

**PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
MINUTES**

The Putnam County Board of Zoning Appeals met for its regular monthly meeting on December 8, 2025, at 6:30 p.m. in the Commissioner’s Meeting Room at the Putnam County Courthouse 1 West Washington St, Greencastle, Indiana. Lora Scott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Kevin Scobee, Kate Skirvin, Terry Dorsett, and Lora Scott. Raymond McCloud was not present. Also, present was Jim Ensley, County Attorney and Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. See attached sign in sheet for audience members present.

Lora Scott suggested that the review and approval of the 2026 meeting dates be moved to the last item on the agenda.

Kevin Scobee made a motion to move the review and approval of the 2026 meeting dates to the last item on the agenda.

Kate Skirvin seconded the motion.

The review and approval of the 2026 meeting dates was moved to be the last item on the agenda with all in favor.

Mrs. Scott stated that she would like to go over a couple of things since there are two (2) newish board members. Mrs. Scott requested that if anyone was going to abstain from voting on a case that is before the board, to let her know ahead of time so the board can plan accordingly. Mrs. Scott reminded the board that there is to be no contact with a petitioner or people who want to talk to you about cases. Mrs. Scott explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals has strict guidelines through the state. Mrs. Scott stated that in the UDO the purpose of a special exception is a use that requires more review because of its potential adverse impact upon the immediate neighborhood and the community. Mrs. Scott went over the review criteria for a special exception, stating: “the BZA may approve a special exception upon a determination in writing that the proposed use is 1. Consistent with the vision, goals, and objectives of the comprehensive plan; 2. Complies with the requirements of this ordinance; 3. Is compatible with the character of the general vicinity; 4. Can be adequately served by essential public facilities and services such as streets, police and fire protection, drainage systems, refuse disposal, water and sewers, and schools; 5. Does not create circumstances detrimental to people, property, or the general welfare by producing excessive traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odor, or other conditions incompatible with the uses permitted in the zoning district; 7. Allows orderly development of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.”

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**2025-SE-064: CAMRYN GIBSON** – Special Exception for a dog kennel and setback variance; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning district; Monroe Township; 2326 N CR 50 E (Parcel #67-05-34-300-009.000-013)

Mrs. Scott stated that this case was brought to the board in October and continued until November; however, Mrs. Gibson was out of town in November, so we are hearing the case

again tonight. Mrs. Scott explained that at the October meeting, the public were given the opportunity to speak either for or against. Mrs. Scott stated that Kate Skirvin was not present at that meeting. Mrs. Scott explained that she would allow Kate to ask the first questions.

Eric Gibson, agent for the petitioner, approached the board. Mr. Gibson stated that they would like to amend what they are asking for. Mr. Gibson explained that they were only asking for the development standards variance. Mr. Gibson stated that instead of the required fifty (50) foot setback, they would like to place the mini barn twenty-five (25) feet from the property line.

Mrs. Scott asked if they were asking for variance from the setback to be zero or a foot or two from the property line.

Mr. Gibson stated that they were asking for a reduction from fifty (50) feet to twenty-five (25) feet.

Mrs. Scott asked where the barn was currently located.

Mr. Gibson stated that it was on the property line adjacent to the existing building.

Mrs. Scott asked the plan director for input.

Lisa Zeiner explained that the original request was a reduction from fifty (50) feet to zero feet. Mrs. Zeiner stated that now they were asking that the setback be reduced from fifty (50) feet to twenty-five (25) feet for the new structure not the existing structure that may be removed.

Mr. Gibson explained that at the October meeting they saw a trend that the very small setback requests were not favorable, so we decided to move the mini barn further from the property line to be more in line with what seemed to be pleasing to the board.

Mrs. Scott stated that the special exception would also need to be addressed.

Mr. Gibson stated that they were withdrawing the special exception request at this time. Mr. Gibson explained that they had applied for both a special exception and a development standards variance at the same time. Mr. Gibson stated that only the development standards variance is being requested.

Mrs. Scott asked if they were still boarding dogs on the property.

