**KENDALL COUNTY**
**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

***Kendall County Historic Court House***
***Court Room***
***110 W. Madison Street, Yorkville, Illinois***

**Approved - Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2025 - 7:00 p.m.**

Chairman Keith Landovitz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

Members Present: Eric Bernacki (Arrived at 7:02 p,m.), Tom Casey, Dave Hamman, Keith Landovitz, Karin McCarthy-Lange, Ruben Rodriguez, Claire Wilson, and Seth Wormley
Members Absent: Bob Stewart
Staff Present: Matthew H. Asselmeier, Director
Others Present: Nick Wills, Amber Wills, Matt Clementi, Elizabeth Corrigan, Richard Fitzgibbon, Chris Ormiston, Gayle Hoddy, Josh Haggard, Maria DiClementi, Brian Redmond, Genny Haggard, Sarah Hughes, Ryan Hughes, John Hughes, Nicole Mayer, Mary Marquez, Buddika Gajapala, Vichitra Hitihamiarachchi, Kanishka Liyanage

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Member Hamman made a motion, seconded by Member Wormley, to approve the agenda. With a voice vote of seven (7) ayes, the motion carried.

Member Bernacki arrived at this time (7:02 p.m.)

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Wormley made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2025, meeting with a correction to the name of County Line Road on page 7 of the minutes and correcting that Mr. Asselmeier provided the letter from Seward Township Highway Commissioner Scott Cryder on page 7 of the minutes. With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried.

## PETITIONS

### Petition 25-18 Ansar Gafur on Behalf of JAS Powered by Greenvolt, LLC (Tenant) and Thomas F. Richards, Junior (Owner)

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

The Petitioner is seeking a special use permit for a commercial solar energy facility and a variance to Section 36-282(17)a of the Kendall County Code to allow a commercial solar energy facility on land within one point five (1.5) miles of municipality without an annexation agreement. The southern portion of subject property also has a special use permit from 1974, probably for gravel mining. The Petitioner is voluntarily requesting the revocation of this special use permit.

JAS Powered by Greenvolt, LLC would lease the property from Thomas F. Richards, Junior.

The application materials, NRI Report, stormwater permit application, wetland delineation report, site plan, including the landscaping plan, decommissioning plan, Agricultural Impact Mitigation Agreement and a picture of the property were provided.

The property is located between 17448 and 17676 Route 71, Newark.

The lot size is approximately fifty-one (51) acres and the fenced area is approximately twenty point six acres.

The existing land use Agricultural.

The property is zoned A-1 and A-1 SU for Mining.

The Future Land Use Map for the County calls for this area to be Agricultural. The Future Land Use Map for the Village of Newark calls for this area to be Agricultural.

Route 71 is an Arterial maintained by IDOT. Route 71 is identified as a Scenic Route in the County's Land Resource Management Plan. Lisbon Center Road is a Local Road maintained by Big Grove Township.

No trails are planned in this area.

There is a wetland on the property; a wetland delineation report was provided. There are no floodplains on the property.

The adjacent land uses are Agricultural and Single-Family Residential.

The adjacent properties are zoned A-1 and A-1 SU.

Both the County's Plan and the Village of Newark's Plan call for this area to be Agricultural.

Properties with one half (1/2) mile of this property are zoned A-1, A-1 SU, and A-1 BP in the County, A-1 and Commercial and Manufacturing inside the Village of Newark, and A-1 in LaSalle County.

The A-1 special use permit to the southwest is probably for mining.

Approximately twenty-two (22) existing houses are within one half (1/2) mile of the subject property.

EcoCAT Report was submitted on June 3, 2025, and consultation was terminated.

The LESA Score was 201 indicating a medium level of protection. The NRI Report was provide

Petition information was sent to Big Grove Township on October 1, 2025. No comments received.

Petition information was sent to the Village of Newark on October 1, 2025. Prior to formal application submittal, the Village of Newark submitted an email stating they did not want to annex the property and they were not opposed to the project. This email was provided.

Petition information was sent to the Newark Fire Protection District on October 1, 2025. No comments received.

Petition information was sent to former ZPAC members on October 1, 2025. The Highway Department and Health Department responded and neither Department had any objections. The emails were provided.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission reviewed this proposal at their meeting on October 22, 2025. The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission voted to continue the proposal to a special meeting on November 6, 2025, at 7:00 p.m., by a vote of eight (8) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with one (1) member absent. The minutes were provided.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals initiated a public hearing on this proposal on October 27, 2025. The consensus of the four (4) Members present was to continue the hearing to November 12, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. The minutes of the hearing were provided.

