

Piatt County
Zoning Board of Appeals

May 22, 2025

Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 22, 2025 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. Vice Chairperson Jim Harrington called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Dan Larson, Scott Jean, Bruce Stoddard, and Keri Nusbaum attended. Loyd Wax and Kyle Lovin were absent.

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

The ZBA reviewed the minutes for May 1, 2025.

MOTION: Larson made motion, seconded by Jean, to approve the minutes from May 1 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved.

Public Comments: None

New Business

Sara Gallagher applied for a special use permit for a home occupation for a hair salon and a setback variation for an addition to house the salon for A-1 zoned property located at 1497 N 1050 East Road, Monticello. She was sworn in. Harrington asked about parking spaces. She will be the only stylist and there should be no more than two clients at a time there. The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

ZONING FACTORS- Gallagher

1. Does the current special use restriction promote health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public?
Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the restriction does promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the public.
2. Will granting the SUP be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community.
3. Will granting the special use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity.
4. Will granting the special use diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not diminish property values in the immediate vicinity.
5. Is there adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use, if granted (i.e., roads, utilities, drainage)?

Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that there is adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use.

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 members agreed that there is adequate ingress and egress.

7. Would the special use, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?

Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the special use is in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan.

8. Would the special use, if granted, compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone?

No. The ZBA members agreed that the special use would not compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other properties within the zone.

9. Would the special use, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?

No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there is no evidence that it would create a hardship on other landowners within the zone.

10. Would denying the special use create a hardship on the applicant?

No. The ZBA members agreed that denying the Special use would not create a hardship for the applicant.

11. Is the subject land suitable for the special use and is the subject land suitable for the current zoned use?

Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the subject land is suitable for the special use and the current 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 vacant. The applicant is living there.

13. Would the special use, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?

No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the special use would not have 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 (4-0) that the SUP conforms to the special use.

N/A

MOTION: Stoddard made motion, seconded by Jean to recommend approval to the County Board. Roll was called. Harrington, Stoddard, Jean – Aye; Larson – Abstain. The motion is carried.

Travis Hermann applied for a Special Use for a bed and breakfast/tourist home for Residential Suburban property located at 1821 Lake Ridge West Road, Monticello. He was sworn in. They live next door to the subject property. It has been rented out for the last 4 years, but they would like to offer it as a short term vacation rental moving forward. There was no one signed in to object or question regarding the plan for the property. The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

ZONING FACTORS- T Hermann

3. Does the current special use restriction promote the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public?
Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the restriction does promote the health, safety and general welfare of the public.
4. Will granting the SUP be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community.
3. Will granting the special use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity.
4. Will granting the special use diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?
No. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that granting the SUP would not diminish property values in the immediate vicinity.
5. Is there adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use, if granted (i.e., roads, utilities, drainage)?
Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that there is adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use.
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 members agreed that there is adequate ingress and egress.
7. Would the special use, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?
Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the special use is in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan.
8. Would the special use, if granted, compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone?
No. The ZBA members agreed that the special use would not compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other properties within the zone.

9. Would the special use, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there is no evidence that it would create a hardship on other landowners within the zone.
10. Would denying the special use create a hardship on the applicant?
No. The ZBA members agreed that denying the Special use would not create a hardship for the applicant.
11. Is the subject land suitable for the special use and is the subject land suitable for the current zoned use?
Yes. The ZBA members agreed (4-0) that the subject land is suitable for the special use and the current use.
12. Is the applicant's property, as presently zoned, vacant? If so, how long has it been vacant?
Yes. The ZBA agreed that the property is vacant and has been vacant for approximately six months.
13. Would the special use, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the special use would not have 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 (4-0) that the SUP conforms to the special use.
N/A

MOTION: Larson made motion, seconded by Jean to recommend approval to the county board. Roll was called, all in favor and the motion carried.

These items will be considered at the next County Board Meeting on June 11, 2025 at 9 a.m.

MOTION: Larson made motion, seconded by Stoddard to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor and the meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum
Piatt County Zoning Officer