Mr. Gibson stated that they were abiding by the ordinance and they do not have more than four dogs on the property. Mr. Gibson reiterated that the special exception had been withdrawn.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that in the UDO it states that a kennel is an establishment housing four (4) or more dogs, cats, or other small animals, and where boarding, grooming, breeding, training, or selling of animals is conducted either for commercial or non-commercial purposes.

Mr. Gibson showed the location of the existing barn and the proposed location for the mini barn. Mr. Gibson stated that the barn was 33 feet by 33 feet by 24 feet. Mr. Gibson also showed the location of the proposed dwelling that is being planned. Mr. Gibson stated that the portable structure is the structure that the variance is for, not the existing barn.

Terry Dorsett asked if there were plans for another structure next to the kennel.

Mr. Gibson stated that the only other structure would be a residential dwelling. Mr. Gibson explained that at some point in the future a barn for goats may be built.

Mrs. Skirvin asked about the privacy fence.

Mr. Gibson stated that the privacy fence would still be installed.

Mrs. Scott stated that she understands the wish to withdraw the special exception. Mrs. Scott explained that if the property owner continues to board or house any dogs more than four (4) that would not be allowed. Mrs. Scott asked about existing clientele.

Mr. Gibson explained that the boarding business was not full-time. Mr. Gibson stated that there are several weeks when there are no dogs on the property.

Mrs. Scott stated that in order to have more than four (4) animals on site that are being boarded, a special exception would be required.

Mr. Gibson stated that they were aware of that requirement. Mr. Gibson explained that there would not be more than four (4) animals on the property. Mr. Gibson stated that the business has very low impact and there are no dogs 24/7/365. Mr. Gibson reiterated that the special exception request had been withdrawn.

Mrs. Scott stated that at the October meeting there was discussion of the possibility of boarding twelve (12) dogs.

Mr. Gibson stated that at the October meeting they were considering redoing the existing barn to allow for boarding. Mr. Gibson explained that they were no longer considering that option. Mr. Gibson stated that all they were asking for was the development standards variance and not a special exception for a kennel. Mr. Gibson explained that the kennel might be revisited next year, but as of right now they are asking to withdraw the special exception request.

Mr. Scobee stated that he would be abstaining from the vote.

Mrs. Skirvin asked for clarification on the kennel and that there would not be more than four dogs at one time.

Mr. Gibson stated that there will not be more than four (4) dogs at any time.

Mrs. Skirvin asked if the business was actually going to people's houses to watch the dogs.

Camryn Gibson stated that she no longer does that now that she has small children.

Mr. Dorsett stated that he did not have any concerns with the development standards request.

Mrs. Scott asked why the structure could not meet the fifty (50) foot setback.

Mr. Gibson stated that there was an existing fence in the area and they did not want to go beyond it.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that per the UDO an accessory structure cannot be in front of a residential structure. Mrs. Zeiner explained that to meet that requirement, they are asking for the reduction in setback to twenty-five (25) feet.

Mr. Dorsett asked if the dogs were ever taken from the kennels to the barn.

Mr. Gibson stated that dogs are never loose, they are always within their runs.

Mrs. Scott stated that typically after a hearing is closed to the public it is not opened back up. Mrs. Scott explained that given this case has significantly changed she reopened the public hearing.

Sandra Grimes approached the board. Mrs. Grimes stated that she has a concern with the dogs barking. Mrs. Grimes explained that she had a recording from the day before of the dogs barking. Mrs. Grimes stated that the noise was a lot.

Mr. Dorsett asked if Mrs. Grimes had dogs.

Mrs. Grimes stated that she has two (2) dogs. Mrs. Grimes explained that her dogs were kept inside most of the time. Mrs. Grimes stated that according to Facebook, Mrs. Gibson has been booked full several times. Mrs. Grimes explained that there were more than four (4) dogs on the property.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the definition of a kennel, per the UDO, is an establishment housing four (4) or more dogs, cats, or other small animals and where boarding, grooming, breeding, training or selling of animals is conducted either for commercial or non-commercial purposes. Mrs. Zeiner explained that if there were one, two, or three dogs on the property at any time, it would not be considered a kennel per the definition.

Mrs. Scott asked if the board could put any requirements on a developmental standards variance.

