**Fountain County BZA Special Meeting**

**Date & Time:** Thursday, September 11, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

**Location:** Fountain County Courthouse

**Board Members Present:**

Jessica Anderson

John Allen

Chris May (joining via Zoom)

Daye Phillippo

Jon Schrock (joined by Zoom before arriving in person)

**Agenda**

Interested Parties Rule for Appeal Hearings

**Minutes**

* Meeting called to order
* Pledge of Allegiance to the flag
* Quorum established. Daye Phillippo makes a motion to take up Interested Parties Rule. John Allen seconds. Proposed rule is read:

I move that the Fountain County Board of Zoning Appeals adopt a rule defining “Interested Parties” for appeal hearings as follows:

An “interested party” shall include any property owner whose land is located with 300 feet of the boundary line of any parcel included in the permit area subject to the appeal, as well as any additional individual or entities as determined by the Board in accordance with Indiana law.”

Discussion:

* Jon S. proposes the distance be changed to a one mile radius.
* Jessica A. clarifies the difference between interested parties and public notice, stressing that we should not be arbitrary, and that a mile could water down the standing of the adjacent or near adjacent residents. She explains that precedent in Indiana suggests that 600 feet would be in keeping with being measured but give some additional buffer to projects.
* Daye P. reads her own prepared opinion statement regarding “interested parties” (attached)
* Chris M. mentions the option for a secondary enhanced notice rule according to state law.
* Daye Phillippo withdraws the original motion so an amended motion can be issued.
* Jon Schrock moves to reissue the motion. Chris May seconds.

Proposed amended rule is read:

An “interested party” shall include any property owner whose land is located with 600 feet of the boundary line of any parcel included in the permit area subject to the appeal, as well as any additional individual or entities as determined by the Board in accordance with Indiana law.”

* Jessica Anderson again opens the floor for discussion. No discussion. She calls for the vote.
* All vote in favor by roll call. The amended motion passes.
* Jessica Anderson motions to adjourn. Chris May seconds. All vote in favor.

**Next Scheduled Meeting:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

**Submitted by Daye Phillippo**

**Daye Phillippo’s “Interested Parties” opinion statement**

In determining interested parties in any huge new construction project, our roadways are a consideration. Who will fund all the necessary repairs if/when huge, heavy construction equipment destroys our chip & seal and gravel roads? County taxpayers? If so, every single taxpayer of this county would seem to me to be an “interested party.”

Likewise, if a project requires fencing thousands of acres to keep deer out of the places they can currently roam freely, it has the potential to affect every single resident of this county.

Not only would a project requiring fencing like that give increased deer pressure on the farmers who are raising food crops, there would be greatly increased movement of deer into the roadways we all travel, driving kids to school and to other events, driving to go shopping locally or in a bigger city, and for so many, commuting to work both locally and to the bigger cities nearby at dawn and dusk when deer are most active and difficult to see. Deer already cause many car accidents on our rural roads. How many more accidents are deer are likely to cause if they have *thousands* fewer acres on which to roam? In the case of a project like that, every single resident of this rural county who uses the roads would seem to me to be an “interested party.”

Without a doubt, the farmers in this county would not only have to absorb the losses from increased deer pressure on their crops, but would also have the possibility of the disruption caused by large construction equipment blocking their access to grain bins and/or to their fields during the construction phase which could take a very long time. In this instance, these farmers would most certainly seem to me to be “interested parties.”

And what about emergency services to rural residents? If roads have to be closed due to either degradation caused by heavy construction equipment, or by the roads being blocked by that equipment, would ambulances and firetrucks be able to get where they need to be in a timely manner? Again, this would seem to me a reason to consider every single rural resident of this county to be an “interested party.”

And for all of us in Fountain County, those who live in the towns and cities, and those who live out in the country, don’t we all have a duty of care for the well-being of our neighbors? After all, loving our neighbor as we love ourselves is one of the two greatest commandments.

“Jesus said to him, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ This is *the* first and great commandment. And *the* second *is* like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets”

(Matthew 22: 37 – 40).

These are my own thoughts and opinions as an almost 30-year-long resident of Fountain County. I submit them to fellow board members for their consideration in helping us determine who qualifies as an “interested party” that should be notified of sweeping changes with the potential to affect so many people in our county.

Daye Phillippo

September 2025