

**SHELBYVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**February 10, 2026**

Vince Bradburn: All right may the February 10th meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals come to order. Mr. Secretary, could you call roll?

Mike Evans: Yes. Mr. Cassidy: Here. Mr. Bradburn: Here. Mr. Garrett III: Here. Mrs. Newkerk: Here.

Bradburn: Thank you. The first item on our agenda is the election of officers. The first step in the process is to open up nominations. So the floor is open for, actually, sorry, let me review. We have a president, vice president, and secretary. So I'll open up the floor for the nomination of president.

Doug Cassidy: I'd like to nominate Mr. Bradburn as our leader and president.

Bradburn: Mr. Bradburn's nominated. Any further nominations? How long do I have to wait?

James Garrett: I think we're good.

Bradburn: Yeah, it sounds like nominations are closed. Since there's no one opposed, I gracefully, gracefully accept. The second office is vice president. The floor is open for nominations.

Garrett: I nominate Doug Cassidy to the role of vice president.

Bradburn: Mr. Cassidy is nominated. Any other nominations? Hearing none, congratulations, Mr. Cassidy. Mr. Vice President or Vice Chair. For secretary. Do we have to vote the planning staff in? Okay, so let's open up the floor for nominations for secretary.

Garrett: I nominate the planning staff as the role of secretary.

Bradburn: Planning staff's been nominated. Any further nominations? Hearing none, congratulations, planning staff. Thank you for serving that role. Once again look forward to eventful or less eventful, I should say, 2026. Here we go. Next item on the agenda for us this evening is approval of minutes. Approval of minutes for December. That, yeah, the floor is open.

Cassidy: I'd like to make a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Garrett: Second.

Bradburn: Have a nomination for approval and a second. All those in favor indicate by saying "Aye".

Unison: "Aye".

Bradburn: Those opposed, same sign. Motion passes. Moving on down to old business. The secretary could announce this one. Go ahead.

Evans: I can. First item under the old business is BZA 2025-16, Aaron Callus, 2205 North Michigan Road. It was a petition by Mr. Callus for a development standard variances, and he has requested continuance.

Bradburn: Okay. Have a continuance for old business, which moves us on into new business. First up is the BZA 2026-01. Mr. Secretary, could you read us the business?

Evans: Yes. First item under new business is BZA 2026-01, Timothy Vanzo, use variance. It's a petition by Mr. Vanzo seeking a use variance to allow the western side of the property to be used for residential while maintaining the eastern portion for a structure, warehouse storage. This petition is located, our property is located at 818 South Pike Street in an IL zoning district.

Bradburn: Excellent. We'll open up to the petitioner.

Eric Glasco: Good evening. My name's Eric Glasco with law firm Stevenson Rife, here on behalf of Mr. Vanzo. As the planning staff indicated, this deals with 818 South Pike Street, which is a piece of real estate. Right behind the old Mickey's T Mart. I like coming here because we get the history from Adam, but as I'm walking in, Doug's giving me the history of the building on what all used to be in this warehouse. So, I won't pretend to know more than Doug on that, but I think it used to be Keifer Storage that was over there, and some other storage facilities were based out of there. It actually was originally residential before the storage was added, and that residential use was maintained for a significant period of time. At some point around 2022, or maybe a little bit before that, that residential use stopped. So, where it used to be what we would call a legal non-conforming use, which means that it doesn't fit the zoning, the IL, but it's a legal use because it's being allowed. That ceased to go away when that use stopped. And so, they looked at electrical records. The Planning Department looked at electrical records to determine that residential use stopped. So, in order for the owner to use it as residential, which is his intention—I'll talk a little bit about that—we now need to come back in front of you and request that the use variances, which is what we're doing this evening. Mr. Vanzo has family that lives in the area, one of which is a sister that has special needs. His intention would be to move back to the area, use this as his residence so that he can assist with taking care of that sister. So, he's looking to use the portion of it in the front that was residential, but also expand some into, I believe, two, maybe four of the existing storage units and incorporate those into the residential nature of this. We gave you some site plans or some potential building plans, I believe, are part of the packet. I just kind of want to make it clear. Building permits have not been applied for. The plans have not been finally approved with final authority. So, these are kind of just a rough

schematic of what the development would look like if it were to be approved for residential use, and it were to go through with the construction. And I'm happy to answer any questions you have.

