

Meeting Minutes
Board of Zoning Appeals
January 8, 2026

Members present: Don Criswell, Chr
Dave Barker, Vice Chr
Debbie Brammer, VBM
Peggy Manor, VBM
Jennifer Kelsik, VBM
Joel Harvey, Atty
Kenny Melton, Sec
Janet Davis, Clerk
Kelly Allen, Clerk

Absent:

Also in attendance: Scott Semler, Louise Thompson, Kim Reno, Brian Ausier, Michael (Tony) Piper, Greg York, Sam Hall, Tiffany Youngquist, Megan Kraus, Shelly Hanson, Michael Regner, Austin Bolin, Michael Crabtree, Michele Young

The New Castle Board of Zoning Appeals met on Thursday, January 8, 2026, in the City Council Chambers.

City Attorney Joel Harvey brought the meeting to order at 6:00pm, reading board member Don Criswell's reappointment by Mayor Greg York, effective January 1, 2026 and expiring December 31, 2029. Mr. Harvey then opened the floor to nominations for the 2026 Chairman of this Board. Peggy Manor nominated Dave Barker; second made by Don Criswell. With no additional nominations, the board members then voted and the motion passed unanimously. Mr. Harvey then turned the meeting over to Chairman Barker. When the Chair called for nominations for vice-chairman, Debbie Brammer nominated Don Criswell to serve as vice chair as Mr. Criswell simultaneously volunteered to serve as vice chairman. With no additional nominations, this motion also passed unanimously.

After the Chairman confirmed the members had reviewed the minutes from the November 13, 2025 meeting, Peggy Manor made a motion to accept the minutes, second by Debbie Brammer; the motion to accept the minutes passed unanimously. Chairman Barker then explained the procedures of the meeting to those in attendance, and further confirmed for the applicants that all voting members were present. They were also advised that three affirmative votes were required for a request to be granted.

The Chairman then introduced the first item on the agenda, BZA-13-25, an application made by Scott Semler of Destination Rentals LLC, 5443 N CR 300W, Middletown; requesting a use variance to use the existing single-family residence and separate garage apartment at 1620 P Avenue, New Castle as a multifamily property; in R1 single-family residential zoning. This application was postponed from the December meeting, due to lack of a quorum.

Mr. Semler addressed the board members, informing them he worked for Community North Hospital, working weekend options which allows him to work on properties during the week. He began purchasing and renovating properties as a hobby in 2022, with several of these properties located in New Castle. He informed the board members that he bought his first house at the age of 19, and is now 45, as he provided documentation that included before and after pics of homes he had purchased and renovated. The Building Commissioner had already completed a site inspection so Mr. Semler was aware of the corrections required and intends to modify as needed to code. He had also hired Cory Owens, a local home inspector, to inspect the home, as well. He then provided letters of reference. One of these letters was written by the current homeowner, Tina Cavanagh, who was in attendance at this meeting. Her letter explained how, although she had owned the home and lived there for several years, her grandfather previously owned the home and had added the garage apartment back in 1962. Parking for the garage apartment was available behind the garage at the alley, with two spots in front of the house as well. Mr. Semler felt very confident he could manage this property. He did not intend to make many changes to the property, as it had been very well maintained. He believed approval of this request would help provide additional housing that the community needs. He used a local realtor and local property manager to help him. He then provided a letter of reference from a previous tenant who had become a current tenant again, because of how he maintains his properties.

Dave Barker then confirmed the garage apartment had actually been added 60 years ago, and Debbie Brammer added that the apartment had not been done legally, which was the reason this application was made.

Peggy Manor asked Mr. Semler to explain the parking, to confirm it would not be an issue. Mr. Semler told her the pad in the rear allowed for two cars. Ms. Cavanagh then confirmed she had just moved from the property, and there are two parking spaces in the rear for the garage apartment.

Dave Barker asked if the garage located below the apartment was used for parking, and Mr. Semler informed him it was not at the present but he may add a garage door at a later time. Peggy Manor then asked where the entrance to access the garage apartment was located, and was told it was at the front of the garage, away from the alley.

