

Piatt County
Zoning Board of Appeals

January 25, 2024

Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 25, 2024 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. Chairman Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Attending were Dan Larson, Kyle Lovin, Will Chambers and Keri Nusbaum.
County Board members in attendance: Gail Jones, Kathleen Piatt.

MOTION: Lovin made motion, seconded by Larson to approve the minutes from December 21, 2023 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved.

Public Comments: None

Daniel E. (Zeke) Wade applied for a variation to allow construction of a new single family dwelling on 10.13 acres of A-1 Agriculture land located at 1058 E 2250 North Road, Monticello. He recently purchased the property. He states there was a homestead on the land at one point. There is approximately 1- 1.5 acres of the property available for building, and that is where he will place the home. The LESA score is low. (175.05) Part of the property is in timber, and has not been farmed. The ZBA members considered the zoning factors.

VARIATION ZONING FACTORS- Wade

1. Will the proposed use compete with the current use of the land?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the proposed use would not compete with the current use.
2. Will the proposed use diminish property values in surrounding areas?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that it will not diminish property values in the surrounding area,
3. Would a denial of the variance promote the health, safety and general welfare of the public?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there was no evidence that a denial would not promote the health, safety and welfare of the public.
4. Would denying the variance create a hardship for the landowner?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that denying the variance would be an inconvenience.
5. Would granting the variance create a hardship for the surrounding property owners?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there is no evidence that granting the variance would create a hardship for surrounding property owners.
6. Is the property suitable for its current use?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the property is suitable for the current use.
7. Is the property suitable for the proposed use?
Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the property is suitable for the proposed use.

8. Is there a community need to deny the variance?

No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there is no evidence of a need to deny the variance.

9. Is the subject property non-productive with its current use?

Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that only approximately one acre of the subject property has ever been in production.

10. Would a granting of this variance compete with the Piatt County Comprehensive Plan?

No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the variance would not compete with the comprehensive plan.

MOTION: Chambers made motion, seconded by Lovin, to recommend approval of the variation to the county board.

MOTION: Larson made motion, seconded by Lovin to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor and the meeting adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum
Piatt County Zoning Officer