

**PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MINUTES**

The Putnam County Board of Zoning Appeals met for its regular monthly meeting on October 14, 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 6:50 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Lora Scott, Kevin Scobee, Terry Dorsett, and Raymond McCloud. Kate Skirvin was not present. Also, present was Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. See attached sign in sheet for audience members present.

REVIEW OF MINUTES – August 11, 2025, meeting minutes. The September meeting was cancelled due to a lack of a quorum.

Lora Scott asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes.

Kevin Scobee made a motion to approve August 11, 2025, meeting minutes as presented.

Raymond McCloud seconded the motion.

August 11, 2025, meeting minutes were approved as presented with all in favor.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mrs. Scott stated that the board does not currently have a vice chair. Mrs. Scott explained that a vice-chair would need to be nominated now that there is a full board. Mrs. Scott nominated Kate Skirvin as vice-chair.

Mr. Scobee seconded the motion.

Kate Skirvin was appointed vice-chair with all in favor.

Mrs. Scott stated that she would like to make an amendment to the agenda to move Camryn Gibson case to be heard after Ty Stewart and move the unsafe structure case to the last item on the agenda.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to amend the agenda to hear about the Gibson case prior to the unsafe building case.

Terry Dorsett seconded the motion.

The agenda was amended with all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS:

2025-SE-049: JESSICA YOUNG – Special Exception for a dog kennel. Review of previous approval; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning district; Franklin Township; 9042 N US 231 (Parcel #67-02-30-700-016.002-005)

Lisa Zeiner explained that Mrs. Young was on fall break and currently out of the state. Mrs. Zeiner stated that Mrs. Young has asked that this case be continued to the November 10, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to continue the review of the previously approved special exception for **2025-SE-049: JESSICA YOUNG** until November 10, 2025, meeting.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

2025-SE-049: JESSICA YOUNG continued to November 10, 2025, with all in favor.

2025-DSV-050: TIM & LEANN LAWLESS – Development Standards Variance to reduce the front setback from 50 feet to 40 feet; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning district; Monroe Township; 1140 E CR 425 N (Parcel #67-05-23-300-019.001-013).

Leann Lawless, property owner, approached the board. Mrs. Lawless explained that they were wanted to remove the existing manufactured dwelling and replace it with a larger manufactured dwelling. Mrs. Lawless asked that the front setback be reduced from the required 50 feet to 38 feet from the edge of the road. Mrs. Lawless explained that they have pushed the proposed dwelling back as far as they could on the property without going down the steep hill behind the existing dwelling.

Mrs. Scott stated that when she drove by the property, she noticed that there were two (2) creeks that ran through the property.

Mrs. Lawless stated that was correct and that with heavy rains the low area floods. Mrs. Lawless explained that the only location for a dwelling was on top of the hill where the existing dwelling was located.

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

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve the development standards variance for **2025-DSV-050: TIM & LEANN LAWLESS** to reduce the front setback to 38 feet from the edge of the road for the location of a new dwelling.

Mr. McCloud seconded the motion.

The development standards variance for **2025-DSV-050: TIM & LEANN LAWLESS** was approved with a 38-foot setback with all in favor.

2025-DSV-051: KATHY HUNT – Development Standards Variance to reduce the side setback from 25 feet to 15 feet; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning district; Floyd Township; 5347 N CR 600 E (Parcel #67-06-15-300-020.000-004)

Tim Hunt, property owner, approached the board. Mr. Hunt stated that the existing garage that has a lean-to on it needs to be torn down. Mr. Hunt explained that they want to build a bigger garage in the same location as the existing. Mr. Hunt stated that the new structure would be the same width but would be longer.

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

Mr. McCloud made a motion to approve the development standards variance for **2025-DSV-051: KATHY HUNT** to reduce the side setback from 25 feet to 15 feet.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

2025-DSV-051: KATHY HUNT development standards variance to reduce the side setback from 25 feet to 15 feet was approved with all in favor.