Don Criswell asked to confirm what made this situation illegal, and Joel Harvey informed him the property was zoned R1 for single family use, and did not allow multiple units on a parcel. Debbie Brammer again confirmed that Mr. Semler would not be remodeling the garage to add an apartment, but was only asking to use the apartment that already existed. The only changes he intended were to bring it to code. Mr. Criswell then confirmed the apartment was built in 1962.

When the Chairman asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the request, Kim Reno approached the board, stating she and Ms. Cavanagh were very close growing up. She had moved to Pennsylvania and, when she moved back after her husband's passing, Tina allowed her to stay in the apartment for a year. She did not experience any parking problems and was never aware of any parking issues at this property. She did not notice issues with street parking, either.

Louise Thompson, 508 West Michigan Street, Greenfield then addressed the board, advising she was a Senior Home Coach and also works for Remax First Integrity Real Estate at 1484 South Memorial Drive, New Castle. She had compiled a packet of information for the board members, including a letter from the current property owner; notes from two former tenants; references for Mr. Semler, the potential buyer, including a letter from a current local tenant; listings for rental properties that were for rent in the vicinity; and before and after pictures of properties Mr. Semler had purchased and renovated. She believed he had been working very hard to improve the availability of local housing. Some of the homes he kept as rental properties, and some he had sold to mostly first-time home buyers. She has seen the need for both rental properties and for properties to purchase.

Mr. Semler then told the board members that he forgot to mention that he found 1902 Rosemont Avenue, which was .3 miles from the P Avenue property, that was used a multifamily property.

With no one else present wishing to speak in favor of the request, the Chair then offered the floor to anyone wishing to speak in opposition. Brian Auxier, 1622 P Avenue, New Castle, addressed the board, stating he was the owner of the property adjacent to the east of 1620 P Avenue. He had lived there for over 21 years. He had not experienced any problems with the property as it had been used as multiunit, but felt the apartment over the garage had probably been dormant more than it had been utilized over the years. He believed Ms. Cavanagh had not used the apartment as a rental, but only offered it to family and friends at various times. The current owner had been a good neighbor, and had done an excellent job in upkeep of the property. He was concerned, if the variance was approved, about renting the units to two unrelated families that may not get along. He felt street parking was a factor at times, and provided the example of how, over the recent holidays, a neighbor down the street who was on oxygen and needed to park close to her residence, had difficulty parking at her residence due to the excessive number of vehicles parked on the street. She, as well as other neighbors, had signed a petition in opposition to this request, that had been submitted to the Building Commissioner's office. The width of the lot was 33' wide on the Beacon map. A standard municipal curb parking spot was 18' to 22', so the lot width did not allow for two cars to park street side. Therefore, renting the house and the apartment could cause a parking issue. Steve Rust created an apartment on the south side of the laundry across the street. In summation, it has been a great place to live, and he was concerned how approving this use would affect the neighborhood. It was a good starter neighborhood with many generational family homes. Allowing the multifamily use had the potential of creating parking issues, and the property was not zoned for that use. The property lies 13' away from his house.

When no one else chose to speak on the matter, Scott Semler asked if he could approach the board again, and stated he had a local property manager who visits his properties twice a year. Peggy Manor informed him that twice a year was not enough. Mr. Semler answered that he was aware the situation was not perfect. Mrs. Manor asked how long his leases were, and Mr. Semler told her one year, then added he also performs background checks on the applicants prior to leasing. Mr. Semler also added that Mr. Auxier had his own driveway to park his vehicles.

Janet Davis then informed the board, for the record, that the Building Commissioner's office had received letters regarding this application from Mr. Auxier, who had also chosen to speak at this

meeting; from the current owner, Tina Cavanagh, who had also chosen to speak at this meeting; and a petition that was also submitted by Mr. Auxier.

Peggy Manor then asked if the UDO allowed for this situation, and Kenny Melton told her since this property was zoned R1 that it did not. He confirmed Mr. Semler's earlier statement that the apartment would be required to be brought to current code. Mr. Melton also mentioned that the UDO now allows for ADU's but this property would not meet those guidelines.