Jim Ensley stated that it has not been done in the past. Mr. Ensley explained that development standards deal with heights, widths, setbacks, etc. Mr. Ensley stated that development standards are conditions would not be necessary.

Mrs. Scott asked what happens when someone violates the requirements of a special exception or a finding of fact that the BZA has made.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that failure to comply with development standards is a one hundred dollar fine for the first offense and five hundred dollars for each offense after that. Mrs. Zeiner explained that failure to comply with written commitments the fine is five hundred dollars for the first offense and one thousand dollars for any offense after. Mrs. Zeiner explained that there has not been stipulations placed on a setback variance in the past.

Mr. Scobee asked about the existing structure.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that the variance request was not for the existing barn that was built prior to 1992. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the request was for the accessory structure that is portable and wants to place the structure twenty-five (25) feet from the property line.

Mrs. Scott stated that the animal control ordinance that the county has would still be in effect. Mrs. Scott explained that if any neighbor had a complaint about noise or there being more than three (3) dogs they would have to contact animal control.

Mr. Dorsett made a motion to approve the reduction in the side setback from fifty (50 feet to twenty-five (25) feet for **2025-SE-064: CAMRYN GIBSON.**

Mrs. Skirvin seconded the motion.

The development standards variance for **2025-SE-064: CAMRYN GIBSON** to allow the side setback to be twenty-five (25) feet was approved with all in favor. The Special Exception was withdrawn by the petitioner.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**2025-DSV-073: REX ATKINS** – Development standards variance; Setback reduction in a Residential (R1) zoning district; Greencastle Township; 3033 S CR 200 W Greencastle IN 46135 (Parcel #67-09-32-201-011.000-007)

Amanda Canada, representing the petitioner, approached the board. Ms. Canada stated that the setback requirement is thirty (30) feet. Ms. Canada explained that there is an existing fiber optic utility building on the property and the only space available puts the building at a setback of twenty-seven and a half (27.5) feet. Ms. Canada stated that they could not push the buildings closer together to make up the additional two and half (2.5) feet to meet the setback requirements. Ms. Canada explained that the new building is twice the size of the existing building and will also be used as a fiber optic utility building.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that when the existing building was constructed it was under the old ordinance and within the two (2) mile fringe of the City of Greencastle. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the city's setbacks were different from the County's setbacks. Mrs. Zeiner stated that now that the two (2) mile fringe has been dissolved, the property reverts to county standards.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak in favor or in opposition of this project. No one came forward. Mrs. Scott closed the public hearing for this project.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve the setback variance from thirty (30) feet to twenty-seven (27) feet for **2025-DSV-073: REX ATKINS** as presented.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

The development standards variance for **2025-DSV-073: REX ATKINS** to allow the setback to be twenty-seven (27) feet was approved with all in favor.

**2025-SE-083: GOOD NEWS MISSION** – Special Exception to allow a vocational school in an Agriculture (A2) zoning district; Cloverdale Township; 11707 S CR 300 W Cloverdale (Parcel #67-16-07-900-001.000-002)

Dan Evans, representing Good News Mission approached the board. Mr. Evans stated that the mission would like to build a school building and gymnasium on the 145 acres.

Mrs. Scott asked how big the building would be.

Mr. Evans stated that the building was proposed to be 15,360 square feet. Mr. Evans present the plans for the property and building. Mr. Evans explained that there would be seven (7)

classrooms, a couple of offices, restroom, a little bit of storage space, and a full basketball court. Mr. Evans explained that the existing lodge is where the school operation is currently taking place. Mr. Evans stated that they currently operate with nine (9) staff members and eleven (11) students. Mr. Evans explained that they hope to grow but not have more than fifty (50) students. Mr. Evans stated that the original use of the property was an Indiana Baptist Assembly campground that could house approximately 120 kids. Mr. Evans explained that the septic system and electricity was designed for much more than what has been in operation since 2008 and the intent is not to get to those numbers. Mr. Evans stated that they do operate a year-round school for troubled teenage boys 13 to 18. Mr. Evans explained that the kids they take have primarily been kicked out of school. Mr. Evans stated that they take guardianship of the students from their parents, so the boys are on the property 24/7. Mr. Evans stated that because of that it is their responsibility to educate them. Mr. Evans stated that the school would be 9<sup>th</sup> grade through 12<sup>th</sup> grade only and the students would end up with a Core 40 diploma. Mr. Evans explained that they were working on getting the American Association of Christina Shools (AACCS) Accreditation and they need a formal building for that purpose. Mr. Evans explained that the property is zoned agricultural (A2) which allows for a K-12 school, but private type schools require a special exception.