2025-DSV-052: TY STEWART – Development standards variance to reduce the rear setback from 20 feet to 2 feet; Residential (R1) zoning district; Monroe Township; 1214 W CR 350 N (Parcel #67-05-29-401-011.000-013)

Patsy Coffee, agent for the property owner, approached the board. Ms. Coffee stated that Mr. Stewart was asking for a variance to build a 30-by-48-foot barn. Ms. Coffee explained that the 2-car detached accessory structure, and a small mini barn had been removed from the property. Ms. Coffee requested that the rear setback be reduced to 2 feet from the property line so that the structure is not too close to the dwelling and so that it does not lose any of the paved driveway.

Mrs. Scott asked if the reason for reducing the setback was so that a larger structure could be built.

Ms. Coffee stated that it was true and to increase property value.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was any way for the building to be smaller or configured in a different way.

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

Mrs. Zeiner stated that her office had received a letter from an adjoining property owner. Mrs. Zeiner read the letter from Debra Nussbaum: “I, Thomas and Debra Nussbaum next door at 1248 W CR 350 N Greencastle Indiana, wish to address our concerns. We the Nussbaum’s, property owners, do not want the pole barn or garage; has to be 15 feet from the property line survey stick in ground, 15 feet from that.”

Ms. Coffee stated that the Nussbaum’s were the property owner to the west. Ms. Coffee explained that they would meet the 15 feet requirement along that property line. Ms. Coffee stated that it was the rear property line that they are seeking a variance on.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the rear setback in a residential zoning district is 20 feet, and Mr. Stewart is requesting a reduction to two (2) feet.

Mr. McCloud asked if the garage could be rotated to meet the setback.

Mr. Stewart stated that the reason for the request was to keep from cutting into the existing driveway or concrete. Mr. Stewart explained that the garage would go behind the existing driveway.

Ms. Coffee stated that moving the garage would also place it too close to the dwelling.

The board discussed the options of different setbacks.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve **2025-DSV-052: TY STEWART** to reduce the rear setback from 20 feet to 10 feet.

Mr. McCloud seconded the motion.

2025-DSV-052: TY STEWART development standards variance for a rear set back of 10 feet was approved with all in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

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

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

Mrs. Scott stated that the other three (3) members of the board would have to be in full agreement with the motion.

Camryn Gibson, property owner, approached the board. Mrs. Gibson stated that she is requesting a special exception to allow a dog kennel business and a development standards variance for the side setback to be able to add on to an existing building.

Mrs. Scott asked about the kennel.

Mrs. Gibson stated that the building that the dogs would be housed in was a pre-built structure that was approximately 2 to 3 feet from the existing barn. Mrs. Gibson explained that the kennel was a portable structure.

Eric Gibson, previous property owner, approached the board. Mr. Gibson stated that he owned the property for 25 years and just carved off a portion for Camryn to build on. Mr. Gibson explained that the existing building was built prior to 1992 and was on or at the property line. Mr. Gibson stated that the kennel was Camryn's business, how she paid her bills. Mr. Gibson explained that the barn has be insulated and added sound proofing to the structure.

Mrs. Gibson stated that a six-foot privacy fence would also be installed along the property line.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak in favor or in opposition of the project.

Sandra Grimes, 2422 N CR 50 E, approached the board. Mrs. Grimes stated that she was confused about what the setbacks were in a A1 district.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the side setback is 50 feet in an A1 zoning district.

Mrs. Grimes asked what the addition would be used for, if they were boarding dogs or cats or both, how many dog kennels are inside the mobile kennel, and how many animals this request would allow. Mrs. Grimes voiced concerns about the wood privacy fence as there was a previous incident when a neighbor's dog killed one of her horses. Mrs. Grimes requested that the kennels be moved further south.

Barry Grimes, 2422 N CR 50 E, approached the board. Mr. Grimes explained that his barn was built two (2) feet from the property line prior to zoning.

Mr. Gibson stated that the addition to the existing barn, one side will be for livestock, and the other side will be for the dog kennel business. Mr. Gibson explained that the portable building has six (6) kennel runs. Mr. Gibson stated that the fence would be a six (6) foot privacy fence along the property line that would tie into a perimeter fence to keep animals from getting out. Mr. Gibson explained that while there will be personal horses on the property the kennel would only be for dogs.