Mr. Auxier then pointed out that he had included a survey in the documents he had submitted, that was performed by Coor's of Knightstown, that showed the garage apartment building was not 5' off the alley. Mr. Auxier also pointed out that the petition he had submitted had been signed by eight of the twenty homeowners on the block. Dave Barker then asked if setback of the garage apartment was relevant in this situation, and Kenny Melton stated that the existing structure would be considered grandfathered. Mr. Auxier then expressed concern that Mr. Semler might try to add more apartments to the garage if this request was approved for multifamily use. He was then informed that the approval, if granted, would be to use the existing apartment. He would have to return to the board and make a new request if he wanted to expand the number of units on the property.

Dave Barker then confirmed with Janet Davis that the legal requirements for this request had been met.

Jennifer Kelsik asked about the apartment in the rear of the building where Aariah's Nail Glam was located. Kenny Melton advised her that building had been mixed occupancy since Steve Rust had added the apartment years ago.

Louise Thompson then asked if Mr. Semler could provide his property manager's contact information to neighbors so that they could reach out with any issues that may arise at this property. Peggy Manor then reiterated that the manager should be checking on the properties more than twice a year so that issues could be caught and resolved quickly. Mr. Semler then informed her that, although he lived in Middletown, he was in New Castle often, and checked on his properties as well.

The Chair then offered the floor to anyone else wishing to speak on the request, and with no response, he then asked the board members if they had additional questions. When no additional discussion followed, Chairman Barker then called for voting. After conducting a roll call vote, Janet Davis announced the following outcome:

BZA-13-25: granted 3-2

Mr. Semler was advised to contact the Building Inspector's office to obtain the appropriate permits, once the transaction was completed.

The Chairman then introduced the next request on this agenda, BZA-1-26, an application made by Michael A. Piper, 1229 South Main Street, New Castle; requesting a development variance for the 24' x 25' garage that was placed on the blacktopped surface of the upper level of his property, which was not located in the rear yard, and may not meet the side setback requirement; in R1 single-family residential zoning.

Michael Piper, who goes by Tony, addressed the board regarding his request. He told the board he had lived in New Castle his whole life; he was retired; was a pastor; currently owned rental properties in New Castle and in Lewisville; was a multisport coach for the New Castle schools, and operated the local wrestling club; and also had purchased the church at 19th Street and G Avenue, reviving the run-down property and giving it new life.

He informed the board members that he and his wife did not have a garage on the property, and the rear yard is lower with a pretty steep embankment, making it difficult to park in the rear yard. They had purchased and placed the garage on the upper level of the property, on the existing blacktop surface that was once a parking lot. He then reminded them that this property had previously been a dentist office and this had been the lot for that office. He and his wife believed the added garage makes the property more functional as a residence, and the location of the garage allows it to be used for parking that is easily accessed from the house. They have had issues with random vehicles frequently using the blacktop as a parking lot, and the Pipers felt locating the garage on the lot helped indicate the lot belongs to their house and was for their personal use. The colors of the garage were chosen to match their house. The required newspaper ad and notices to the neighbors had been made, and he had spoken to his neighbor to the north where the garage was placed, who had no issue with the garage. He apologized for their oversight in placing the garage without first checking with the city.

Debbie Brammer confirmed the garage was already on the property. Mr. Piper clarified the location of the garage for the board members, and told them that he and his wife had also added planters to the asphalted area to help eliminate the nuisance parking they'd experienced. Don Criswell then confirmed with Mr. Piper that he and his wife not only owned the property but lived there as well. Mr. Piper also pointed out that parking at the upper level was easier to access the house then parking in the lower rear yard would be.

Dave Barker then confirmed with Janet Davis that the legal requirements had been met by this applicant. He then offered the floor to any one present who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, the request with no response. He then called for voting, and after conducting a roll call vote, Janet Davis announced the following outcome:

BZA-1-26: granted 5-0

Mr. Piper was then advised he would need to purchase a building permit from the Building Inspector's office.

