

**Starke County Plan Commission**  
**Regular Meeting and Public Hearings**  
**September 13, 2023**

- ❖ **Call to Order** – Vice-President Allen called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
- ❖ **Pledge of Allegiance** - Led by Vice-President Allen.
- ❖ **Roll Call:** Todd Jackson, president, and citizen member (Absent); Mark Allen, vice-president, trustee; Howard Bailey, councilman; Phil Woolery, extension educator; Charles Chesek, commissioner (Absent); Todd Lawrence citizen member (Absent), Denise Cultice, citizen member, Isaiah Collins, citizen member; Thomas Schouten, Surveyor; Justin Schramm, commission counsel; Wallace (Boz) Williams, building commissioner; Robby Blodgett, code enforcement officer; and Mary Beever, administrator. There were (3) visitors present.
- ❖ **Approval of the minutes**
  - Member Schouten made a motion to accept the minutes from the August 9, 2023 meeting as written, seconded by Member Cultice. Motion carried 5-0.
- ❖ **PUBLIC HEARING-** to discuss an unsafe structure on property owned by April Roberts and described as follows: Mont Resorts Lots 59 Thru 64 Blk K. S35/T32/R1, 0.43 acres, Parcel number 75-11-35-302-118.000-008, located at 8722 S Sycamore St. Monterey, IN 46960.
  - Vice-President Allen read the public hearing above. He went on to ask if April Roberts was present. (She was not at this time, she arrived later in the meeting after her hearing was over.) He went on to ask if anyone had a chance to look at that property.
  - Member Collins asked if it was the one that fell in.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever responded yes.
  - Member Bailey asked if that was the one we had gave time to.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever answered yes
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that she was possibly going to put it for sale.
  - Member Collins asked if she was supposed to be at the last month’s meeting.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated she was sick or something, and now she was supposed to be here tonight but she’s not.
  - Vice-President Allen asked what the next recourse is.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever stated she was supposed to get an estimate for the demo/clean-up but she hasn’t supplied anything.
  - Member Bailey asked what our next step is.
  - Vice-President Allen stated to fine her at the minimum.
  - Member Schouten asked if it is unsafe or environmental public nuisance.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever stated it is somewhat unsafe because there is a basement that is open that it’s all collapsed into. She went on to say that she believes it’s unsafe and an environmental public nuisance. She then added that we are here to see what the board wants to do.
  - Vice-President Allen asked Atty. Schramm what our options are at this point.
  - Member Howard asked P.C. Admin Beever to refresh his memory, he went on to ask if this came up two meetings ago, and that she didn’t show up at the last August meeting.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever responded yes, and went on to state that she was supposed to come to the August meeting with an estimate from a contractor on what it would be to clean-up. She went on to say that Ms. Roberts was also interested in seeing about selling it. She added that the last she heard from her is that she was having gall bladder problems and possibly having to get it out.
  - Member Cultice asked how long ago that was.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever answered before the last meeting in August. She added that since then she’s gotten notice of the meeting tonight.
  - Atty. Schramm suggested that we proceed with the unsafe building ordinance in this situation and that the first step would be to issue an order, and start the unsafe building process. He went on to state that the order would give a time frame to rehabilitate the property. He further discussed this with the board on the process of giving between 10-60 days of when the notice is given to update the violation. He then went on to state that if the board so chooses to make a motion for this that he would take care of it then at that point.
  - Member Cultice made a motion to inform Ms. Roberts that she’ll have 60 days according to the unsafe building code about the unsafe structure. Seconded by member Schouten. Motion carried 5-0.
- ❖ **Code Enforcement Officer report**