Bradburn: Excellent. Thanks. We'll open up to board questions. Start down here with Mr. Cassidy.

Cassidy: Do you know what will be stored in the back buildings? That, you know, is he renting those out, using for self-storage, or what's?

Glasco: He rents those out. They're currently rented. I think they have some vacancies, but some of them are rented. They will continue to be rented. I mean, there are legal requirements of what can and cannot be stored in a storage unit and so I would assume that they're abiding by that and meeting those standards. But no, he does not. We don't know exactly what's going to be stored there. Adam could add a little bit more to this, but with this being IL, and the residential being adjacent to industrial, and specifically with the storage facility and the lack of knowledge of what's in there. The design standards that have to be met for the residential will kind of go, it's my understanding, go beyond the local, and they'll have to meet state design standards as well for that residential construction to increase safety and and on that front part of the building.

Cassidy: And he's just tearing off the wooden part, not the block part on the south end of that building? It's block?

Glasco: Yeah, that's my understanding. I mean, obviously, one of the goals is to make the entire facade look better. So, if you've seen it, it needs some work. So, I, you know, with the amount of investment that's going into it, I don't think the block building is going to look the way it does now. But I don't think he's looking to rebuild the entire block structure. I think that that is going to be maintained.

Cassidy: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you.

Bradburn: Go to Mr. Garrett.

Garrett: Yeah, I just want to make sure the petitioner is aware of the conditions imposed on this and make sure he's okay with that.

Glasco: Yeah, I got a copy of the conditions, and I emailed those to him, and he did not have any issues with those. He's actually on the Zoom. If he had issues, he could, you know, make a comment on that. I believe that there is an additional structure being built, which is a garage that'll be kind of on the north side. You can kind of see that in the plans. And so, he wanted to make sure that that was taken into account with the landscaping buffer, which I believe it is on the ingress and egress on that.

Garrett: That's all I have. Thank you.

Bradburn: Ms.Newkirk. Welcome to the board.

Blake Newkirk: Thank you so much. I don't have any questions right now. Mine was answered earlier in the pre-meeting.

Bradburn: Do you want to restate that just in case, you know, so it's on the record as opposed to the pre-meeting.

Newkirk: Absolutely. So, I had asked earlier how we would go about enforcing not the ordinances but the conditions that were being suggested here by the staff and they had explained how they would go about doing that. So, that answered my question.

Bradburn: I couldn't remember what you had asked, so I wanted to make sure if it was something I needed to address and go on the record, I could. Thanks. Excellent. I have no questions. We'll close that portion, and open up the public portion. Is anybody in the public interested in speaking? No one online?

Evans: No.

Bradburn: You look over your shoulder to look on Facebook, I guess. I don't know. All right, all right. So, we'll close up the public meeting portion, and open up to board discussion and/or motions.

Cassidy: I'd like to make a motion to approve the requested variance to allow the residential use in the western portion of the site according to the staff's report and to approve the inclusion of the four conditions that were listed.

Bradburn: Got a motion. Do I hear a second?

Newkirk: Second.

Bradburn: Yay. That was Ms.Newkerk, by the way, for the second. No, no, no. It's in there. It's in there now. Okay, we have a motion seconded. Please cast your ballot for BZA 2026-01.

Evans: Okay, this is for BZA 2026-01. Ms.Newkirk votes yes. Mr. James votes yes. Mr. Cassidy votes yes. Mr. Bradburn votes yes. So, the quorum has approved. Motion passes. Moving on to the second petition. Whenever you're ready, Secretary.