Mrs. Gibson stated that if the dogs are small, they could house a maximum of twelve (12), if the dogs are large, they could only house six (6). Mrs. Gibson explained that the runs are all individual runs, one dog per run. Mrs. Gibson stated that each run has turf to prevent digging. Mrs. Gibson explained that the dogs are put up at night and let out in the morning for exercise.

Mrs. Scott asked about the insulation.

Mrs. Gibson stated that the insulation inside the structure stops the noise when the dogs are inside the structure.

Mrs. Scott asked how many hours the dogs are outside the structure vs inside the structure.

Mrs. Gibson stated that the dogs are put inside the structure around 8:30 p.m. and let out around 6:30 a.m. Mrs. Gibson explained that the dogs are free range in and out of the structure during the day.

Mrs. Scott talked about the County's Animal Control Ordinance. Mrs. Scott explained that the animal control ordinance was not a part of the UDO and was not under zoning, but it was a part of the county's other ordinances. Mrs. Scott stated that the board must consider how this special exception impacts those who live around it. Mrs. Scott explained that the request cannot negatively impact on the next-door neighbor. Mrs. Scott asked how the floors inside the kennel are sanitized.

Mr. Gibson stated that the flooring was waterproof planks.

Mrs. Gibson explained that she uses kennels disinfectant that's specific for dog germs.

Mr. McCloud asked how the waste is disposed of.

Mrs. Gibson stated that the waste is placed in an outdoor enclosed bucket that gets hauled off to the dumpster every day or every other day.

Mrs. Scott asked if a septic system would be installed.

Mrs. Gibson stated that a system would be installed for the dwelling they will be building, but since there will not be any plumbing/dog washing a septic is not required for the kennel.

Mrs. Scott asked about a kennel license.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the problem with the animal control ordinance is that there are items, like the kennel license that are not enforced by anyone. Mrs. Zeiner explained that no department

within the county government knows who issues the kennel licenses, therefore they are not issued. Mrs. Zeiner stated that when a complaint comes in in reference to domesticated animals, it is the animal control officer who is called not the planning & zoning department. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the Putnam County animal control officer and or the sheriff's department enforces the animal control ordinance.

Mrs. Scott stated that the kennels must be inspected prior to the issuance of a kennel license.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the county did not designate an inspector. Mrs. Zeiner explained that it would be the animal control officer or the Putnam County Health Department who would or should be responsible for inspecting these facilities.

Mrs. Scott asked about safety protocols.

Mrs. Gibson stated that all the kennels have carabiners on them, the kennel door is locked at night, the windows are always shut, there are four (4) outdoor cameras, and three indoor cameras that are on all the time.

Mrs. Scott asked about the safety protocol information about the people whose animals are being boarded.

Mrs. Gibson stated that she has each client complete a lot of paperwork, including the aggression of the dogs, odd behaviors, emergency contacts, vet information, feeding instructions, medication supplements, etc.

Mr. Gibson explained that Camryn was a registered vet technician.

Mrs. Scott asked about vaccination records.

Mrs. Gibson stated that vaccination records are required prior to acceptance, including proof of Botella distemper, rabies, and it is suggested Lyme disease.

Mr. McCloud asked liability insurance.

Mrs. Gibson stated that she has gotten a few quotes on what that would cost.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that insurance did not have anything to do with the special exception request as that was more of a state requirement for businesses.

Mrs. Gibson stated that her business was LLC.

Mrs. Scott asked about the contractor listing.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the listing the county has is only for building contractors and does not apply to all businesses.

Mrs. Grimes stated that the proposed lean-to would be on the property line.

Mr. Gibson stated that the existing barn which predates zoning is also on the property line as is the Grimes' barn which predates zoning.

Mrs. Scott closed the public hearing for this project.