Per § 36-282(17) of the Kendall County Code, commercial solar energy facilities businesses can be special uses on A-1 zoned property subject to the following conditions:

a. All commercial solar energy facilities and test solar energy systems located within one point five (1.5) miles of a municipality shall either annex to the municipality or obtain an annexation agreement with the municipality requiring the municipality's regulations to flow through the property. Petitioner is requesting a variance.

b. The setbacks for commercial solar energy facilities shall be measured from the nearest edge of any component of the facility as follows:

   Occupied Community Buildings or Dwellings on Nonparticipating Properties-One hundred fifty feet (150') from the nearest point on the outside wall of the structure

   Boundary Lines of Participating Properties-None

   Boundary Lines of Nonparticipating Properties- Fifty feet (50') to the nearest point on the property line of the nonparticipating property

   Public Road Rights-Of-Way-Fifty feet (50') from the nearest edge

   The above setbacks do not exempt or excuse compliance with electric facility clearances approved or required by the National Electrical Code, the National Electrical Safety Code,

Commerce Commission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and their designees or successors. Per the site plan, the project is greater than one hundred fifty feet (150') from the nearest occupied non-participating dwelling. The perimeter fence is setback greater than fifty feet (50') from the adjoining property lines and nearest right-of-way.

c. A commercial solar energy facility's perimeter shall be enclosed by fencing having a height of at least six feet (6') and no more than twenty-five feet (25'). This is true. Per the site plan, the fence is proposed to be eight feet (8') in height and will be wire mesh. The fence will be three inches (3") off of the ground. One (1) twenty foot (20') wide gate is also on the site plan.

d. No component of a solar panel as part of a commercial solar energy facility shall have a height of more than twenty feet (20') above ground when the solar energy facility's arrays are at full tilt. This is true. The maximum height will be approximately thirteen feet (13') off of the ground. The Petitioner does not want a restriction setting the maximum height at this level.

e. The above setback, fencing, and component height requirements may be waived subject to written consent of the owner of each affected nonparticipating property. This written consent shall be submitted at the time of application submittal. No such consent requested or needed.

f. Sound limitations for components in commercial solar energy facilities shall follow the sound limitations established by the Illinois Pollution Control Board. The acoustic noise rating is 73 dBA at one (1) meter and 67dBA at three (3) meters.

g. The County shall not require standards for construction, decommissioning, or deconstruction of a commercial solar energy system or related financial assurances to be more restrictive than agricultural impact mitigation agreement set in State law. The amount of any decommissioning payment shall be limited to the cost identified in the decommissioning or deconstruction plan, as required by the agricultural impact mitigation agreement, minus the salvage value of the project. A copy of the agricultural impact mitigation agreement shall be submitted with the application materials. The decommissioning plan was provided and is outlined in the AIMA, which was also provided. The estimated cost of decommissioning is Three Hundred Fifty-Eight Thousand, Nine Hundred Forty-Four Dollars ($358,944). This money will be provided to the County in the form of a bond as outlined in the AIMA.

h. A vegetative screening shall be placed around the commercial solar energy facility. The landscaping plan was included with the site plan. The plan calls for one hundred four (104) Alleghany Viburnum, one hundred twenty (121) Red-Twig Doorwood, one hundred seventeen (117) Northern Spice Bush, and one hundred seventeen (117) Tannenbaum Mugo Pine. The Viburnum, Doorwood, and Pine will be ten feet (10') in height at maturity; the Bush will be eight feet (8') in height at the time of maturity. The Petitioner also proposes a landscape seed mix of low profile native grasses.

i. Commercial solar energy facility applicants shall provide the results and recommendations from consultations with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources obtained through the Ecological Compliance Assessment Tool (EcoCat) or a comparable successor tool. The commercial solar energy facility applicant shall adhere to the recommendations provided through this consultation. The EcoCat was submitted and consultation was terminated without any specific recommendations.

j. Commercial solar energy facility applicants shall provide the results of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Information for Planning and Consulting environmental review or a comparable successor toll that is consistent with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines and any applicable United States Fish and Wildlife Service solar wildlife guidelines that have been subject to public review. This was provided. Six (6) threatened or endangered species were in the area, but no impacts were anticipated.