Evans: Yes. Moving on. The second item under new business is BZA 2026-02, and this is for Timothy Vanzo, development standard variances. The first variance is for a front yard setback, which is along Pike Street. So, current zoning, any modification brings current setback, which

would be 50 ft. And he's asked that that be brought back to zero, which would comply with the existing block structure.

Bradburn: Excellent. How about we discuss all three together in the public meeting portion, and then we'll obviously vote each one of them separately?

Evans: Yes, that'll work. So, moving along, our second one on the agenda would be 2026-02-B, which is a development standard variance for a side yard setback on the north property line. The third and final under, excuse me, under 2026-02 is the development standard variance for the landscaping standards buffer yard on the north side of the property. So, those are the three.

Evans: Excellent. Thank you. All right, petitioner.

Glasco: Thank you. Still Eric Glasco. I appreciate you bringing up all three at once because I think they all kind of relate to the same issue, which is the way that this site is laid out is not necessarily the most conducive for the IL current zoning standard. So, when we're doing these, it's hard to make the setbacks work with a smaller site like this. So we are looking at setbacks as to the front and sideyard. Pretty much because the building is already within those setback areas on the sideyard. That's going to be a little bit of where they're wanting to build the new garage. There's also not enough room for that landscaping buffer that would normally be in the IL. So you can see along the north you know, so the main things on the front and the side is just an issue of where the existing structures are, and wanting to kind of have those still be in compliance and not violate the UDO standards that are applied to this case. Along the north side, you know, they're not looking to lessen the landscaping that's required, but merely to be able to place it closer to the property line. There is a trail that kind of runs, a proposed trail, at an angle across the northern part of this, northwestern side of this parcel. The proposed development and this landscaping is going to do a couple things. One is going to provide this new structure that will help to shield the storage facility from the view of the trail and any future parks there. Then also, this high density of tree planting that will be along that northern side will also help to provide some shade in that area and also some vegetation for the trails. So we would ask that we get those variances, one, to just make the development conducive for the parcel, but then also to allow us to get a little bit closer to the property line on that landscaping buffer.

Bradburn: Excellent. Thank you. Let's begin with board questions down there with Ms.Newkerk.

Newkerk: I don't have any questions exactly. I just want to ask if you could pass along to your client, "Thank you for wanting to invest in a current structure and beautify an area, especially a structure that doesn't currently look that great." So, thank you for doing that.

Bradburn: Mr. Garrett.

Garrett: Similar to Ms.Newkerk. I just want to welcome Mr. Vanzo back to Shelbyville. We are glad to have you back.

Bradburn: All right, Mr. Cassidy.

Cassidy: Sidewalks? Are you going to redo all the sidewalks through there? At least in front of that property, because driving by it looks like they're breaking up. I know the city's supposed to, but within?

Glasco: I would imagine if you make that a stipulation of the construction, then that's definitely something for them to consider. I don't know what all that would entail at this point. Partly because do we even own the sidewalks, or are those city property? And when we start doing construction on city property, that's...

Adam Rude: I'll give you a better answer. They'll more than likely damage it and if the sidewalks are damaged, they'll repair them. They'll have to replace them. So, I don't envision them being able to build a zero foot setback and not break the sidewalks that are there. So, that might be easier...

Glasco: I have faith in our construction.

Cassidy: Oh, that's all I have. Thank you.

Bradburn: Yeah, yeah. I would just echo the other comments here. It's great when folks want to invest and reinvest in the community. Appreciate the application, very compelling as well as the staff's report. So, we'll close that portion, open up any public meeting or, excuse me, public comment. All right. Seeing none, we'll kick it back to the board up here.

Garrett: I'd like to make a motion to approve of the requested development standards variance from UDO 5.155-E setback standards front yard setback reducing from 50 ft to zero ft to match the existing structure in accordance with the documents submitted pursuant to the finding of fact presented in the Planning Staff report.