Mr. Dorsett asked for clarification on the setbacks.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that while the existing barn is a legal non-conforming structure. Mrs. Zeiner stated that because they are changing the use of the structure by having part of it for the kennel, the UDO requires a development standards variance for the setbacks to bring the structure into compliance with the ordinances. Mrs. Zeiner explained that if the addition to the structure was all for agricultural uses, goats, horses, etc. they would only have to get a building permit for the additions. Mrs. Zeiner stated that one side of the structure would be used for the kennel business and that is what triggered the requirement of needing a variance.

Mr. Gibson stated that the existing barn would get a face lift with new metal siding to be aesthetically pleasing to the eye for any neighbor or passerby.

Mrs. Scott asked about the inspection of the kennel on US 231 and the waste being required to go to a septic system.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the Putnam County Health Department did the inspection because they are also grooming dogs and that waste, per the Health Department ordinances, is required to go to a septic system.

Mrs. Scott explained that all three members of the board had to agree in order for the project to be approved. Mrs. Scott stated that she could not support this project for approval of the special exception because of how close it is to a neighboring residence and the impact that the business would have on not only the value of their property, but the quality of life when you did not choose to have dogs barking in your back door. Mrs. Scott explained that the petitioner could request a continuance to the November meeting when more members of the board would be present.

Mr. Scobee asked if there was anything the petitioner could do to modify the request so that the kennels were not as close to the adjoining property.

Mrs. Scott stated that the board was not here to consider personal ramifications of decisions.

Mrs. Scott explained that the board had to consider the following:

1. The proposed use is consistent with the vision, goals, and objectives of the Unified Development Ordinance.
2. The proposed use complies with the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance.
3. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the general vicinity.
4. The proposed use can adequately be served by essential public facilities.
5. The proposed use 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.
6. Allows orderly development of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

Mrs. Scott stated that she could not support the project because it impacts on those other properties with the sound of the dogs.

Mrs. Gibson requested a continuation of the case.

Mr. McCloud made a motion to table **2025-SE-064: CAMRYN GIBSON** until November 10, 2025, meeting.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

2025-SE-064: CAMRYN GIBSON was continued to November 10, 2025, meeting with all in favor.

UNSAFE BUILDING: RICHARD NICHOLS – Unsafe/abandoned Structure; Rural Preservation (A1) zoning district; Jefferson Township; 7266 E CR 400 S (Parcel #67-13-02-200-001.000-010)

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the building department received a complaint on the dwelling at this site. Mrs. Zeiner explained that there had been a fire some time ago, but the owner abandoned the dwelling and as you can see from the pictures in your packet, the structure is not safe and is open to the elements. Mrs. Zeiner stated that several attempts have been made to reach out to the owner of the property to discuss their plans for the structure, whether that was to rebuild or demolish it. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the owner has not responded to the multiple attempts even though they received and signed the letters that were sent. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the next step is to have the BZA board deem the structure as unsafe to start the process for getting bids and/or a court order to have the structure demolished.

Mrs. Scott stated that she went past the property, and the structure is in bad shape, there is also a swimming pool in the backyard. Mrs. Scott explained that she was not sure if the swimming pool had water in it or not.

Mr. McCloud made a motion to deem **7266 E CR 400 S (Parcel #67-13-02-200-001.000-010)** as an unsafe dwelling.

Mr. Dorsett seconded the motion.

7266 E CR 400 S (Parcel #67-13-02-200-001.000-010) was deemed unsafe with all in favor.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was any other discussion before the board.

Mr. McCloud asked about the old grocery store in New Maysville.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it was her understanding that the county was going to approach the other adjacent property owner about working together to remove the structure. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the structure crosses a property line and when the properties went up for tax sale the Commissioner's got one of the parcels and someone else purchased the other parcel. Mrs. Zeiner explained the Jim Ensley was working on it with the commissioners.

Mrs. Scott asked if there was a Plan Commission meeting in November.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there was one item that would be going before the Plan Commission and since there were two cases that the BZA continued there would also be a BZA meeting in November.

Mrs. Scott voiced concerns with data centers and there not being any language in the UDO about them.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that any additions to the UDO would have to go before the Plan Commission and there would have to be public hearings to get input from the county citizens. Mrs. Zeiner suggested asking Civic Blueprint to help since they helped draft the UDO.