k. A facility owner shall demonstrate avoidance of protected lands as identified by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and the Illinois Nature Preserve Commission or consider the recommendations of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources for setbacks from protected lands, including areas identified by the Illinois Nature Preserve Commission. This is true. The site is designed around the farmed wetlands.

l. A facility owner shall provide evidence at the time of application submittal of consultation with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office to assess potential impacts on State-registered historic sites under applicable State law. No potential impacts to State-registered historic sites exist.

m. A commercial solar energy facility owner shall plant, establish, and maintain for the life of the facility vegetative ground cover consistent with State law and the guidelines of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources' vegetative management plans. The vegetation management plan shall be required at the time of application submittal. The vegetation management plan, including timelines for planting and maintenance of the vegetation was provided.

n. The facility owner shall enter into a road use agreement with the jurisdiction having control over the applicable roads. The road use agreement shall follow applicable law. The facility owner shall supply the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department with a copy of the road use agreement. This provision shall be waived if the jurisdiction having control over the applicable roads does not wish to enter into an agreement. The Illinois Department of Transportation did not want to enter into a road use agreement. An email outlining this position was provided.

o. The facility owner shall repair or pay for the repair of all damage to the drainage system caused by the construction of the commercial solar energy system within a reasonable time after construction of the commercial solar energy facility is complete. The specific time

shall be set in the special use permit. The Petitioner does not believe there is any drain tile on the property and, if drain tile exists, they would not impact the project layout.

No buildings are planned for the site. Any structures proposed for the site, including the solar arrays, shall obtain applicable permits.

The property is presently farmland. No wells, septic systems, or refuse collection points were identified.

The Petitioner applied for a stormwater management permit.

Per the site plan, the Petitioner proposes one (1) twenty foot (20') wide gravel access road from Route 71 along the west and southwest portions of the property.

There is one (1) twenty (20') wide vehicular access gate. The site plan references other, personnel gates, but does not show where those would be located.

Knox box information will be provided to the County.

No permeant parking was proposed. There will be a twenty thousand (20,000) square foot staging area during construction located northwest of the fenced area.

No lighting was proposed.

There is one sign shown on the site plan near Route 71 and a second sign is shown on the vehicular access gate stating emergency contact information.

No glare information

No property value studies were provided.

No odors were foreseen.

The acoustic noise rating is 73 dBA at one (1) meter and 67dBA at three (3) meters.

If approved, this would be the fourth special use permit for a commercial solar energy facility in unincorporated Kendall County.

The Petitioner has agreed to enter into a community benefits agreement. In that agreement, the Petitioner agreed to pay the County approximately Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000) per megawatt annually with five percent (5%) increases every five (5) years. The Petitioners for the proposals on Ament Road and Corneils Road agreed to the same agreement, which was provided.

The proposed findings of fact for the special use permit were as follows:

The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. The project will generate

clean, renewable electricity while producing no air, noise, or water pollution, or ground contamination. The project will be screened from adjoining properties. The Petitioner submitted a vegetative management plan outlining the types of vegetation that will be planted, the timing of planting, and a maintenance plan for the vegetation.

The special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use makes adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. The proposal will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of nearby properties. The surrounding properties are primarily zoned A-1 and will not be prevented from continuing any existing use or from pursuing future uses. The proposal's operations would be quiet and minimal traffic will occur after installation is completed. The solar panels are setback from Route 71 and Lisbon Center Road and neighboring houses to avoid negative visual impacts.

Adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The proposal will have adequate utility interconnections designed in collaboration with Ameren. The proposal does not require water, sewer, or any other public utility facilities to operate. The Petitioner will also build the road and entrance at the facility and will obtain approval from IDOT for access from Route 71. After initial construction traffic, landscape maintenance and maintenance to the project components are anticipated to occur on an as-needed basis, consistent with the vegetative management plan. Existing traffic patterns will not be impacted in the post-construction operations phase.

The special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the County Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the requested variance is granted, the proposal meets all applicable regulations.

The special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The proposal is also consistent with a goal and objective found on page 3-4 of the Land Resource Management Plan, "Support the public and private use of sustainable energy systems (examples include wind, solar, and geo-thermal)."

