

Piatt County
Zoning Board of Appeals

September 3, 2026

Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 3, 2026 in Room 104 of the Piatt County Courthouse. Chairperson Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Jim Harrington, Robert Chambers, Dan Larson, States Attorney Perry and Keri Nusbaum attended. Kyle Lovin was absent.

County Board members in attendance: Todd Henricks and Gail Jones.

Public Comments: None

Old Business

The road use agreement for the Mansfield gravel pit is in process.

New Business

Steve Koester applied for zoning re-classification for property zoned B-1 General Business located at 1991 N 1225 East Road, White Heath. He asks the zoning to be changed to A-1 Agriculture to allow development of a solar facility.

Steve Koester was sworn in. The property has been in crops since he purchased it. His original intent was for a subdivision, but the township opposed it. He now has the opportunity to lease it for solar development. The zoning ordinance allows solar development in agriculture zoning.

Desiree Noisette was sworn in and spoke about the work Tree Line Solar has done with the community.

Diana Orberson was sworn in. She owns property adjacent. She asked why the solar application was allowed and how Koester would feel about living by solar development.

The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

ZONING FACTORS- Koester

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 restrictions promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the public.
2. Will granting the zoning classification change be detrimental to the safety, comfort, or general welfare of the community?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there are some concerns due to the proposed solar use.
3. Will granting the zoning classification change be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property within the immediate vicinity?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there is a possibility it could be injurious to the use and enjoyment.

4. Will granting the classification change diminish property values of other property within the immediate vicinity?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there was no evidence presented regarding property values.
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.
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 are adequate measure 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 impede or compete with the existing zoned uses of property within the zone.
9. Would the change, if granted, create a hardship on other landowners within the zone?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that there have been concerns voiced by other landowners.
10. Would denying the change create a hardship on the applicant?
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that it would be an inconvenience.
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 (4-0) that the land is suitable for both the current and the proposed use.
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 vacant.
13. Would the proposed change, if granted, have a harmful impact upon the soil?
No. The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the change would not have a harmful effect on the soil.
14. What is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) rating for the subject land?
The LESA score is 167.67
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.
The ZBA agreed (4-0) that the request does conform to the regulations of the zoned district.
The ZBA agreed that the public necessity is not applicable to this subject property.

Motion: Harrington made motion, seconded by Larson to recommend the approval of the zoning re-classification to the County Board. Roll was called, all in favor and the motion carried.

The County Board will consider the matter at their regular meeting on September 9, 2026.

Motion: Larson made motion, seconded by Harrington to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum
Piatt County Zoning Officer