Mr. Scobee asked if the Commissioners could put a temporary hold on anything.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it would be up to the commissioners to decide.

Mrs. Scott asked what would stop Google, for example, from coming in and building a data center in an A1 zoning district.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that if the proposed use is not listed as an allowed use on the property, the options include: finding an alternative use for the property that is permitted or a site that is properly zoned to for the use, if the use is not listed anywhere in the ordinance, they could request that the Administrator consider the intended use is a similar use as what is permitted and the administrator could request the BZA to make that determination. Mrs. Zeiner stated that if proposed use is not in the use table or otherwise permitted by the UDO is prohibited. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the options would be to request an amendment to the ordinance for the use to be added to a district which would go through the Plan Commission and then to the County Commissioners or request a Special Exception through the BZA. Mrs. Zeiner stated that since data centers are not mentioned anywhere in the UDO, they are considered prohibited unless the applicant petitions for the use to be added to the UDO or it comes before the BZA as a special exception.

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

Mr. Scobee seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 10th day of November 2025.



Lora Scott, President

PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

OCTOBER 14, 2025 at 6:30 p.m.

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
Heanne Lawless	1140 ECK #25 N Greencastle IN
Eric Gibson	2326 N CR 50 E Greencastle TN
Camryn Gibson	2308 N CR 50 E Greencastle IN 46135
Sandra Grimes	2482 N Co Rd 50 E Greencastle IN, 46135
Tim Hunt	5347 N. CR 600 E BAINBRIDGE, IN 46105
Patsy Coffey & Ty Stewart	1214 W Co Rd 350 N Greencastle IN. 46135

Lisa Zeiner

From: Debra Nussbaum <debranusbaum41@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 11:12 AM
To: Lisa Zeiner
Subject: Re: BZA Meeting

CAUTION: This sender of this email is not from Putnam County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I. Thomas and Debra Nussbaum Next door at. 1248 w county road 350 n , Greencastle, Indiana. Wish to address our concerns. We the Nussbaum s. Property owners. Dont want the pole barn or. Garage. Has to be. 15 foot. From the property line survey stick in ground 15 foot from that
.
Thomas and Debra Nussbaum.
Email Debranusbaum41@gmail.com. call. 317-493-9640. If any questions

Mrs. Nussbaum

The Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) meeting is October 14, 2025, at 6:30 p.m. at the Putnam County Courthouse, 1st Floor. If you cannot attend, but want to voice concerns or opposition, please reply to this email.

Lisa L. Zeiner

Lisa Zeiner

Plan Director

Putnam County Planning & Building

1 W Washington St 4th Floor Room 46

Greencastle, IN 46135

(765) 301-9108

Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor
(Title of Officer)

Planning/Building
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana
(County)