- **Jerry Tolson** – 8920 S US 35 Monterey, IN 46960
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett stated that they are still cleaning up on that property, and they have a new dumpster out there now. She went on to say that they have till Sept 25 before another fine is imposed.
- **Gary Litzkow** – 2300 E. Toto Rd. Knox, IN 46534
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett advised the board that this property is now on sheriff sale.
  - Atty. Schramm stated that we've filed a complaint over in circuit court on this property for the fines that are outstanding and to abate the violations on the property. He went on to state that that time frame is coming up here soon on that property for them to respond. He went on to advise the board that you have to wait so long to file for a default judgement. He went on to advise the board that since the property is going up for sheriff's sale that he believes they should proceed on and file for a motion of default judgement. He went on to explain the process of if it gets sold at sheriff sale. He added that in the event it did sell the new owner would be responsible to clean it up, however we may not get the fines. He went on to discuss with the board the one-year redemption period and that unfortunately nothing may occur on that property for a year.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz asked if it goes on tax sale and the liens we have on it get scrubbed off, then the old owner comes in and redeems the property, are the liens still scrubbed off.
  - Atty. Schramm answered no if they reclaim it the liens are still there. He went on to add that the only things that aren't removed are sewer bills and state and federal taxes.
  - Member Schouten asked if we are liable to send the new purchaser a letter to let them know.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz said they probably won't disclose it during the sale.
  - Member Cultice added that if someone buys it, it's their purpose probably to go ahead and clean it up anyway. She went on to ask why you would buy something that bad.
  - Member Schouten added he would hope so.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that when he was with the health department that they've had meth houses and stuff go up for sale and they wouldn't disclose it and he'd have to get ahold of the new owner, which at that time the new owner would state that no one told them that and the county would end up having to buy it back because it wasn't disclosed. He went on to say that they can somehow do that though because they are saying that they are selling the title.
  - Atty. Schramm added that it's the tax certificate. He added to this that honestly there are companies now that come in and buy these because they know that they will get 10-15% on top of that back and they make a business out of it. He went on to state that the frustrating part to the board is that during the one-year redemption period no one is probably going to do a lot with it, because if it did get redeemed by the original owner then they'd be out the monies they put into it. He went on to explain that they cannot recoup those costs and gave an example.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz asked if the board should disclose that to the new owner.
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett added that he redeemed it the last time.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz added that was before anyone cleaned it up or anything. He went on to say that if someone did go in there and clean it up and then he redeems it then he'd get a free clean-up.
  - Member Schouten added that he didn't believe this was right.
  - Member Cultice added that maybe he's ran out of money paying fines.
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett added that he paid the \$350.00 fine so that he didn't have to clean it up. She went on to state that right after that is when it went up for sheriff's sale and then he had a year to redeem it.
  - Member Cultice stated that he knows how to work it.
  - Atty. Schramm added that a personal judgement would stay with him personally.
- **Recreational Vehicle Ordinance**
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett added that she is still waiting on the new ordinance.
- **Soltis** – 2075 S Sr. 23 Knox, IN 46534
  - Member Cultice asked if PZinkInvestment Group LLC is also known as Soltis.
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett answered no that the Soltis property is in reference to the pictures that she provided to the board for the property located at 2075 S. SR 23 Knox, IN 46534 and they are before and after pictures of clean up. She added that it had been in violation since 2017.
  - Member Schouten asked if the property that Mark Milo was working on cleaning up.
  - Code Enforcement Officer Blodgett answered yes, it is.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated it's looking good.
  - Member Cultice asked where it is at.
  - P.C. Admin. Beaver answered Ober.

- **PZinkInvestment Group LLC** – 2860 W. SR 10 North Judson, IN 46366.
  - Member Cultice stated that this used to be an old gas station and her uncle and aunt live next to it. She went on to state that the people that staying there are running generators and burning oil.
  - Member Schouten asked if they were burning oil in the generator.
  - Member Cultice answered no they are just burning stuff with oil or something on it creating lots of smoke, and the generator is just noisy. She went on to state that her aunt and uncle know the board is trying to work on it and suggested that the other board members go by it.