Chairman Barker then introduced the third item on this agenda, BZA-2-26, an application made by Greg York, 545 South Main Street, New Castle; requesting a development standards variance, to add an attached 24' x 30' garage to the west side of the residence without meeting the setback requirements on the west and south property lines; in R3 single-, two- and multi-family residential zoning. After introducing the application, Chairman Barker recused himself from this request, since he worked for the applicant.

Mr. York explained that he had recently purchased the property from Sam Hall. The home had been built in the late 1800's and there was no garage on the property. He and his wife wanted to add an attached garage, with a master bedroom and master bath above it. For a 23' x 30' garage,

he would need 3' on the west side of the property, and 7' on the south side. He believed this addition would improve both the value of this property and the surrounding neighborhood. He and his wife will live at this residence. It would not be a rental or a flip.

Jennifer Kelsik confirmed the space above the garage would not be a separate apartment. The property will remain a single-family residence. The garage would be a double with steps and a ramp to the house. Debbie Brammer asked if the addition would match the existing exterior of the house and Mr. York confirmed it would. Don Criswell asked how far off the required setbacks his plan was, and Mr. York stated it was 6' from an existing garage on the west side and 7' on the north side. The property was a corner lot, which meant it had two front yards and two side yards, and the garage would not extend into the yard on Lincoln Avenue beyond the front line of houses on that block.

Peggy Manor asked if the neighboring property to the west was the same property where this board had approved a massage therapist's request to operate from her home. Mrs. Manor was concerned about whether an added garage could create a parking issue on Lincoln Avenue. When she was informed the property where the therapist was approved was on the corner of South 12th Street and Lincoln Avenue, and not the property immediately to the west, she felt that was not located close enough to be a factor.

The Chairman then asked if the board members had any additional questions, and when there were none forthcoming, he then asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the request.

Sam Hall, 539 South Main Street, New Castle, informed the board that he lived at the house next door to the property in this application, and that he was the previous owner who sold it to Mr. York. He had been in this neighborhood for 55 years, and currently owned 7 other properties in the neighborhood. He was in support of the new addition and was in favor of granting the request.

When the Chair asked for anyone else in favor of the request, and then anyone who might be opposed, he did not receive a response. Jennifer Kelsik confirmed with Janet Davis that the legal requirements for this application had been met, and for the record, Mrs. Davis advised the members that Sam Hall's address of record was the property he had sold to Mr. York, so the notice was mailed to the house next door at Mr. Hall's request. Obviously, Mr. Hall received his notice since he was present to speak in favor of the request. Chairman Barker then called for voting, and after completing a roll call vote, Janet Davis announced the following outcome:

BZA-2-26: granted 4-0, with one voting member abstaining

Mr. York was told to reach out to the Building Inspector's office when he was ready to proceed with his project.

The Chairman then introduced the final item on this agenda, BZA-3-26, an application made Henry County Women's Recovery Center, represented by Tiffany Youngquist, 1317 Broad Street, New Castle; requesting a use variance at 423 South 11th Street, New Castle; to allow the operation of a non-residential women's recovery center within the existing church building; for

daytime, non-overnight recovery services that support women in addiction recovery; in R2 single- and two-family residential zoning.

Tiffany Youngquist, 3619 South Leeson Drive, New Castle, informed the board that the recovery center was currently located at the rear of Koontz Insurance, located at 1317 Broad Street, New Castle.

Megan Kraus, Shelly Hanson and she began the recovery center in 2023 in the space in the back of Koontz Insurance office. Currently, they were operating day classes on Mondays and Wednesdays, and that remained their plan as they moved forward. They had been at that location for over a year, with no complaints about their women. Their recovery services were not court mandated. All were there by choice. The service was a Christ centered, biblically based service, helping women discover who they were in the Lord to help them beat their addictions. This was a church building that had been used for a similar purpose, to reach people who were lost to bring them to the saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Debbie Brammer confirmed they were not functioning as a church, although it was a church building. Don Criswell asked if the church building was currently being used as a kindergarten, since this board had approved a variance for that use. Ms. Youngquist informed him the building was owned by Heartland Christian School but a kindergarten was not operating at the property. The recovery center wished to lease the property for their use now. They would maintain the property, and they did not intend to make any changes to the structure, as they believed it was a fantastic building that had been well maintained.