Collections for Period: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
0 ABOVE-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
2 ADDITION (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
1 ADDITION (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$300.00	\$2,700.00	\$3,000.00
0 ALTERATION OF DRAWINGS - FIRST VIOLATIO	1180-18	\$0.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
0 ALTERATIONS (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
8 ALTERATIONS (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$480.00	\$1,560.00	\$2,040.00
1 ATTACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$600.00
0 ATTACHED DECK	1180-18	\$0.00	\$240.00	\$240.00
6 BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$2,400.00	\$24,800.00	\$27,200.00
10989 BUILDING PERMIT/ PER SQ FT	1180-18	\$2,197.80	\$45,317.00	\$47,514.80
0 BUSINESS, COMMERCIAL, PUBLIC	1180-18	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
18 CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY	1180-18	\$360.00	\$2,460.00	\$2,820.00
1 CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT PERMIT - FIRST VIC	1180-18	\$300.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,800.00
0 CONTINUING WORK W/O INSPECTION - SEQUE	1180-18	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
2 CONTINUING WORK WITHOUT INSPECTION - 1	1180-18	\$200.00	\$50.00	\$250.00
3 CONTRACTOR LISTING	4906-18	\$300.00	\$5,600.00	\$5,900.00
28 COPY - WIDE FORMAT	1181.010	\$56.00	\$388.00	\$444.00
4 COPY WIDE FORMAT COLOR	1181.010	\$20.00	\$95.00	\$115.00
0 COPYS B/W PER PAGE	1180-10	\$0.00	\$19.50	\$19.50
0 COPYS COLOR PER PAGE	1180-10	\$0.00	\$9.00	\$9.00
8 DEMOLITION PERMIT	1180-18	\$400.00	\$450.00	\$850.00
4 DETACHED ACCESSORY - PREBUILT	1180-18	\$240.00	\$900.00	\$1,140.00
11 DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$1,650.00	\$6,900.00	\$8,550.00
8 DETACHED ACCESSORY- GENERAL	1180-18	\$480.00	\$2,220.00	\$2,700.00
1 EDUCATIONAL, INSTITUTE, CHURCH	1180-18	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
24 ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$1,440.00	\$6,540.00	\$7,980.00
0 EMERGENCY ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$120.00	\$120.00
0 ENGINEERING REVIEW FEE (PER HR)	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,936.25	\$2,936.25
1 FENCE PERMIT	1180-18	\$60.00	\$900.00	\$960.00
0 IN-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
0 LEGAL AD FEE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$240.00	\$240.00
0 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL - PER LOT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$850.00	\$850.00
0 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL PRIMARY PLAT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$600.00	\$600.00
2 MANUFACTURED TYPE II, TEMP STRUC	1180-18	\$200.00	\$900.00	\$1,100.00
0 MANUFACTURING/WAREHOUSE	1180-18	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
1 MAUFACTURED TYPE I, MULTI-SEC	1180-18	\$200.00	\$4,200.00	\$4,400.00
0 MINOR SB RESIDENTIAL SECONDARY	1000-10	\$0.00	\$350.00	\$350.00
3 OTHER	1180-10	\$265.00	\$841.25	\$1,106.25
2 RENEW BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$120.00	\$1,160.00	\$1,280.00
0 REPLAT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
0 REPLAT - 1 LOT ONLY	1000-10	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
0 REPLAT - STARDUST	1000-10	\$0.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
0 REZONE - \$25.00 PER ACRE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,550.00	\$2,550.00
0 REZONE - MAX FEE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
0 REZONE - OTHER	1000-10	\$0.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
0 REZONE SAME USE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$1,050.00	\$1,050.00
0 REZONING	1000-10	\$0.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00

Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor
(Title of Officer)

Planning/Building
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana
(County)

Collections for Period: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
0 ROOF	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
3 RURAL SUBDIVISION	1000-10	\$750.00	\$5,750.00	\$6,500.00
0 RURAL SUBDIVISION PER BUILDING LOT (OVE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
0 SIGN	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
122 SINGLE INSPECTION	1180-18	\$7,320.00	\$44,820.00	\$52,140.00
0 SOLAR PANEL PERMIT	1180-18	\$0.00	\$225.00	\$225.00
1 SPECIAL EXCEPTION	1000-10	\$400.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,400.00
0 TEMPORARY USE PERMIT	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
0 VARIANCE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00
Total Amount Collected		\$22,538.80	\$189,461.00	\$211,999.80

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	\$1,150.00
1180-10	\$265.00
1180-18	\$20,747.80
1181.010	\$76.00
4906-18	\$300.00
	\$22,538.80