❖ **New/Old Business & Violations**

- **RV Ordinance** – Permanent Use definition
  - P.C. Admin. Beever. Stated that she provided the board with the ordinance and she pulled up the old version on the screen. She went on to state that this went before the commissioners and that they did not like that there were two definitions for the same term of permanent use in it. She added that the two definitions are specifically how the term was used twice in two different locations in the ordinance. She continued on to tell the board that they have sent it back to the planning commission for a revision on the term permanent use. She added that this was not something that was changed from the original ordinance. She added that with this new ordinance she cleaned it up and made it look a little better and then added the fee structures into it for giving fines. She then asked for suggestion on this.
  - Atty. Schramm. asked P.C. Admin. Beever what they thought was conflicting or didn't like.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever stated that they did not like that the same term had two definitions.
  - Member Woolery added that they just want one definition.
  - P.C. Admin Beever added that this part wasn't even changed from the previous ordinance but they are wanting it changed into one definition for permanent use.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz explained to Atty. Schramm. that there are situations where sometimes some one is building a home, and we give them a permit to live in a camper while their building a house. He went on to state that that would be a permanent use. He went on to state then we have ones that stay in them for 72 hours and that is a temporary use. He went on to state that they can come get a free permit to stay/camp in it for the 72 hours.
  - Member Cultice added that then we have like the gas station on SR 10 where they are staying in it.
  - P.C. Admin Beever responded and stated yes and then we have permanent use like that, where they are living in the camper illegally.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz went on to add that also in the ordinance goes into campers, sheds, and tents.
  - Member Woolery stated that the definitions pretty much say the same thing except one says 72 hours.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz answered yes except they need worded differently.
  - P.C. Admin Beever added that it needs to be something the commissioners will like.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated it still needs to be two different things though.
  - Member Bailey stated it is two different things, that there is a difference in camping and living in one for six months. He went on to state that his question for the commissioners would be how we'd have the same definition for that.
  - Audience member Hudgens added that the language states permanent use to sewer connections, septic, or electric. He went on to state that he believes the definition is wrong based on the use of permanent hook-up connections.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz stated he'd disagree because some temporary connections can be used as permanent connections.
  - Audience member Hudgens went on to state you can live in a camper forever permanently with an extension cord. He went on to say that according to national electric code though that is a temporary connection.
  - Member Schouten asked so what your saying is we change permanent to temporary.
  - Audience member Hudgens stated that he believes they need to state the time frame that they are living there.
  - Vice-Chairperson Allen stated that he believes time should be the factor.
  - Discussion broke out between many of the members regarding the time frame.
  - Attorney Schramm stated that he doesn't mind having more than one definition.
  - P.C. Admin Beever stated that the commissioners are the ones having the issue with more than one definition.
  - Attorney Schramm stated that he didn't completely understand what the commissioner's issue was when they were going over this.
  - Member Bailey stated that maybe the board should table this till they can hear from commissioner Chesek.
  - P.C. Admin. Beever responded that's fine, it's up to the board what they want to do.
  - Bldg. Comm. Boz added that there is a definition in there also for temporary use for the 72 hours.

- Atty. Schramm. added that we could put permanent use as used under this section constitutes the following, and then list what it would include. He went on to state that if we provide him with what we want then he could make something up.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz added that around Bass Lake we have a lot of RV's and the conservancy does not want them connecting to their sewer system. He went on to state that this ordinance he wants to help them out a little with it in regards to them only being allowed to stay 72 hours in one as long as they contain their own waste.
- Atty. Schramm asked if they had a list of things that constitute a permanent use of using an RV. He went on to ask if it's there over 72 hours if it would be considered permanent use. He then states he's just trying to piece out what is needed or if it's easier to state that any one of these constitutes a permanent use.
- Member Bailey asked if get some one that is wanting to stay in an RV for six months while they are building their home if we are going to make them hardwire their trailer then.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz answered they have to pull a permit for it. He went on to add that it's a temporary permanent dwelling for one year.
- Member Cultice added it would be semi-permanent.
- Member Bailey asked if they do that though, are able then to use an extension cord and that or would they have to hard wire and plumb it. He went on to state he doesn't have a problem with that because it's temporary.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz answered no and that as long as they are making progress and moving along no. He went on then to state though that if they did put their septic in first that he wouldn't have an issue with them hooking up to it.
- Member Bailey stated that in fairness to Atty. Schramm, so that he's only has to write this one time and not go back and forth that the board needs to wait and have a commissioner say here's exactly what we want.
- Member Collins asked if he thought that he could explain the A and B aspect of it well enough now.
- Atty. Schramm stated he'd hate to send it back up to them and then them send it back because it's not what they want.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz asked if he could do something like anything after 72 hours constitutes permanent use without a certain permit.
- Atty. Schramm added that that triggers them to get a permit, but doesn't mean that they have to vacate the premises.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that they have to have a permit and we won't issue one unless they are building a house. He went on to give the example that if someone came in and wanted a permit and said they just want to live in their camper for a year on their property, we would not give them a permit for that. He went on to state that they have to be building a house to get one.
- P.C. Admin. Beaver stated that is the only reason we would issue one is if they are in process of building a home. She went on to add that it's only good for one year and if they aren't finished in that year they can't renew it and they'd have to make other living arrangements.
- Vice-President Allen asked the board for a motion to either do something or to table it.
- Member Bailey made a motion to table this discussion till the commissioners can explain what they want to do. Member Cultice seconded that motion. Motion carried 5-0