Jennifer Kelsik asked how many women attended a class, and was told the largest class included eight women. Tiffany Youngquist further stated they did not intend to exceed ten women in a class. The sessions were 2 hours in length and held in the mornings, from 10:00am until noon.

Dave Barker then confirmed with Janet Davis that the legals had been met, and Mrs. Davis also stated for the record that one certified receipt had the wrong address but the green card had been returned, and it reflected the appropriate address as well as the owner's signature.

When the Chairman asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the request, Shelly Hanson, 308 South Main Street, New Castle, approached the board, informing them she was part of the center, and taught one of the classes. She wanted to address the concerns that people sometimes had when they are aware that people with addictions would be in their neighborhood. She pointed out it had functioned as a church building until about May of last year, so it was already a place where broken people should be able to come to get help.

Peggy Manor confirmed that those who attended their counselling services were not court ordered but were choosing their services. Dave Barker wondered how the women got to their counselling services, and was told they arrived by various methods. Jennifer Kelsik asked if any classes were held at Hagar's Hope and was told there were not, as it was a transition home that did not include a structured program. They have actually partnered with Hagar's Hope for those women to have a program available. Dave Barker confirmed that no one would reside at the recovery center.

Chairman Barker asked if the members had any additional questions, and when there were none, he offered the floor to anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. Megan Kraus, 5330 W CR 100S, New Castle, who was the executive director of the Henry County Women's Recovery Center, approached the board. She wanted them to understand that those who attended their services had no time to hang out. They came for counselling, and then they left. She believed in holding these women accountable, and does not want the neighbors disrupted. She was willing to provide her personal phone number to the neighbors to call if any issues arose. She holds the women in their program to very high standards.

The Chairman offered the floor to anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the request, and with no response, he then offered the floor to anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Michael Regner, 433 South 11th Street, New Castle, approached the board, telling them he lived adjacent to the property, and was a county councilman. He believed there was a need for women's shelters but doesn't think a residential neighborhood is a good place. He maintains the property for Heartland, mowing the yard, picking up trash and keeping the parking lot cleared. The drive between 11th and 10th Streets that goes to the side entrance to the church building was very heavily travelled by speeders. There was a big parking lot in the back with a basketball court where neighborhood kids hang out and play ball but it was also a place for undesirables to hang out at night. A lot of skate boarders hang there, as well. He has had to pick up a lot of beer bottles and syringes, and has had to call the police to the parking lot quite often.

He wondered if there would be daytime security for the property, as he also had concerns about disgruntled boyfriends or husbands showing up and causing problems in the neighborhood. He had lived at his home for over 33 years. These are adults so would there be a designated smoking area for them?

When Mr. Regner started to comment on potentially rezoning the church property, he was advised the request was not to rezone the property, but to allow this recovery center to use the church property for their specific purposes since current zoning did not allow it.

Jennifer Kelsik pointed out the undesirables were hanging out at night, and that was not when the recovery clients would be there. When she asked if Mr. Regner was paid by Heartland, he said he was. Peggy Manor asked if he had contacted the police department regarding the issues at the property, and he told them police had been called there on more than one occasion. He also informed the board that people were known to sleep in cars in the lot, as well. Debbie Brammer then asked if the issues described were happening when the church was still operating, and Mr. Regner said they were. When asked if the church addressed the issues described, he stated they did not because they were not around at the times the issues occurred. Peggy Manor asked if the women were there voluntarily seeking help, did he believe they would contribute to that problem? How would this center adversely affect the issue? He felt it hard to answer that because it was a "what if" question. Mr. Regner also stated he was big on shelters, and was informed this was not a request for a shelter, but to hold classes at the property. When he asked if the recovery center would have to return if they decided to become a shelter, he was told they would. A shelter would be an entirely different classification.

