

Piatt County  
Zoning Board of Appeals

May 26, 2022  
Minutes

The Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals met at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 26, 2022 in Room 104 of the Courthouse. Chairman Loyd Wax called the meeting to order. The roll was read. Attending were: Wax, William Chambers, Jim Harrington and Keri Nusbaum. County Board members in attendance: Ray Spencer, Todd Henricks.

**MOTION:** Harrington made motion, seconded by Chambers to approve the minutes from April 28, 2022 as written. On voice vote, all in favor and the minutes were approved.

**Public Comments:** None

**New Business**

Donald Hufford applied for a variation to allow for the construction of a single family dwelling on 11.63 acres of A-1 Agriculture land located at 670 E 1950 North Road, Monticello. Kevin Dalton was sworn in. He and his wife are the proposed purchasers of the property and his family has been farming the surrounding ground for 65 years. This tract has been pasture or in a tree program for the last several years. The Daltons wish to build a new home there. Mr. Dalton was provided a copy of the NRI/LESA report. The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

**VARIATION ZONING FACTORS- Hufford**

1. Will the proposed use compete with the current use of the land?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) 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 (3-0) 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 (3-0) 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 (3-0) that denying the variance would be an inconvenience.
5. Would granting the variance create a hardship for the surrounding property owners?

The ZBA agreed (3-0) 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 (3-0) that the property is suitable for the current use.
7. Is the property suitable for the proposed use?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the property is suitable for the proposed use.
8. Is there a community need to deny the variance?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) 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 (3-0) that the property is in pasture, not in production.
10. Would a granting of this variance compete with the Piatt County Comprehensive Plan?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the variance would not compete with the comprehensive plan.

**Motion:** Chambers made motion, seconded by Harrington to recommend approval of the variation to the County Board. Roll was called. Chambers – Yes; Harrington – Yes; Wax – Yes. The motion carried.

Louis and Angela Stoerger applied for a variation to allow for the construction of a single family dwelling on 3.00 acres of AC Agriculture land located at 1155 N State Route 32, Cisco. Louis Stoerger was sworn in. They want to build a new home on a portion of the family farm. Mr. Stoerger and their builder, also present were give copies of the NRI/LESA report. The ZBA considered the zoning factors.

#### **VARIATION ZONING FACTORS- Stoerger**

1. Will the proposed use compete with the current use of the land?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that some land will be taken out of production.
2. Will the proposed use diminish property values in surrounding areas?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that it will not diminish property values.
3. Would a denial of the variance promote the health, safety and general welfare of the public?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) 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 (3-0) that denying the variance would be a hardship to the owner.

5. Would granting the variance create a hardship for the surrounding property owners?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that there is no evidence that granting the variance would create a hardship for surrounding property owners. The surrounding property is owned by the applicant.
6. Is the property suitable for its current use?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the property is suitable for the current use.
7. Is the property suitable for the proposed use?  
Yes. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the property is suitable for the proposed use.
8. Is there a community need to deny the variance?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that there is no evidence of a need to deny the variance.
9. Is the subject property non-productive with its current use?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the property is in production now.
10. Would a granting of this variance compete with the Piatt County Comprehensive Plan?  
No. The ZBA agreed (3-0) that the variance would not compete with the comprehensive plan.

**MOTION:** Harrington made motion, seconded by Chambers to recommend approval to the County Board. Chambers – Yes; Harrington – Yes; Wax – Yes. The motion carried.

These items will be considered by the County Board at their meeting on June 8, 2022.

**MOTION:** Chambers made motion, seconded by Harrington to adjourn. On voice vote, all in favor and the meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keri Nusbaum  
Piatt County Zoning Officer