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: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
0 ABOVE-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
2 ADDITION (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
1 ADDITION (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$300.00	\$2,700.00	\$3,000.00
0 ALTERATION OF DRAWINGS - FIRST VIOLATIO	1180-18	\$0.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
0 ALTERATIONS (COMMERCIAL)	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
8 ALTERATIONS (RESIDENTIAL)	1180-18	\$480.00	\$1,560.00	\$2,040.00
1 ATTACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$600.00
0 ATTACHED DECK	1180-18	\$0.00	\$240.00	\$240.00
6 BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$2,400.00	\$24,800.00	\$27,200.00
10989 BUILDING PERMIT/ PER SQ FT	1180-18	\$2,197.80	\$45,317.00	\$47,514.80
0 BUSINESS, COMMERCIAL, PUBLIC	1180-18	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
18 CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY	1180-18	\$360.00	\$2,460.00	\$2,820.00
1 CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT PERMIT - FIRST VIC	1180-18	\$300.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,800.00
0 CONTINUING WORK W/O INSPECTION - SEQUE	1180-18	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
2 CONTINUING WORK WITHOUT INSPECTION - 1	1180-18	\$200.00	\$50.00	\$250.00
3 CONTRACTOR LISTING	4906-18	\$300.00	\$5,600.00	\$5,900.00
0 COPYS B/W PER PAGE	1180-10	\$0.00	\$19.50	\$19.50
0 COPYS COLOR PER PAGE	1180-10	\$0.00	\$9.00	\$9.00
8 DEMOLITION PERMIT	1180-18	\$400.00	\$450.00	\$850.00
4 DETACHED ACCESSORY - PREBUILT	1180-18	\$240.00	\$900.00	\$1,140.00
11 DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	1180-18	\$1,650.00	\$6,900.00	\$8,550.00
8 DETACHED ACCESSORY- GENERAL	1180-18	\$480.00	\$2,220.00	\$2,700.00
1 EDUCATIONAL, INSTITUTE, CHURCH	1180-18	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
24 ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$1,440.00	\$6,540.00	\$7,980.00
0 EMERGENCY ELECTRICAL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$120.00	\$120.00
1 FENCE PERMIT	1180-18	\$60.00	\$900.00	\$960.00
0 IN-GROUND POOL	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
2 MANUFACTURED TYPE II, TEMP STRUC	1180-18	\$200.00	\$900.00	\$1,100.00
0 MANUFACTURING/WAREHOUSE	1180-18	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
1 MAUFACTURED TYPE I, MULTI-SEC	1180-18	\$200.00	\$4,200.00	\$4,400.00
3 OTHER	1180-10	\$265.00	\$841.25	\$1,106.25
2 RENEW BUILDING PERMIT	1180-18	\$120.00	\$1,160.00	\$1,280.00
0 ROOF	1180-18	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$180.00
0 SIGN	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
122 SINGLE INSPECTION	1180-18	\$7,320.00	\$44,820.00	\$52,140.00
0 SOLAR PANEL PERMIT	1180-18	\$0.00	\$225.00	\$225.00
0 TEMPORARY USE PERMIT	1180-18	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$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: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
Total Amount Collected		\$21,312.80	\$162,051.75	\$183,364.55

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	\$265.00
1180-18	\$20,747.80
4906-18	\$300.00
	\$21,312.80

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: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
0 ENGINEERING REVIEW FEE (PER HR)	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,936.25	\$2,936.25
0 LEGAL AD FEE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$240.00	\$240.00
0 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL - PER LOT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$850.00	\$850.00
0 MAJOR SB RESIDENTIAL PRIMARY PLAT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$600.00	\$600.00
0 MINOR SB RESIDENTIAL SECONDARY	1000-10	\$0.00	\$350.00	\$350.00
0 REPLAT	1000-10	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
0 REPLAT - 1 LOT ONLY	1000-10	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
0 REPLAT - STARDUST	1000-10	\$0.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
0 REZONE - \$25.00 PER ACRE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,550.00	\$2,550.00
0 REZONE - MAX FEE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
0 REZONE - OTHER	1000-10	\$0.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
0 REZONE SAME USE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$1,050.00	\$1,050.00
0 REZONING	1000-10	\$0.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00
3 RURAL SUBDIVISION	1000-10	\$750.00	\$5,750.00	\$6,500.00
0 RURAL SUBDIVISION PER BUILDING LOT (OVE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
1 SPECIAL EXCEPTION	1000-10	\$400.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,400.00
0 VARIANCE	1000-10	\$0.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00

Total Amount Collected \$1,150.00 \$26,926.25 \$28,076.25

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	\$1,150.00
	\$1,150.00

Report Of Collection

Approved by State Board of Accounts for Putnam County, 2001

To: Putnam County Auditor
(Title of Officer)

PLAT BOOK
(Governmental Unit)