The proposed findings of fact for the variance were as follows:

The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship or practical difficulty upon the owner if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out. The subject property is located within one point five (1.5)

miles of the Village of Newark. The Village of Newark submitted an email stating they did not want to annex the property or enter into a pre-annexation agreement.

The conditions upon which the requested variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification. Other A-1 zoned properties within one point five (1.5) miles of a municipality could request a similar variance, if the municipality refuses to annex or enter into a pre-annexation agreement.

The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property. The difficulty was created because the Village of Newark did not wish to enter into a pre-annexation agreement or annex the property.

The granting of the variation will not materially be detrimental to the public welfare or substantially injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. Granting the variance would not be detrimental to the public or substantially injurious to other properties.

That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood. The proposed variance would not impair light or air on adjacent property, cause congestion, increase the danger of fire, or negatively impact property values.

Staff's recommendation is neutral because of lack of clarity in State law regarding using the LaSalle and Sinclar Factors in evaluating applications of special use permits for commercial solar facilities. Assuming that conditions can be imposed on the special use permit, the proposed conditions and restrictions are as follows; to date the Petitioner has not agreed to these conditions:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan and vegetative management plan, decommissioning plan, and Agricultural Impact Mitigation Agreement.
2. A variance to section 36-282(17)(a) of the Kendall County Code is hereby granted allowing a commercial solar energy facility within one point five (1.5) miles of a municipality without an annexation or pre-annexation agreement.
3. Any special use permits previously granted on the subject property are hereby revoked in their entirety.
4. The developer and/or owner of the subject property allowed by this special use permit shall enter into a community benefits agreement with Kendall County.
5. None of the vehicles or equipment parked or stored on the subject property allowed by the special use permit shall be considered agricultural vehicles or agricultural equipment.
6. All of the vehicles and equipment stored on the subject property allowed by the special use permit shall be maintained in good condition with no deflated tires and shall be licensed if required by law.

7. Any structures, included solar arrays, constructed, installed, or used allowed by this special use permit shall not be considered for agricultural purposes and must secure applicable building permits.

8. Warning signs shall be placed in the locations shown on the site plan. These signs shall include, at minimum, the address of the subject property and a twenty-four (24) hour emergency contact phone number. Additional signage may be installed, if required by applicable law.

9. KenCom and other applicable public safety agencies shall be supplied the access code to the Knox Box/security gate.

10. Damaged drain tile will be repaired on a timeframe approved by the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department.

11. The operators of the use allowed by this special use permit acknowledge and agree to follow Kendall County's Right to Farm Clause.

12. The property owner and operator of the use allowed by this special use permit shall follow all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws related to the operation of this type of use.

13. Failure to comply with one or more of the above conditions or restrictions could result in the amendment or revocation of the special use permit.

14. If one or more of the above conditions is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining conditions shall remain valid.

15. This special use permit and variance shall be treated as a covenant running with the land and is binding on the successors, heirs, and assigns as to the same special use conducted on the property.

Member Wilson asked about the proposed use of the funds from the community benefit agreement. Mr. Asselmeier said those funds would offset the loss from not developing the property into something other than a solar farm and it would be the County Board's discretion on how those funds were spent. Member Wilson suggested that some of the funds be reserved to pay for the County to review the decommissioning costs as allowed by the AIMA and pay for decommissioning costs, if the operator was no longer in existence. The Planning, Building and Zoning Committee drafted the community benefit agreement. A professional engineer would review the decommissioning costs in ten (10) years as allowed by the AIMA.

Member Bernacki requested the setbacks as shown on the site plan. The setback is one hundred fifty feet (150').

Elizabeth Corrigan, Project Manager for the Proposal, discussed the submittal process, the creation of the proposal, and the details of the proposal.

Member Wilson asked if the Petitioner's representatives had any experience with decommissioning a solar project. Matt Clementi, Civil Engineer, responded no. He noted that no wind or battery components were part of this proposal. He explained how the decommissioning plan was created and how the bond was calculated. The owner of the facility is responsible for decommissioning.

Mr. Clementi said the height of the panels would not be five feet, ten inches (5' 10"). That is the height of the axel. At maximum tilt, the panels would be approximately thirteen feet (13') off of the ground.

Member Bernacki asked about moving the solar panels further south on the property. Mr. Clementi responded that the location was determined by the property owner. Ms. Corrigan noted the industrial activity on the southern end of the property.