Mrs. Scott asked if the demand for the school has exceeded what you can accept.

Mr. Evans stated that they currently have a 'wait' list of twelve (12) students. Mr. Evans explained that most of the staff also live onsite.

Mrs. Scott asked about the curriculum.

Mr. Evans stated that the curriculum is the standard core classes. Mr. Evans explained that they use Becca and Jones Curriculum mixed with other curriculum. Mr. Evans stated that vocational training is also a part of the school. Mr. Evans stated that one of the classes is heavy equipment operation, where we teach the students how to use backhoes, skid steer, and tri-axle dump trucks. Mr. Evans explained that there are also automotive, carpentry, plumbing, HVAC, and other low level skills that you need to know to succeed in life.

Mrs. Skirvin stated that it sounded like a fantastic program. Mrs. Skirvin explained that Core 40 would be going away after 2025 and the diploma requirements are completely different.

Mr. Evans stated that they were hoping to partner with some companies so the students can get that on-the-job experience.

Mr. Dorsett asked if the students were allowed to leave the campus.

Mr. Evans stated that they were not. Mr. Evans explained that they don't get to see their parents except for designated times but the parents come to the property. Mr. Evans stated that Thanksgiving and Christmas are the only times they get to go home and that is only for a 48-hour period. Mr. Evans explained that each student is searched upon returning. Mr. Evans stated that the students are not allowed to have cell phones.

Mrs. Scott asked about funding.

Mr. Evans stated that it is free. Mr. Evans explained that everything Good News Ministry does is free, including the 81-bed homeless shelter, a 10-unit homeless family shelter, a free health clinic, and a youth center all on the near east side of Indianapolis. Mr. Evans stated that they have been in operation for 75 years through donations. Mr. Evans explained that they do not get government grants or programmatic grants.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve the special exception to allow a vocational school in an Agriculture (A2) district for **2025-SE-083: GOOD NEWS MISSION** as presented.

Mrs. Skirvin seconded the motion.

The special exception for **2025-SE-083: GOOD NEWS MISSION** to allow a vocational school in an Agricultural (A2) zoning district was approved with all in favor.

Mrs. Scott stated that the next item on the agenda was the 2026 meeting dates. Mrs. Scott explained that there was discussion at the Plan Commission meeting about moving the meeting day.

Mr. Scobee stated that the Plan Commission moved their meeting day to the second Thursday of every month and the meetings would start at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Scobee proposed having the BZA meetings on the second Thursday of every month and having the meetings begin at 7:30 p.m.

Mrs. Scott stated that the biggest concern is having the meeting back-to-back on the same night. Mrs. Scott explained that she was not comfortable with having people here for the BZA meeting but having to wait until the Plan Commission meeting ends. Mrs. Scott stated that moving the time to 7:30 p.m. would hopefully help with that.

Mr. Dorset stated that he was moving the time.

Mrs. Scott made a motion to move the meeting time to 7:30 p.m. and the meeting day to the second Thursday of every month.

Mrs. Skirvin seconded the motion.

The meeting day and time changed to starting at 7:30 p.m. on the second Thursday of the month.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there would not be a meeting in January because no one had filed anything.

Mrs. Scott asked if there were any other items to discuss.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there was a question from the October meeting about the properties in New Maysville, specifically the old store property.

Mr. Ensley stated that now that the redemption period is over, he would need to talk with the adjoining property owner about purchasing the property since the building crosses the property line.

Mrs. Scott asked about having alternate members of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mrs. Scott explained that Mr. McCloud would be gone January, February, and maybe March so there would only be four (4) members and if any recuses from the vote that would require the other three vote

the same to approval or deny a project. Mrs. Scott stated that it might be helpful to have an alternate.