Putnam County, Indiana
(County)

Collections for Period: 8/25/2025 thru 9/30/2025

Description	Funds to be Credited	Collections This Period	Prior Collections	Year to Date Collections
28 COPY - WIDE FORMAT	1181.010	\$56.00	\$388.00	\$444.00
4 COPY WIDE FORMAT COLOR	1181.010	\$20.00	\$95.00	\$115.00

	Total Amount Collected	\$76.00	\$483.00	\$559.00
--	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------

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	
1181.010	\$76.00
	\$76.00

2025 BUILDING PERMIT REPORT AS OF 9/30/2025

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
COUNTY	New dwellings	37
	Assessory Dwelling	5
	Pools	5
	Commercial	4
	Electric	119
	Detached Accessory	84
	Demolition	14
	Additions	22
	Cell Modifications	
	Roof	4
	Addition Commercial	3
	PreBuilt Accessory	14
	Fence	3
	Signs	1
	Remodel	8
	Floodplain - DOT Bridge	
	Solar Panels	3
	Storage Tank	
	Grading	
	Cabin	
	ILP - GENERAL	
	Attached Accessory	15
	TOTAL	341

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
TOWN OF BAINBRIDGE	Fence	2
	New Dwelling	2
	Detached Accessory	
	Additions	
	Roof	
	Commercial - Addition	
	PreBuilt Accessory	1
	Demolition	
	Commercial	1
	Remodel	
Electric	3	
TOTAL	9	
TOWN OF ROACHDALE	Fence	6
	Roof	
	Demolition	
	Electric	2
	New Dwelling	2
	Signs	
	Detached Accessory	1
	ILP	
	Attached Accessory	1
	Prebuilt Accessory	
Commercial		
Solar Panels		
TOTAL	12	

LOCATION	TYPE OF PERMIT	NUMBER OF PERMITS ISSUED
TOWN OF RUSSELLVILLE	Electric	3
	Additions	1
	Remodel	
	Demolition	
	Commercial	
TOTAL	4	
TOWN OF CLOVERDALE	Underground Storage	1
	Commercial	1
	New Dwelling	21
	Electric	6
	Additions	
	Pools	
	Demolition	1
	Fence	5
	Solar panels	
	Sign	
Attached Accessory	3	
Temporary Use	1	
Stormwater/grading		
Remodel	1	
Prebuilt Accessory		
Detached Accessory	2	
TOTAL	42	
HERITAGE LAKE	Additions	5
	Cell Modifications	
	New Dwelling	36
	Deck	
	Demolition	1
	Attached Accessory	5
	Electric	5
	Pool	1
	Remodel	1
	Roof	
Fence		
Detached Accessory	6	
TOTAL	60	
GRAND TOTAL PERMITS		468

2025 PLAN COMMISSION & BZA CASE REPORTS AS OF 9/30/2025

BZA - CASES

LOCATION	TYPE	NUMBER
County	Development Standards Variance	8
	Special Exception	7
	TOTAL	15
Town of Bainbridge	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	TOTAL	0
Town of Roachdale	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	1
	TOTAL	1
Town of Cloverdale	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	TOTAL	0
Town of Russellville	Development Standards Variance	
	Special Exception	
	TOTAL	0
GRAND TOTAL BZA CASES		16

PLAN COMMISSION - CASES

LOCATION	TYPE	NUMBER
COUNTY	Major Plat	1
	Development Plan Review	
	Replat	
	Rezoning	11
	TOTAL	12
TECH REVIEW ONLY	Stormwater Review	3
	Development Plan Review	
	Rural Subdivision	9
	Minor Plat	18
	Replat	7
	TOTAL	37
Town of Bainbridge	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning	
	TOTAL	0
Town of Roachdale (County hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning (1 heard by Council)	
	TOTAL	0
Town of Cloverdale (County hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Development Plan Review	
	Rezoning	1
	TOTAL	1
Town of Russellville (County Hears these)	Minor Plat	
	Major Plat	
	Rezoning	
	TOTAL	0
	GRAND TOTAL PC CASES	