The owner of the property was not present.

Chairman Landovitz asked about possibly accessing the property from a different road instead of Route 71. Ms. Corrigan said that the property owner determined the location of the panels and access point.

Chairman Landovitz explained the legal framework for reviewing commercial solar special use permits. He noted that Public Act 102-1123 preempted most of the County's authority with regards to review. He asked speakers for conditions that could be incorporated in the special use permit.

Richard Fitzgibbon discussed drainage in the area. He was concerned that the solar panels would increase the flow of water onto his property. He discussed the location of culvert under Route 71. He noted the poor state of the drain tile in the area, which were installed in the 1950s. He asked about the ground cover. His property was not considered floodplain. Mr. Clementi said the majority of the site drains to the west. A native prairie grass would be planted below the solar panels and the runoff would be less than if the property was in active farming.

Mr. Clementi said the majority of traffic would occur during construction. After construction, traffic would be minimal; only maintenance people would visit the site.

Member Bernacki asked if a drain tile study occurred. Ms. Corrigan said the drain tile study should be completed within the next two (2) weeks. The results will not impact the placement of the solar panels.

Josh Haggard did not oppose renewal energy projects when properly sited. He noted the proximity of the proposal to Cushing Field. He noted the lack of a glare study and lack of a property value study. He expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the proposal to nearby homes. He

requested a local property value study. He said that the developer, JAS Powered by Greenvolt, was not a local company. He noted the County Staff's neutral recommendation. He expressed concerns regarding drainage. He noted the unsightly appearance of the solar project on Newark Road. He said the Petitioner did not engage with neighbors prior to the meeting. He requested an FAA compliant glare study, an independent Kendall County centered property value study, a legally enforceable maintenance and vegetative management plan with clearly defined schedules, responsible parties, and monetary performance guarantees, a robust decommissioning surety, and local accountability with a local contact. He questioned if the Fire District was equipped and trained to handle fires at the property. He questioned what the Village of Newark gained from this proposal.

Maria DiClementi agreed with Mr. Haggard. She had concerns about fire suppression.

Brian Redmond said he attended the Village of Newark meeting and said the Village was not in favor of the project.

Genny Haggard agreed with Mr. Haggard.

Member Bernacki asked if other counties required conditions related to glare and airports. Mr. Asselmeier said there are regulations when the airport is federally designated. A glare study could be requested.

Sarah Hughes agreed with Mr. Haggard. Member Bernacki asked about flooding issues on her property. She deferred the answer to her father.

Brian Hughes agreed with Mr. Haggard. He requested a larger setback from the property line. The development is fifty foot (50') from the property line. State law established the setbacks.

John Hughes agreed with Mr. Haggard and favored a larger setback.

A resident asked how the County would guarantee compliance with the vegetative management plan. Mr. Asselmeier responded that the vegetative management plan would be a condition of the special use permit and, under normal circumstances, if a party violated the terms of a special use permit, that party could be fined and/or the special use permit could be revoked. The resident filed a complaint against the solar farm on Newark Road for unsightly vegetation.

Member Hamman noted that he owned property in the vicinity. He discussed the project on Newark Road; he questioned the location on the property for the solar project on Newark Road. He also favored moving the solar panels in the subject case further south and east on the property to address concerns of the neighbors.

Amber Wills said that she was planning to build a home in the area. She asked about the timeline for the planting of the vegetation. Mr. Asselmeier said the installation timeline was outlined in the vegetative management plan. Discussion occurred regarding penalties and enforcement. If the

property owner wanted to expand the solar field, an amendment to the special use permit would be required. She noted that the solar panels would be taller than the vegetation proposed.

A resident asked what would happen to that portion of the field that was not included in the solar project. The area outside the project area could be farmed. Mr. Clementi said that any part of the site that is not actively farmed would be planted in prairie grass. The operator was leasing the entire property.

Discussion occurred regarding providing a property value study. The Petitioners were open to providing a property value study.

Member Wilson asked if the typical flight path for Cushing Field passed over the proposed solar field. She also asked if the Petitioner was willing to get a glare study. She also questioned why nobody from Cushing Field was in attendance, if glare was a problem. Parties within seven hundred fifty feet (750') were sent notices. Member Hamman said the runways run parallel to Route 71.

Member Wormley favored requesting that the site plan be adjusted to move the solar panels away from the homes. He also favored a glare study.

