

Piatt County
Zoning Board of Appeals

June 25, 2026

Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2026 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. Chairperson Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Kyle Lovin and Robert Chambers, and Keri Nusbaum attended. Dan Larson and Jim Harrington were absent.

County Board members in attendance: Todd Henricks and Jerry Edwards.

The ZBA reviewed the minutes for May 28, 2026.

MOTION: Lovin made motion, seconded by Chambers, to approve the minutes from May 28, 2026 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved

Public Comments: None

Old Business

There has been no progress on a road use agreement for the Mansfield gravel pit.

Tree Line Solar LLC asked to be delayed to the July meeting while they work with neighbors.

New Business

Monica Munds was sworn in. She and her husband Michael applied for a Special Use Permit to allow two single family dwellings on a 1.60-acre parcel of I-B Interchange Business zoned land at 843 County Farm Road, Monticello. The current residence is existing non-conforming. Any residential use requires a special use permit in I-B zoning. They wish to build a single level ranch home approximately 1400 square feet. The ZBA members considered the zoning factors.

ZONING FACTORS – MUNDS

1. Does the current special use restriction promote health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public?
Yes. The property is zoned I-B Interchange business. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the current restriction promotes the health, safety, morals and welfare of the public.
- 2 Will granting the SUP be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?
No. The ZBA voted (3-0) that there is no evidence that it would be detrimental.
- 3 Will granting the special use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA agreed unanimously (3-0) that the special use would not be injurious.
4. Will granting the special use diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the SUP would not diminish property values in the vicinity.

5. Is there adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use, if granted (i.e. roads, utilities, drainage)?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that there is adequate infrastructure.
6. Are there adequate measures to provide ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets if the SUP is granted?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that there is egress and ingress.
7. Would the special use, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the special use would be in harmony.
8. Would the special use, if granted, compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone?
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that it would not compete or impede with the uses of other property.
9. Would the special use, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that it would not create a hardship.
10. Would denying the special use create a hardship on the applicant?
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that it would be an inconvenience.
11. Is the subject land suitable for the special use and is the subject land suitable for the current zoned use?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the property is suitable for the current use and for the special use.
12. Is the applicant's property, as presently zoned, vacant? If so, how long has it been vacant?
No. The ZBA agreed that the property is not currently vacant.
13. Would the special use, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that there is no evidence there would be a harmful impact on the soil.
14. What is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) rating for the subject land? N/A
15. Does the SUP conform to the regulations of the zoned district? The Zoning Board must find that there is a public necessity for the special use.
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the request conforms to the zoned district.
There is no public necessity, but the applicant has a need.

Motion: Lovin made motion to recommend approval to the county board with the condition that the existing dwelling be removed within 3 years. Chambers seconded. Roll was called, all in favor and the motion carried.

The County Board will consider the matter at their regular meeting on July 8, 2026.

Motion: Lovin made motion, seconded by Chambers to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor.
The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum
Piatt County Zoning Officer