#### ❖ **New/Old Business & Violations**

##### ➤ **Noakes Update**

- P.C. Admin. Beaver stated that he is continuing to make his payments.

##### ➤ **Daniel Petru Miron 2735 E. US 30 Hamlet, IN 46532 Trucking Company update.**

- P.C. Admin. Beaver added that they have received their notice from Atty. Schramm and they came in. She added that she gave them all the paperwork to apply with the BZA and told them that they will also need a business permit.

##### ➤ **Gary Litzkow – 2300 E. Toto Rd. Knox, IN 46534**

- Member Cultice asked if Atty. Schramm had that one.
- Atty. Schramm stated that he's applying for a default judgement on that one.
- Member Cultice added that this is the one that is up for tax sale.
- Atty. Schramm added that he'll be filing the motion for default judgement in that time.

##### ➤ **Marie Frances Stokes c/o Janice Himes 8880 N 1150 E. Walkerton, IN 46574**

- P.C. Admin. Beaver stated that she put this one here to take to public hearing possibly. She went on to state that in the mean time she discovered that this property had changed ownership, and that the new owner came in and applied for a demolition permit, and she's waiting to see if it gets cleaned up now.

➤ **John Shorosh/Gregory Cozma- 75-07-16-300-042.100-012**

- Vice President Allen asked if they were here.
- P.C. Admin. Beever answered no.
- Vice President Allen asked for information on this one.
- P.C. Admin. Beever stated that Gregory Cozma had applied with the Board of Zoning appeals a couple months back to build a pole barn on the property that is in the floodplain. She went on to state that he did have an elevation certificate, but the BZA voted to deny his request. She continued on to state that there was a re-hearing on this due to a clerical error but the BZA voted again to deny his request.
- Vice President Allen asked if it was for a polebarn with less than 10 acres.
- P.C. Admin answered yes. She went on to state that Mr. Cozma is buying it on land contract from the property owner Mr. Shorosh that owns a larger parcel behind the one in question. She went on to inform the board that since he was denied by the BZA that Mr. Cozma came into the office with Mr. Shorosh. Mr. Shorosh then tried to apply for a building permit for a pole barn on that parcel stating that the property is still in his name, however it's states it's being sold to Mr. Cozma on land contract. She went on to state that she informed them to talk to Bldg. Comm. Boz and see what he says about it. She then explained that they talked with Boz over it and Boz told them that they would need to ask the Planning Commission whether or not to issue a permit to Mr. Shorosh for a polebarn on this property.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz added that currently this property is under land contract and we know what they are trying to do. He went on to state that if they take the property out of land contract and put it solely back into Mr. Shorosh's name then he has no problem.
- Vice President Allen added at that point you couldn't stop him then.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz informed the board that he knows what their intentions are and he couldn't issue that permit and that's why he told him to take it up with the board.
- Vice President Allen stated and then he's not here first of all and asked the board for their opinion.
- Member Cultice stated that maybe we should notify him that he has no option.
- Vice President Allen added to follow the exact requirements that the BZA told him.
- Member Cultice then asked or do we want to try and get him to the next meeting.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that this is the second one he hasn't showed up to. (referring to the first BZA hearing)
- Member Cultice then suggested sending him a letter stating that nothing can be done unless it's all in one parcel.
- Atty. Schramm recommended stating that until there is one singular piece of property that is 10 acres or more that we the board can't do anything about it.
- P.C. Admin. Beever stated that the smaller parcel is completely in floodplain, and that he does have an elevation certificate but it was obtained by the other property owner when it was all one piece.
- Atty. Schramm then gave a scenario if the land contract is terminated and a barn is built on it already then it sells again we could be potentially fighting another land owner over a barn on less than 10 acres.
- Member Collins asked how many acres are in total.
- P.C. Admin. Beever answered that the one up front is 3 acres and the one in back is 16 acres. She clarified that the 16 acre parcel is solely owned by Mr. Shorosh and the 3 acre parcel is owned by Mr. Shorosh on land contract to Mr. Cozma.
- Vice President Allen stated that they are trying to manipulate it.
- Atty. Schramm stated that they don't have to make a motion on it because per our code that states that they must have more than 10 acres to build an accessory structure.
- Member Woolery stated to just tell him to come back when he has 10 acres.