Discussion occurred regarding a Kendall County centered property value study. Mr. Asselmeier said there were three (3) approved solar projects, but the one (1) on Newark Road was the only project that had been constructed. The number of transactions for a study would be limited. State law does not allow for property value guarantees as a condition of special use permits.

Chairman Landovitz noted that the Petitioner was open to submitting a glare study. He suggested moving the solar panels away from residences. He also requested the creation of registered agent and designed contact on file with the County and the owners of the record of adjacent properties. He asked if the Petitioners would like to continue the review in order to have an opportunity to revise the site plan.

The Petitioners were agreeable to the existing proposed conditions. The Petitioners were agreeable to reviewing the site plan in relation to setbacks.

The proposed changes and items for submittal were as follows:

1. Amending the site plan showing the solar field moved further south and east on the property away from the neighboring houses.
2. Submitting a glare study.
3. Requiring the operator's contact information be on file with the County and with the owners of record of adjoining properties.

Discussion occurred regarding planting the native vegetation outside of the solar panel area on the property.

Ms. Corrigan asked about the requested setbacks. Member Wormley favored a five hundred foot (500') setback on the north from the residences, moving the solar panels further to the east, and closer to ravine to the south. It was noted that the County was not requiring larger setbacks, but was requesting larger setbacks.

Member Wormley suggested the Petitioners to work with the neighbors.

Ms. Corrigan requested that the proposal be continued to the December 10, 2025, meeting in order to be given an opportunity to talk to the property owner.

Member Wilson asked about drain tile installation. Mr. Clementi said that no plans exist to change the drainage pattern. More absorption of water would occur if the property was converted to prairie grasses instead of farming.

Member Wilson made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to continue review of the subject Petition at the Petitioners' request to the December 10, 2025, Kendall County Regional Planning Commission meeting.

The votes were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ayes (8): | Bernacki, Casey, Hamman, Landovitz, McCarthy-Lange, Rodriguez, Wilson, and Wormley |
| Nays (0): | None |
| Absent (1): | Stewart |
| Abstain (0): | None |

The motion carried.

The proposal goes to the Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals on November 12, 2025, with a request for continuance and back to the Kendall County Regional Planning Commission on December 10, 2025.

**Petition 25-19 Koswatte Sumanawansa on Behalf of Chicago Buddhist Vihara**

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

The Petitioner would like to install a healing meditation garden at the subject property. The garden would consist of a central stupa that is twenty-five feet (25') tall and twelve feet (12') in diameter, walking paths, small group gathering spaces, and native plantings.

The Buddhist Temple is located immediately to the east of the subject property.

The subject property has been zoned B-2 since 1976.

The application materials, plat of survey, site plan, and pictures of the subject property were provided.

The property is located west of 5313 Route 34, Oswego.

The property is approximately one point five (1.5) acres in size.

The existing land use is Vacant Commercial.

The property is zoned B-2 General Commercial District.

The County's Plan calls for the property to be Suburban Residential (Max 1 DU/Acre). The Village of Oswego's Plan calls for the property to be Downtown.

The adjacent land uses are Single-Family Residential, Commercial, and Institutional (Buddhist Temple).

The adjacent properties are zoned R-3, R-3 SU, and B-2 SU.

The County's Plan calls for this area to be Suburban Residential. The Village of Oswego's Plan calls for the area to be Residential and Downtown.

The properties within one half mile (1/2) are zoned A-1, A-1 SU, R-3, R-3 SU, B-1, B-3, B-3 SU in the unincorporated area and R-2, R-3, R-4, and B-2 inside the Village of Oswego.

The R-3 special use to the east is for a church sign. The B-2 special use is for the dwelling unit for a watchman and outside storage. The B-3 special use to south is for outside storage. The A-1 special use to west is for a riding stable, including an apartment.

EcoCAT Report not required because the property was not zoned A-1.

The LESA Score was 146 indicating a low level of protection. The NRI was provided.

Petition information was emailed to Oswego Township on October 1, 2025. The Oswego Township Planning Commission met on October 22, 2025, and recommended not to file an objection by a vote of two (2) in favor and one (1) in opposition. The Oswego Township Board did not meet on the proposal. The information from Oswego Township was provided.

Petition information was emailed to the Village of Oswego on October 1, 2025. No comments received.

