

Piatt County
Zoning Board of Appeals

February 26, 2026

Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2026 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. Chairperson Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Dan Larson, Jim Harrington, Bruce Stoodard and Keri Nusbaum attended. Kyle Lovin and Robert Chambers were absent.

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

The ZBA reviewed the minutes for January 22, 2026.

MOTION: Larson made motion, seconded by Harrington, to approve the minutes from January 22, 2026 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved

Public Comments:

Jan Myers – opposes solar, question Roberts rules.

Gary Warren – Said that Sally Turner is opposing the state zoning laws. He says solar is a scam. He spoke about density of Co2.

Old Business

The ZBA continued deliberation on the application of East Monticello Solar 1, LLC which was started on January 22.

Steve Long was sworn in. The new site plan addresses all of the concerns the nearby homeowners had. It moves the road further east, and the entire project is further from the homes. Harrington asked him what the max height of the panels would be. The answer was 12 feet. Harrington and Wax had questions about glare. Long answered that because the panels rotate and follow the sun, there is little chance for glare.

Gary Warner was sworn in and talked about chemicals in the panels, leach concerns, and possible cancer affects and psychological damage.

Mike Wileaver was sworn in. He thanked Long for listening to their concerns at the last meeting, and said this plan is much better. He requested there be no additional solar development on the land.

Colleen Killion was sworn in. She is a homeowner and asked about the road.

Janet Spencer was sworn in. She has concerns about the new location, as it is near a farmstead, and that landowner is not in attendance. She asked where the electricity will be distributed. Long answered it will go onto the grid. There will be an opportunity to sign up for a subscription, which would earn a discount.

John Spencer was sworn in. He has concerns about drainage, wind, contaminants, and that solar farms attract tornados.

Joe Lieb was sworn in. He said he had heard there were interruptions in power in Deland caused by the solar farm there. He is concerned about wind and drainage problems. He would like it to be located elsewhere further away from town.

Jim Payne, the landowner was sworn in. He said he tried to be a good neighbor by relocating the project. He had tile work done to improve the drainage on the property prior to this.

Harrington questioned how debris would be managed and Long said it would be picked up with the routine maintenance. Wax asked about vegetation management. Long responded they keep it cut because if it blocks the panels, it is not good. Bruce Stoddard asked about the possibility of a different connection point.

The ZBA members considered the zoning factors.

ZONING FACTORS- East Monticello Solar 1, LLC

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 current restrictions promote the health, safety, morals or general welfare of the public.
2. Will granting the SUP be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?
The ZBA agreed 4-0 that there are still some concerns about the project.
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 granting the special use could 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?
The ZBA agreed 4-0 that granting the special use could diminish property values within the immediate vicinity.
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 ingress and egress is not a concern.
7. Would the special use, if granted, be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county?
No. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that they do not think the special use would be in harmony with the overall comprehensive plan of the county.
8. Would the special use, if granted, compete with or impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone?
Yes. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that the special use would compete with and impede the existing zoned uses of other property within the zone.
9. Would the special use, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?
The ZBA agreed 4-0 that it would create an inconvenience for adjacent landowners.

10. Would denying the special use create a hardship on the applicant?
The ZBA agreed 4-0 that denying the special use would possibly 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 agreed 4-0 that the land is suitable.
12. Is the applicant's property, as presently zoned, vacant? If so, how long has it been vacant?
Yes. The ZBA agreed 4-0 that the land is currently being farmed.
13. Would the special use, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?
The ZBA agreed 4-0 that there were concerns raised about possible harmful impacts to the soil.
14. What is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) rating for the subject land?
181.6 which is a low 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 use does conform. There are differing opinions as to the public necessity for the special use.

Motion: Larson made a motion to recommend approval contingent upon a road use agreement, along with conditions for weed control and that if there were a formal complaint, the project owner has 90 days to cure. Harrington seconded the motion. Roll was called. Stoddard – No, Larson – No, Harrington- No, Wax – No. The motion did not pass. The application will go to the county board with no recommendation.

New Business

None

Motion: Harrington made motion, seconded by Larson to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum
Piatt County Zoning Officer