Mr. Ensley stated he was not sure about have an alternate member per the state code, but it would be up to Roachdale and Russellville as they were the ones who appointed Mr. McCloud.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was any other discussion.

There being no additional business before the BZA, Mrs. Skirvin made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of May 2026.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lora Scott, President

PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

DECEMBER 8, 2025 at 6:30 p.m.

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
Dan Evans	11707 S. CR 300 W. Reelsville, 46171
Janita Grimes	2422 N Co Rd. 50E Greencastle
Camryn Gibson	2308 N CR 50 E Greencastle, IN 46135
Eric Gibson	2326 N CR 50 E Greencastle

**PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
AGENDA**

**MONDAY DECEMBER 8, 2025**

**6:30 P.M.**

Commissioner's Meeting Room - 1 W Washington St - Greencastle, IN 46135  
(765) 301-9108

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Raymond McCloud  
(Roachdale 2025-2029)  
 Kevin Scobee  
(PC 2022-2026)  
 Kate Skirvin  
(Comm/PC. 2024-2028)

Terry Dorsett  
(Cloverdale 2025-2029)  
 Lora Scott  
(Comm. 2023-2027)

Jim Ensley, Attorney  
 Lisa Zeiner, Director

**2. REVIEW OF MINUTES** – November Minutes – **NOT READY**

**3. 2026 Meeting Date Review & Approval**

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS** -Public hearing items have been advertised according to law. For items involving a piece of land, courtesy notices have been sent to some property owners. Testimony for and against each proposal will be taken and a decision by the Board of Zoning Appeals made. The Board may continue an item to another date for hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

❖ **OLD BUSINESS**

**2025-SE-064: Camryn Gibson** – Special Exception Dog Kennel and Setback Variance; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning District; Monroe Township; 2326 N CR 50 E,  
(Parcel #67-05-34-300-009.000-013)

❖ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**2025-DSV-073: Rex Atkins** – Development Standards Variance; Setback Reduction in an Residential (R1) zoning District; Greencastle Township; 3033 S CR 200 W, Greencastle, IN 46135  
(Parcel #67-09-32-201-011.000-007)

**2025-SE-083: Good News Mission** – Special Exception; - To allow a vocational school in an Agriculture (A2) zoning District; Cloverdale Township; 11707 S CR 300 W, Cloverdale  
(Parcel #67-16-07-900-001.000-002)

**5. BUSINESS SESSION** - In its business session, the Board of Zoning Appeals meets in open session to discuss each item and decide on an outcome. By law, a business session agenda is posted at least 48 hours prior to this meeting. This is not a public hearing. No testimony is taken unless the Board requests it. The Board may continue an item to another date for the hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

**7. WISHES TO BE HEARD**

Information pertaining to these cases is available to the public weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Department of Planning & Building, Putnam County Courthouse 1 W Washington St, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Room 46 Greencastle, Indiana 46135. There are times during routine application processing when files may not be immediately available. Written objections to any item on the agenda may be filed with the secretary of the Plan Commission before the hearing. At the hearing, oral comments concerning each Public Hearing proposed will be heard. The jurisdiction of the Plan Commission is all of Putnam County except the City of Greencastle, and the Towns of Bainbridge, Cloverdale, and Roachdale. For more information call (765) 301-9108.

FOR SPECIAL ACCOMODATIONS A NEEDED FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS PLANNING TO ATTEND THIS HEARING. PLEASE CALL, THE PLANNING SECRETARY AT (765) 301-9108 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

2025 BUILDING PERMIT REPORT AS OF 11/20/2025

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
COUNTY	1-2 Family Dwellings	31
	Above Ground Pools	3
	Accessory Dwellings	5
	Addition/Alterations	29
	Attached Accessory	7
	Commercial	2
	Demolition	19
	Detached Accessory	122
	Educational/Church	2
	Electrical	141
	Fence	17
	ILP - GENERAL	0
	In-Ground Pool	3
	Lean To	5
	Living Quarters	4
	Manufactured	16
	Remodel	0
	Roof (Storm Damage)	4
	Storage/Industrial	0
	Sign	2
	Solar	3
	Temporary Use	1
	Underground Storage	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>416</b>

