe. The new owners, Blue Fox Heating and Cooling, plan to establish their second operation onsite, commonly known as 1511 W 350 N, West Lafayette, Wabash 1(SW) 23-5.

AREA ZONING PATTERNS:
The site in question is zoned GB and has been since it was rezoned in 1987 (Z-1312). GB zoning borders on the south and a large area of OR zoning is adjacent to the east. Land directly west is zoned R3 and has been since 1992 (Z-1490). No variances or special exceptions have been granted recently for the immediate area.

AREA LAND USE PATTERNS:
This parcel supports two buildings and a parking lot that is partially paved. Land to the west is occupied by an apartment complex and land to the east is part of the Purdue Research Park. South of the site is wooded with a small pond. A portion of the West Lafayette public trail is adjacent to the east in the research park.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION:
The site has a driveway to CR 350 N which is classified as a rural secondary arterial. Based on the submitted site plan, no changes to the access are planned.

Parking requirements for an HV/AC contractor is based on 1 paved parking space per employee on the largest shift, plus one paved space per 200 square feet of office, sales or similar floor area. With 3,424 square feet of office (18 spaces) and a maximum of 10 employees (10 spaces) on the largest shift, 28 parking spaces are required. The submitted site plan conforms with this standard.
ENVIRONMENTAL AND UTILITY CONSIDERATIONS:
Sewer and water serve the site.

STAFF COMMENTS:
Blue Fox Heating and Cooling now occupies this site that was most recently The Wild Bird Shoppe. The retrofit of this property is prompting these two variance requests for a reduced building setback and elimination of the required bufferyard between GB and R3 zoning.

The site currently supports two buildings with a parking area along the road. The building nearest to CR 350 will be repurposed into an office and sales area, but the L-shaped building at the back of the lot will be razed and replaced with a larger 50’ x 110’ building to be used for the fabrication and storage of materials. This new structure is proposed to sit 15 feet from the rear lot line (as required) but only 5 feet from the western property line (the current building has a side setback of 2.3 feet and a rear setback of 5.7 feet). Because this lot is adjacent to R3 zoning on the west side, a 30-foot building setback and 30-foot wide planting bufferyard are required. Petitioner is asking to reduce the setback to 5 feet and to eliminate the bufferyard requirement entirely.

According to the petitioner’s engineer, placing the new building on the east side of the site (where there is a 0’ side setback requirement) may present problems due to the site topography and drainage concerns. Because of these issues, the petitioner wants to use the site of the existing building for the new structure.

The zoning ordinance requires a 30-foot wide bufferyard where GB abuts R3, but it recognizes that this may not be possible in situations where the continued use of existing buildings and parking areas would occupy the space otherwise reserved for the bufferyard. If this existing building could be renovated or somehow reused, this bufferyard variance would not be necessary because the continued use of the buildings, driveways and parking areas do not require buffering. However, this older building does not meet the user’s needs and a new structure is needed.

Regarding the ballot items:

1. The Area Plan Commission at its April 21, 2021 meeting determined that the variances requested ARE NOT use variances.

And it is staff’s opinion that:

2. Granting these variances WILL NOT be injurious to the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community. A 5-foot building setback and the elimination of the required bufferyard will have no negative impact on public health and safety (#1 and #2).

3. Regarding the setback variance (#1), use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the setback variance request WILL NOT be affected in a
substantially adverse manner because the current structure, with a 2 ½ foot setback has existed here since the early 1970’s. However, regarding the bufferyard variance (#2), the use and value of the area adjacent to the west of the bufferyard variance WILL be affected in an adverse manner. While no bufferyard ever existed here, the more intense use of the land as a contractor’s business may have a greater impact than the previous user, making a bufferyard more necessary for the adjacent residences.

4. Regarding both requests (#1 and #2), the terms of the zoning ordinance are being applied to a situation that IS common to other properties in the same zoning district. There is nothing unusual with this site in regard to its shape, size or topography compared to other similarly sized commercial lots.

5. Regarding the setback variance (#1), strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance WILL NOT result in an unusual or unnecessary hardship as defined in the zoning ordinance. Adequate room exists to build a new building outside of the 30’ setback. While a building with this footprint may not fit easily on the site, it could be redesigned to fit without the need for a setback variance. Additionally, it is possible to build on the eastern side of the property and mitigate any drainage concerns with the proper engineering.

Regarding the bufferyard variance (#2), strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance WILL NOT result in an unusual or unnecessary hardship. The only portion of the western property line that would require a bufferyard is where the building demolition is proposed because continued use of the existing driveway and parking areas do not require buffering (UZO 4-9-2(a)(2)).

**Note:** Questions 5a. and 5b. need only be answered if a hardship is found in Question 5 above.

5a. The hardship involved IS self-imposed or solely based on a perceived reduction of or restriction on economic gain. Regarding the setback variance (#1), it is petitioners desire to rebuild the storage building within the required building setback. While building in another location may be more expensive, it could be done. Regarding the bufferyard variance (#2), the situation is also self-imposed and based on a perceived restriction on economic gain because the proposed building can be built in a conforming location leaving space for the required bufferyard.

5b. The variances sought DOES NOT provide only the minimum relief needed to alleviate the hardship because staff can find no hardship in either variance request (#1 and #2).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Variance #1: Denial
Variance #2: Denial