Petition information was emailed to the Oswego Fire Protection District on October 1, 2025. On October 6, 2025, the Oswego Fire Protection District submitted an email saying they had no comments or concerns. This email was provided.

Petition information was sent to former ZPAC members on October 1, 2025. Neither the Highway Department nor the Health Department had any comments on this proposal. The related emails were provided.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission reviewed this proposal at their meeting on October 22, 2025. The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission voted to continue the proposal to a special meeting on November 6, 2025, at 7:00 p.m., by a vote of eight (8) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with one (1) member absent. The minutes were provided.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals initiated a public hearing on this proposal on October 27, 2025. The consensus of the four (4) Members present was to continue the hearing to November 12, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. The minutes of the hearing were provided.

The Kendall County Code contains the following requirements of places of worship:

a. The height for the towers and steeples shall not exceed seventy-five feet (75') and not more than forty-five feet (45') for the main structure.

b. Other related uses, such as schools, child day care services, kindergartens, meeting facilities shall be permitted to the extent that the activity is otherwise permitted, and shall be subject to all applicable regulations, including parking.

The proposal meets the above regulations.

According the submitted information, there will be one (1) central stupa contained in a walled area. The walled area around the stupa is approximately one thousand nine hundred fifty (1,950) square feet. There will also be walking areas, meditation areas, and seatings areas.

Activities will occur during the daytime, primarily on weekends.

A building permit will be required for any structures constructed on the property.

No utilities are onsite; they are available at the Buddhist temple east of the subject property.

There is no parking spaces onsite. There are forty-eight (48) parking spaces at the Buddhist temple east of the subject property.

No direct road access is planned for the subject property from Route 34.

According to the submitted materials, no stormwater permit is required.

Solar-powered lighting will illuminate the paths and four (4) solar powered pole lights will be installed at the stupa area.

No information regarding signage was provided.

No information was provided regarding security.

No fencing is planned for the site.

No large trees are proposed, but the existing mature vegetation at the north and south ends of the site will
be preserved.

Additional landscaping will feature perennial plants and small shrubs.

No information was provided regarding noise control.

No information was provided regarding refuse. This likely can be accommodated at the Buddhist temple east of the subject property.

If approved, this would be the fifteenth ($15^{th}$) special use permit for a place of worship in unincorporated Kendall County.

The proposed findings of fact are as follows:

That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. Provided the site is developed in accordance with the submitted site plan, this should not be an issue.

That the special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use shall make adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. Provided the use operates as proposed, no injury should occur to other property and property values should not be negatively impacted.

That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The subject property will utilize ingress/egress and utilities from the neighboring property to the east. Provided the site is developed according to the proposed site plan, drainage should not be an issue.

That the special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the County Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals. This is true; no variances are needed.

That the special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. This use is consistent with the other uses in vicinity of the subject property.

Staff recommended approval of the requested special use permit subject to the following conditions and restrictions; to date the Petitioner has not agreed with these conditions:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the site plan.
2. Failure to comply with the above condition or restriction could result in the amendment or revocation of the special use permit.
3. If one or more of the above conditions is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining conditions shall remain valid.
4. This special use permits shall be treated as covenants running with the land and is binding on the successors, heirs, and assigns as to the same special uses conducted on the property.

Buddika Gajapala explained the project.

Member Bernacki asked why the sand meditation area was proposed closer to Route 34 instead of near the back of the property. Mr. Gajapala responded that the back of the property had mature vegetation.

Member Wilson thank the Petitioners for their patience.

Nicole Mayer lives northeast of the subject property, north of the existing temple. She noted the lack of vegetation separating the properties. She expressed concerns regarding a lack privacy the proposed use would create. The proposed use would be open to the public and the public would be able to look into her backyard. She said the Petitioners have never notified her of events at the temple. She said that she contacted law enforcement regarding noise at temple events. She felt the proposal will increase noise. She felt the proposal will increase traffic; the temple already has events that cause parking issues. She said the proposed use will invite unknown visitors into the residential neighborhood. She did not favor unrestricted public access near homes. She felt the proposal would negatively impact property values. She presented a petition signed by neighbors against the proposal. She requested the installation of a minimum ten foot (10') privacy fence or wall, the installation of a dense vegetative buffer along the entire property line, a restriction of public use hours to daytime only, and no general public access to the garden without clear County approval, supervision, and restriction to the garden.