Bradburn: Got a motion. Do I hear a second?

Cassidy: Second.

Bradburn: Seconded by Mr. Cassidy. Please cast your votes for UDO 2026-2 A. That's for the front yard setback.

Evans: Results of the vote for BZA 2026-02A, front yard setback. Ms. Newkirk votes yes. Mr. Garrett votes yes. Mr. Cassidy votes yes. Mr. Bradburn votes yes. So, it does pass.

Bradburn: Okay. Moving on. Let's entertain the F, the side yard setback.

Garrett: I'd like to make a motion to approve the requested development standards variance from UDO 5.55-F setback standards, side yard setbacks, reducing from 25 ft to 17 ft in accordance with the documents submitted pursuant to the findings and facts presented in the Planning Staff's report.

Bradburn: Motion, hear a second?

Newkirk: Second.

Bradburn: Okay. Got a motion and a second for UDO 2026-2. This is F, sideyard side. Please cast your votes.

Evans: We knew what you're doing. The result of the vote for BZA 2026-02 B, sideyard setback. Ms. Newkirk votes yes. Mr. Garrett votes yes. Mr. Bradburn did not vote. Mr. Cassidy votes yes. Mr. Bradburn also votes yes. So, that passes.

Bradburn: All right, last one. This one's C. Looking at the landscape standards.

Garrett: I'd like to make a motion to approve the requested development standards variance from UDO 5.32-H, landscaping standards buffer yard type three, reducing the buffer yard in accordance with the document submitted pursuant to the findings of facts presented in the Planning Staff's report.

Newkirk: Second.

Bradburn: All right. Got a motion to second for UDO, or 2026-2C. Please cast your ballots.

Evans: The result of the vote for BZA 2026-2C buffer yard landscaping set or reduction would be Mr. Bradburn voted yes, Mr. Cassidy votes yes, Ms.. Newkirk votes yes, and Mr. Garrett votes yes. So, that also passes.

Bradburn: Excellent. Congratulations. Appreciate your work and best welcome to the project.

Cassidy: You have time?

Glasco: I do not. I think part of it becomes the approvals to get the building permits. Adam, how long does it take the state to get?

Rude: Yeah, because it's not fully a residential structure. It's called a Class 1 structure, and it'll have to go to the state for construction design release, where they do, there'll be a number of fire related codes that they'll have to comply with because of the mix of uses. It could take several months, probably just depending on how far along they are in design.

Bradburn: Looks like we're finished with the new business. Moving on to discussions.

Rude: We had put the annual joint Plan Commission BZA meeting on here because I thought by now I would know if we were actually going to be able to have an annual report done by the end of this month to have that meeting. So what I will report to the board is that by the end of this week we will know if we'll actually have enough done to have that annual meeting this month. One way or another, we will send a follow-up email to both BZA and the Plan Commission on when that joint meeting will be, so that we can review that annual report and some training. I'm going to squeeze in some training for this year's annual meeting, but I was hoping to have—things have not slowed down. So, I was hoping to have a, be able to give you guys some more insight on if we are actually going to be able to get you an annual report by the end of the month. So, that's all I have to report, though.

Garrett: Would that still be before a Plan Commission meeting?

Rude: More than likely.

Garrett: So, we will be fed?

Rude: Yes. I think you've made me say that twice on the record now. At a Plan Commission meeting and a BZA meeting. So, yeah, we'll feed you.

Newkirk: So, is there a potential date in mind for that?

Rude: Yeah. We typically have it like the hour and a half before the regular Plan Commission meeting.

Newkirk: And what is the time for the regular Plan Commission?

Rude: 7:00. So, 5:30-ish, 5:30, depending on how much content we have to get through and how much the Plan Commission has to do that night afterwards. And there will be a Plan Commission meeting for—yeah, that's all I have for discussion, though.

Cassidy: Motion to adjourn.

Bradburn: Accepted. Meeting adjourned.