➤ **Jack Hudgens –Footers**

- Audience member Hudgens introduced himself. He went on to state to the board that he feels that he's being unfairly discriminated against about modular buildings. He went on to state that the conflict he is having is with a footing issue. He went on to state that that he brought with him a specification of a pole barn style structure and he wanted to discuss the IBC for the footers. He went on to talk to the board about the soil conditions it referenced and how to calculate the pole size with the load. He then went on to state that he believes we are holding modular buildings to a different set of standards than we do for polebarns. He went on to read some information that he brought from the IBC. He went on to state that every building we build today requires the right soil and you don't want to build in a swampland. He went on to state that he doesn't know of any contractor that's gone out and got soil testing done before they build. He then referenced a soil map on-line. He went on to show the board the product that he sells and give the board information about the steel structures he sells. He then also explained to

the board his reasoning on why he believes that the engineered drawings he has for these buildings don't need soil testing done and how he believes the foundation recommendations should be understood. He added in what the county inspector is wanting compared to his information. He then went on to explain to the board about helical coil anchors and what he believes is the difference between his structures and pole buildings when it comes to uplift conditions.

- Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that by the IC code anything over two walls on a carport is considered a garage. He then added that at that point you then have to go in to codes for garages. He then added that he doesn't care if they are pinned down to asphalt, stone, concrete or whatever.
- Audience member Hudgens then referenced in his drawings where it has ones with no walls and four walls.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz then added that it also states on there to go back to your local county requirements. He went on to state that's why he's requiring the soil to be tested and to see if the soil can hold it. He then added that Mr. Hudgens told him he was going to give him a structural engineered plan for each one, and he's not.
- Audience member Hudgens stated that he has generic plans that he can get very easily. He then went on to state that Bldg. Comm. Boz wants ones that are specific to each unit. He went on to state that those are \$3500.00, and those ones would show where doors, windows, and overhead doors would be at and has nothing to do with the structural part of it.
- Member Woolery asked if this has to do with our zoning ordinance at all.
- Atty. Schramm asked if he's asking us to modify our zoning ordinance.
- Audience member Hudgens stated no he's being discriminated against because he has licensed stamped engineered drawings saying these are acceptable, and Bldg. Comm. Boz is saying they aren't. He then referenced the online soil map based on a class of soil and stated that Bldg. Comm. Boz isn't accepting that.
- Bldg. Comm. Boz asked how he's proving that the soil is that with out a soil scientist.
- Audience member Hudgens and Bldg. Comm. Boz went back and forth about soil testing and the difference between septic soil scientists. There were questions regarding where the information was coming from and what was actually being asked for by Atty. Schramm. There was further discussion about the engineered drawings that took place, on what type of engineered drawings that would be needed.
- After much further discussion between several board members, Atty. Schramm, and Bldg. Comm. Boz; it was decided that having sona tubes put in 3 ft. deep for carports over 750sqft. is acceptable. For carports over 750sqft it would be required to have the soil tested to see what the soil classification is.