Mr. Regner then informed them he had already been living with a property to the south of his house that had been an eyesore for most of the years he had owned his home, and although that had nothing to do with the recovery center request, he did not need another issue near his house that would affect the value should he decide to sell. Whether the value of his property would be affected by a recovery center in the church building was difficult to determine.

Don Criswell then commented that if the property were used instead of vacant, it may stay in better shape. Jennifer Kelsik asked if the recovery group intended to place a sign, and they said they had considered a sign.

Austin Bolin, 928 Plum Street, New Castle, then approached the board, stating he lived directly behind the church. He was also informed the property was not being considered for rezoning. Don Criswell told him that since there was not a kindergarten currently operating in the church building, and should the board agree to approve this request, the kindergarten would have to appeal again. City attorney Joel Harvey agreed.

Mr. Bolin told them he was in recovery, was 3 years sober, had been in rehab, and had been involved in the recovery community personally. One of his main concerns was the road to the parking lot functions more like a one-way alley rather than a roadway, as it was very tight and difficult to navigate. Additional vehicle traffic from staff, visitors, deliveries, and residents would make it unsafe and impractical for them to access their garages. His next concern was the increased foot traffic in an area where the neighborhood was already struggling with individuals who appeared to have addiction issues, who were walking through the alley/road at all hours of the night and day, and they've had to call the police several times due to this activity. Approving a rehabilitation shelter at this location would create the need for a greater police presence in their neighborhood. This would place a greater burden on the police and would be a waste of tax dollars. Thirdly, they had serious concerns about trash and safety. They've invested in cleaning and maintaining their properties and were worried about discarded items and dangerous trash such as drug paraphernalia ending up in yards where their children play. They did not want to be responsible for cleaning up hazards created by a neighboring facility. Fourthly, property values matter and introducing a women's rehab facility in their residential neighborhood would negatively impact their property values, and make it more difficult to sell in the future. If our town believed shelters like this were necessary, they should be placed in a business or commercial district. Those who would be directly affected did not want this in their backyard.

From a personal perspective, he had been in recovery and was one of the very rare few that recover from drug addiction and alcoholism. The percentage of those who recover is less than 5%. If they are interested in helping people, there was AA, NA, CA, and many other 'A's available, and there was also a meeting guide app where a location could be entered to direct the user to the closest meeting. There were lots of people willing to help, and he was one of those people, just not in his backyard with it affecting his family. He was already dealing with picking up needles and booze bottles on a daily basis. He does not want the problem intensified, and does not want to welcome more of this. He did not want to call the police so often that he becomes the guy who cried wolf.

A short discussion followed regarding facts versus suppositions, and this conversation included the request was to allow counselling services and not open a shelter, as some had commented; the number and length of meetings, and how these could both change; how some addictions may need counseling instead of the 'A's mentioned; the suggestion that the center would be better off to start a church, and operate their own church program; the neighborhood was already dealing with some problems, and perhaps an occupied building might help the issues; whether these problems still existed when the church was operating; and whether fencing would help.

The board briefly discussed whether time limits were in place for those who wished to speak and agreed to revisit the matter further at a later time.

Next, the board heard from Michael Crabtree, who lived at 1000 Plum Street, New Castle, directly behind the church. He worked at the New Castle Correctional Facility, where he's seen a lot of people return to addiction. He personally thought it would lower his property value to have an addiction recovery center, and even just a sign for the center posted, and agreed with the other opinions expressed to the board.

Michele Young, 434 South 11th Street, New Castle, then addressed the board, stating she was in favor of a faith-based recovery center. She believed it was needed for both men and women, and believed they could all agree on this. She also agreed that a residential neighborhood was not the best place for them. She understood the women who used this center were there by choice and not forced into it, but her major concern was still a spouse or boyfriend bringing violence to their neighborhood, especially with a sign posted on the door. She agreed this was a place of hope but there had already been drug, alcohol, and gangster activity on the property. She and her husband both work from home and have seen what goes on at the church property. They've called the police who sometimes do not make an appearance. She realized the women would not be housed at this location but was still not in favor of approving it.

