

Piatt County  
Zoning Board of Appeals

July 8, 2025

**Minutes**

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 2025 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. This meeting was rescheduled from the June 25 meeting where there was no quorum. Chairman Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. Jim Harrington, Dan Larson, Kyle Lovin and Keri Nusbaum attended.

County Board members in attendance: Todd Henricks, Jerry Edwards, Gail Jones, Will Chambers.

The ZBA reviewed the minutes for May 22, 2025.

**MOTION:** Larson made motion, seconded by Harrington, to approve the minutes from May 22 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved.

**Public Comments:** None

**New Business**

Danny Carroll applied for a Special Use for a Minor Subdivision for agriculture property located at 1498 N 300 East Road, Cisco. He was sworn in. Mr. Carroll proposes three lots in the Wolf Run addition subdivision and will retain the remainder of the property in production.

Justin Blackburn was sworn in. He lives nearby and is opposed to any development. He believes the property should stay in production.

Andy Lawhead was sworn in. He lives nearby and is concerned that development would allow mobile or modular housing. He is concerned about property values.

The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

CARROLL – Wolf Run Addition

1. Does the current special use restriction promote the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the special use restriction promotes the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the public.
2. Will granting the SUP be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?  
Possibly, The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the neighbors have brought forth concerns.
3. Will granting the special use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?  
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the neighbors have concerns about the effects on their property.
4. Will granting the special use diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?  
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that although there is no data to support their concerns, the neighbors have expressed concerns.

5. Is there adequate infrastructure to accommodate the special use, if granted (i.e. roads, utilities, drainage)?  
Yes. The ZBA 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 agreed (4-0) that there are adequate measures to provide ingress and egress.
7. Would the special use, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?  
Yes. The ZBA 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 agreed (4-0) that the use would not compete or impede existing zoned uses.
9. Would the special use, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?  
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that it would cause irritation for other landowners.
10. Would denying the special use create a hardship on the applicant?  
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that it would cause 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 (4-0) that the subject land is suitable for the current and proposed use.
12. Is the applicant's property, as presently zoned, vacant? If so, how long has it been vacant?  
N/A . The property is farmland.
13. Would the special use, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?  
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) it would not have a harmful impact on the soil.
14. What is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) rating for the subject land?  
212.48 indicating a medium level of protection.
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 would conform. There are persons wishing to build on the property, but the ZBA is unsure if it can be considered a necessity.

**MOTION:** Harrington made motion, seconded by Larson to approve the Special Use permit for a minor subdivision. Roll was called. Harrington, Wax – Yes; Larson, Lovin – No. The vote is 2-2. The ZBA does not recommend to the County Board.

Brett Hermann applied for a Special Use for a bed and breakfast/tourist home for A-1 Agriculture property located at 444 East 2150 North Road, Deland, IL. He was sworn in. They have been using the property for seasonal workers, but they would like to offer it as a short-term vacation rental when it is not necessary for workers. There was no one signed in to object or question regarding the plan for the property. The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

#### ZONING FACTORS- Brett 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, but 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 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 seasonally vacant and has been vacant for a few months currently.
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, and there appears to be a need for the service.

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

Louis and JoAnn Wozniak, trustees, applied for a zoning reclassification for a 26 acre tract of land located at 3035 North 900 East Road, Mansfield. They wish to have the property re-zoned to G-1 General Industrial to allow for a construction yard for storage of aggregate and equipment. This property has been used as the laydown yard for the Apex/Prosperity Wind project.

John Peisker of Evergreen Roadworks was sworn in. They will be purchasing the subject property if the re-classification is approved. John Hannah, Blue Ridge township road commissioner, said they are in talks to purchase a portion of the property which would allow more efficient operation of the department.

The ZBA members considered the zoning factors.

### **Wozniak/Evergreen Roadworks**

1. Does the current use restriction promote the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the current use restriction promotes the health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the public.

2. Will granting the zoning classification change be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that granting the change would not be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community.
3. Will granting the zoning classification change be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that there is no evidence that granting the classification change would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property.
4. Will granting the classification change diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that granting the classification change would not diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity.
5. Is there adequate infrastructure to accommodate the change in use if granted (i.e. roads, utilities, drainage)?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that there is adequate infrastructure to accommodate the change.
6. Are there adequate measures to provide ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets if the request is granted?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that there is adequate infrastructure for ingress and egress.
7. Would the change in zoning classification, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that the change would be in harmony with the comprehensive plan.
8. Would the zoning classification change, if granted, compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that the change would not compete with or impeded the zoned uses of other property within the zone.
9. Would the change, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that it would not create a hardship on other landowners in the area.
10. Would denying the change create a hardship on the applicant?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed it would create a hardship on the applicant.
11. Is the subject land suitable for the proposed use and is the subject land suitable for the current zoned use?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed that the subject land is suitable for the current and proposed use.
12. Is the applicant's property, as presently zoned, vacant? If so, how long has it been vacant?  
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that the property is not vacant.
13. Would the proposed change, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?  
No. The ZBA agreed there would be no additional harm to the soil. The damage has been done.

14. What is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) rating for the subject land?  
214.28
- 15 Does the request for zoning classification change 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 it does conform, and that there is a necessity.

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

**MOTION:** Lovin made motion, seconded by Larson to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor and the meeting adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum  
Piatt County Zoning Officer