#### ➤ **Jack Hudgens – Code Enforcement Complaint**

- Audience member Hudgens discussed his complaint with the board about his neighbor's hogs. He went on to discuss with the board how his and his neighbor's property is 1400ft deep. He went on to discuss with the board the placement of the hogs and that the neighbor is not in compliance. He added that the neighbor came and discussed this violation with the Planning Commission board and was told to apply with the BZA for a variance in order to keep these hogs where they are for the rest of the year. He went on to state that he was told that there was no BZA secretary and that is why they haven't been having meetings.
- Vice-President Allen stated that there has been BZA meetings.
- P.C. Admin. Beever advised Mr. Hudgens that she told him that there was no BZA secretary for the last few months, but there has been meetings held because the previous secretary had already prepared the hearings in advance. She went on to explain that no new hearings were being scheduled until a new BZA secretary was hired.
- Mr. Hudgens asked if it clearly states in the ordinance that they need to be 300 feet from any residences, then why did they not tell them that they are in violation and to move it back; and then if they wanted to change it then to apply with the BZA.
- Member Schouten asked if this was heard about back in July.
- P.C. Admin. Beever responded that back in July the board told the neighbor to go apply with BZA to have the pigs closer for this year and then move them back further for next year. She went on to state that they informed the board that they had a date to have the pigs butchered in December. She added that the board should have not told him that because at the time there was no BZA secretary to apply with. She then went on to inform the board that she has been in contact with the Cotners and told them that she was not going to make them apply with the BZA because the first available hearing wouldn't be until December and they have a date to have the hogs be butchered in December. She added that she also advised them that if they plan to get hogs in the following year that they would need to have them moved back further on the property to come into compliance.
- Audience Member Hudgens then stated that he's been dealing with this now for two years.
- Member Cultice stated that he only has three more months.

- Audience member Hudgens stated that they should have never allowed it because it's against the ordinance. He went on to state they should have never told him to go to the BZA, to allow him to keep them where they are.
  - Member Collins asked Mr. Hudgens if the BZA didn't grant him a variance for a second dwelling on his property.
  - Audience member Hudgens responded yes they did.
  - Member Collins then added that isn't that a change of the rules then for you.
  - Audience member Hudgens stated that he went to the BZA like he was supposed to before he put the home in. He added that he got approval for it before he did it. He went on to state that the neighbors did this backwards, and he'd be fine with it if the BZA did grant them a variance the right way.
  - Member Cultice added that since Mr. Hudgens had been on the board before that he should know how many things get done prior to the meetings or get a permit.
  - Audience member Hudgens responded that that's when he would fine them.
  - Member Bailey asked if he understands it right that these pigs will be butchered after sixty days and then if they get more they'll move them back.
  - P.C. Admin. Beaver responded that the pigs are due to be butchered in December and if they get new ones in the spring then they will move them back into compliance.
  - Audience member Hudgens added that they got the cart before the horse and that they should have made them move them back, and then go to the BZA for a variance to move them up by the house.
  - Atty. Schramm stated it was a discretionary judgement call.
- **Bldg. Comm. Boz – C of O's**
- Bldg. Comm. Boz stated that he's been having an issue with people calling for certificates of occupancy and that they have never gotten a final inspection done on their project and the permits are expired. He went on to ask the board what they believe he should do in these circumstances where they are wanting these C of O's. He went on to state that they are wanting to know what they need to do or what they can do to get one because the bank wants one for a mortgage. He went on to tell the board that there is no way for him to see what's going on behind the drywall unless they rip it all out and of course they don't want to do all that.
  - Member Cultice stated that's putting the cart in front of the horse there.
  - Member Schouten stated that Bldg. Comm. Boz is right if they aren't letting him inspect things then why should he give them an occupancy certificate.
  - Member Cultice stated their breaking the rules.
- ❖ **End of the month**
- Board reviewed the reports from August 2023.
- ❖ **Public Comments**
- President Jackson asked the Audience members that were there if they had any comments.
- ❖ **Next Scheduled Meeting-** will be Wednesday, October 11, 2023 at 5:30 p.m.
- ❖ **Adjournment-**With no further business, Member Collins made a motion to adjourn the meeting seconded by Member Woolery. Motion carried 6-0.

This meeting was recorded and will be on file in the Starke County Plan Commission Office.

Unless stated otherwise all Plan Commission meetings will be held on the second Wednesday of every month at 5:30 p.m. with the Board of Zoning Appeal meeting on the same night the latter of 6:30 p.m. or the conclusion of the Plan Commission meeting.

Mary W. J. Beaver  
Administrator