Janet Davis then stated for the record that a letter of opposition from Amy Grubbs, 422 South 11th Street, New Castle, was delivered to the Building Commissioner's office that morning. The letter had then been provided to the members of the board via email, prior to the meeting.

Chairman Barker then asked if anyone else wished to comment, and Megan Kraus asked if she could again address the board members. She wanted to respond to some of the issues the neighbors had expressed. Their center had no previous issues with males showing up. She has heard several comments mentioning shelter issues, and again stated this was not a request for a shelter. She found it sad that this neighborhood is dealing with the problems they've described, but the center was coming in to make a difference. She understood their worries and fears that the center may bring more issues, but active users can't make it to this program because they need an active live-in center. Hagar's Hope does not send an active addict to their center.

Peggy Manor then stated that, while she believes a church does not adversely affect the value of surrounding homes, she felt it would take some research to prove whether an addiction recovery center would or would not have an adverse effect on values. As an appraiser, she tended to think it might negatively affect them. Don Criswell commented that the problems the neighborhood

was currently dealing with was negative enough, and Mrs. Manor agreed that would need to be taken into consideration as well.

Jennifer Kelsik then asked how long the center had been looking to move locations, and was told they were starting to look at the end of fall last year, when they noticed the need to expand and grow. Their children attended Heartland School, and due to their existing relationship with the school, Heartland approached them about using the church property. Mrs. Kelsik then confirmed with Ms. Kraus that, if this location did not work out, the center would look for a different location.

Ms. Kraus also pointed out that Hagar's Hope was located just north of Indiana Avenue, just a few short blocks away, which was a live-in transition home. Chairman Barker then asked for clarification of what their class capacity might look like if their center were to grow. They felt they might grow up to 10 in a class, and if there was a greater need, they would consider increasing the number of classes up to maybe 4 per day. When the Chairman asked what the latest in the day they may have class, he was told they had considered a class for teenage girls which would require after school classes. For those, they would consider maybe a 4pm-6pm class time. Ms. Kraus then stated that they were not going to act like they were going to stay small. Addiction is a big problem and they want to make a big impact, and people were struggling. If they found teens with issues outside their facility, they are not going to ignore the problem, nor would they add to it. They would attack the problem and work to minister to them. They would like to start a teen night during the summer, initially for girls but may expand to include boys. They have been considering an eight-week program on Wednesday nights, to prevent addiction, or help prevent them from going into heavy addiction.

Mrs. Hansen then stated that they understood the fear of the neighbors, and those neighbors have made valid points. Two of the center's counselors have come out of addiction themselves, and they would love to see that neighborhood surround them to be a part of the solution, and sow a seed into making a change. There was a huge problem but there was hope. They wanted to teach the women how to be good neighbors. Tiffany Youngquist then added that all three of them were mothers, and they would not place anything into the community that would hurt families or place them at risk. They want to restore and rebuild families.

When Chairman Barker asked for additional questions or comments from the board, there were none. Michael Regner then asked to speak again, and he pointed out that when the presentation first started, there would be maybe ten people but that had grown into four classes of ten plus a Wednesday evening class. He was told that the growth was their dream, but not a fact. Mrs. Manor pointed out that the center may help contribute to the neighborhood, perhaps cleaning up some of the debris that the property owners had been dealing with, and contribute to their community.

Chairman Barker then called for voting, and after conducting roll call voting, Janet Davis announced the following outcome:

BZA-3-26: Denied 3-2

Several of the board members and audience members then commented that it wasn't to say that the need was not there, and the center was offered assistance from several of them. With no additional business, Peggy Manor made a motion to adjourn; second by Don Criswell. The meeting adjourned at 7:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Kenny Melton", written over a horizontal line.

Kenny Melton, Secretary
New Castle Board of Zoning Appeals