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
TOWN OF BAINBRIDGE	1-2 Fam. Dwelling	2
	Accessory Dwelling	
	Addition/Alt.	
	Attached Accessory	
	Demolition	
	Detached Accessory	2
	Commercial	
	Electric	4
	Fence	2
	Remodel	
TOWN OF ROACHDALE	Storage/Indust.	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>
	1-2 Fam. Dwelling	1
	Accessory Dwelling	
	Addition/Alt.	
	Attached Accessory	
	Demolition	
	Detached Accessory	2
	Commercial	
	Electric	2
TOWN OF CLOVERDALE	Fence	6
	Lean To	1
	Remodel	
	Manufactured	2
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
TOWN OF RUSSELLVILLE	Electric	3
	Additions	1
	Detached Accessory	1
	Demolition	
	Commercial	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	
TOWN OF CLOVERDALE	1-2 Fam. Dwelling	
	Accessory Dwelling	
	Addition/Alt.	
	Attached Accessory	4
	Demolition	1
	Detached Accessory	2
	Commercial	1
	Electric	6
	Fence	5
	Lean To	
	Remodel	2
	Manufactured	22
	Temporary Use	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44</b>	
HERITAGE LAKE	1-2 Fam. Dwelling	49
	Accessory Dwelling	
	Addition/Alt.	8
	Attached Accessory	7
	Demolition	1
	Detached Accessory	6
	Commercial	
	Electric	8
	Fence	
	Lean To	
	Remodel	1
ILP	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>82</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL PERMITS</b>		<b>572</b>

2025 PLAN COMMISSION & BZA CASE REPORTS AS OF 11/20/2025

BZA - CASES

LOCATION	TYPE	NUMBER
County	Development Standards Variance	9
	Special Exception	9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>
Town of Bainbridge	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>
Town of Roachdale	Development Standards Variance	1
	Special Exception	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>
Town of Cloverdale	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>
Town of Russellville	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL BZA CASES</b>		<b>19</b>

PLAN COMMISSION - CASES

LOCATION	TYPE	NUMBER
COUNTY	Major Plat	0
	Development Plan Review	
	Replat	
	Rezoning	15
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>
TECH REVIEW ONLY	Stormwater Review	3
	Development Plan Review	1
	Rural Subdivision	11
	Minor Plat	22
	Replat	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44</b>	
Town of Bainbridge	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	
Town of Roachdale (County hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning (1 heard by Council)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	
Town of Cloverdale (County hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	
Town of Russellville (County Hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Rezoning	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL PC CASES</b>		<b>59</b>

# Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor  
(Title of Officer)

BUILDING DEPT  
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana  
(County)

Collections for Period: 1/1/2025 thru 11/20/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
3 ABOVE-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$180.00	\$0.00	\$180.00
2 ADDITION (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
13 ADDITION (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$3,900.00	\$0.00	\$3,900.00
2 ALTERATION OF DRAWINGS - FIRST VIOLATIO	1180-18	\$200.00	\$0.00	\$200.00
1 ALTERATIONS (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$60.00
39 ALTERATIONS (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$2,340.00	\$0.00	\$2,340.00
3 ATTACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$600.00
6 ATTACHED DECK	1180-18	\$360.00	\$0.00	\$360.00
90 BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$36,000.00	\$0.00	\$36,000.00
283646 BUILDING PERMIT/ PER SQ FT	1180-18	\$56,729.20	\$0.00	\$56,729.20
3 BUSINESS, COMMERCIAL, PUBLIC	1180-18	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00
176 CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY	1180-18	\$3,520.00	\$0.00	\$3,520.00
7 CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT PERMIT - FIRST VIC	1180-18	\$2,100.00	\$0.00	\$2,100.00
3 CONTINUING WORK W/O INSPECTION - SEQUI	1180-18	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$300.00
3 CONTINUING WORK WITHOUT INSPECTION - 1	1180-18	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$250.00
66 CONTRACTOR LISTING	4906-18	\$6,600.00	\$0.00	\$6,600.00
39 COPS B/W PER PAGE	1180-10	\$19.50	\$0.00	\$19.50
57 COPS COLOR PER PAGE	1180-10	\$57.00	\$0.00	\$57.00
22 DEMOLITION PERMIT	1180-18	\$1,100.00	\$0.00	\$1,100.00
25 DETACHED ACCESSORY - PREBUILT	1180-18	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00
69 DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$10,350.00	\$0.00	\$10,350.00
56 DETACHED ACCESSORY- GENERAL	1180-18	\$3,360.00	\$0.00	\$3,360.00
2 EDUCATIONAL, INSTITUTE, CHURCH	1180-18	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00
158 ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$9,480.00	\$0.00	\$9,480.00
4 EMERGENCY ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$120.00	\$0.00	\$120.00
18 FENCE PERMIT	1180-18	\$1,080.00	\$0.00	\$1,080.00
3 IN-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$180.00	\$0.00	\$180.00
17 MANUFACTURED TYPE II, TEMP STRUC	1180-18	\$1,700.00	\$0.00	\$1,700.00
1 MANUFACTURING/WAREHOUSE	1180-18	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00
24 MAUFACTURED TYPE I, MULTI-SEC	1180-18	\$4,800.00	\$0.00	\$4,800.00
13 OTHER	1180-10	\$1,799.05	\$0.00	\$1,799.05
16 RENEW BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$1,640.00	\$0.00	\$1,640.00
3 ROOF	1180-18	\$180.00	\$0.00	\$180.00
2 SIGN	1180-18	\$120.00	\$0.00	\$120.00
1100 SINGLE INSPECTION	1180-18	\$66,000.00	\$0.00	\$66,000.00
3 SOLAR PANEL PERMIT	1180-18	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$225.00
1 TEMPORARY USE PERMIT	1180-18	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$60.00

# Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor  
(Title of Officer)

BUILDING DEPT  
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana  
(County)

Collections for Period: 1/1/2025 thru 11/20/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
<b>Total Amount Collected</b>		<b>\$225,109.75</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$225,109.75</b>

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct report of collections due the above named governmental unit for the period shown.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

**Note**

This is not to be used as a receipt for collections. The official to whom the report is made must issue an official receipt for the collections remitted.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title of Officer)

Totals by Fund	
1180-10	\$1,875.55
1180-18	\$216,634.20
4906-18	\$6,600.00
	\$225,109.75

# Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor  
(Title of Officer)

PLANNING DEPT  
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana  
(County)

Collections for Period: 1/1/2025 thru 11/20/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
13 ENGINEERING REVIEW FEE (PER HR)	1000-10	\$2,936.25	\$0.00	\$2,936.25
7 LEGAL AD FEE	1000-10	\$280.00	\$0.00	\$280.00
34 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL - PER LOT	1000-10	\$850.00	\$0.00	\$850.00
1 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL PRIMARY PLAT	1000-10	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$600.00
1 MINOR SB RESIDENTIAL SECONDARY	1000-10	\$350.00	\$0.00	\$350.00
1 REPLAT	1000-10	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$400.00
2 REPLAT - 1 LOT ONLY	1000-10	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$400.00
1 REPLAT - STARDUST	1000-10	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$250.00
102 REZONE - \$25.00 PER ACRE	1000-10	\$2,550.00	\$0.00	\$2,550.00
2 REZONE - MAX FEE	1000-10	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
1 REZONE - OTHER	1000-10	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$250.00
9 REZONE SAME USE	1000-10	\$1,350.00	\$0.00	\$1,350.00
3 REZONING	1000-10	\$1,800.00	\$0.00	\$1,800.00
39 RURAL SUBDIVISION	1000-10	\$9,750.00	\$0.00	\$9,750.00
5 RURAL SUBDIVISION PER BUILDING LOT (OVE	1000-10	\$100.00	\$0.00	\$100.00
7 SPECIAL EXCEPTION	1000-10	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$2,800.00
10 VARIANCE	1000-10	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00
<b>Total Amount Collected</b>		<b>\$37,666.25</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$37,666.25</b>

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct report of collections due the above named governmental unit for the period shown.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

**Note**

This is not to be used as a receipt for collections. The official to whom the report is made must issue an official receipt for the collections remitted.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title of Officer)

Totals by Fund	
1000-10	\$37,666.25
	\$37,666.25