Chairman Landovitz suggested that the neighbors and the Petitioner discuss issues outside of the meeting.

Vichitra Hitihamiarachchi is a member of the Chicago Buddhist Vihara and an architect involved with the design of this project. She noted that Ms. Mayer's property was north of the existing

temple, not the subject property. There is a chain link fence on Ms. Mayer's property that separated the two (2) properties. She noted the vegetation at the north end of the subject property. She was open to taking the matter of installing additional vegetation to her board to address the neighbor's concerns. Mr. Asselmeier noted that the location for the proposed vegetation additions were not on the subject property.

Mr. Gajapala noted that his own house was next to a forest preserve and understood Ms. Mayer's concerns.

Ms. Mayer said that she wanted her privacy and did not want a house next to a public park. She previously requested that the Chicago Buddhist Vihara email her to discuss matters and she has not received a response. She did not favor a wooden fence because the location of the Buddhist's fire pit.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked about the fence placement. Ms. Mayer said the fence was on her property.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked how long Ms. Mayer had lived in her home. Ms. Mayer has lived in her home eight (8) years. The church was built in 1986.

Mary Marquez presented a plat of survey of her property and noted that the common property line did not have any vegetation. She has dogs that do not like strangers. She expressed concerns about parked cars along the property line and onto her property. She expressed concerns about people going to the garden at night. The temple might have two hundred (200) people onsite.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked how long Ms. Marquez has lived at her home. The response was almost six (6) years. Ms. Marquez would like a fence installed at the property line for safety reasons. She did not want to live next to a park.

Discussion occurred regarding splitting the cost of constructing a fence. The neighbors were opposed to splitting the cost. The requested fence would not be placed on the property that is subject to the proposed special use permit; the Buddhist Vihara would need to discuss the fence.

Chairman Landovitz asked for the zoning background of this area, including buffer between the business and residential uses. Mr. Asselmeier said the subject property has been zoned business since 1976 and the neighboring houses were zoned residential since 1956. He noted that buffering would be required if this was a business proposal and there would be no public meetings. Member Hamman discussed the uses in the area.

Member Wilson asked if the property would be open to the public. The garden would be open to the public. There would be a sign-up sheet for people to use the garden.

Chairman Landovitz asked if the Petitioners planned to have festivals on the subject property and how the Petitioners manage capacity at their existing property.

Discussion occurred regarding the noise ordinance.

There were no regulations regarding a maximum capacity of the number of people on the property.

The Petitioners were agreeable to the proposed conditions in the special use permit.

Member Bernacki made a motion, seconded by Member McCarthy-Lange, to recommend approval of the special use permit with the conditions proposed by Staff.

Member Bernacki noted the property was zoned B-2 since 1976 and he could think of other uses that would generate more traffic, noise, and decrease property values. He noted the mature trees and buffers on the site.

Chairman Landovitz stated that he was in favor of the proposal. He agreed with Member Bernacki. He noted that the problem occurred because of the way the area was zoned previously. Considering the existing zoning of the area, the proposed site plan, and the main issues arising from the neighboring property and not the subject property, he did not see a reason to deny the request.

The votes were as follows:
Ayes (8): Bernacki, Casey, Hamman, Landovitz, McCarthy-Lange, Rodriguez, Wilson, and Wormley
Nays (0): None
Absent (1): Stewart
Abstain (0): None

The motion carried.

The proposal goes to the Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals on November 12, 2025.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD/PUBLIC COMMENT**
None

**NEW BUSINESS**
**Recommendation on Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Meeting Calendar**
Member McCarthy-Lange made a motion, seconded by Member Wilson to approve the meeting calendar.

With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried.

**OLD BUSINESS**
**Update on Comprehensive Plan Update Project**
Mr. Asselmeier presented the slides from Mike Hoffman of Teska Associates regarding the update. He noted the draft transportation and land use plans and the next step in the process is to have a

combined meeting of the Comprehensive Land Plan and Ordinance Committee and Regional Planning Commission on December 10, 2025.

Chairman Landovitz announced there would be a joint meeting of the Comprehensive Land Plan and Ordinance Committee and Regional Planning Commission on December 10, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

**REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD**

Mr. Asselmeier reported that Petitions 25-04 and 25-09 were approved by the County Board while Petition 25-10 was denied at the County Board.

**OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Asselmeier announced that Petition 25-18, an amendment to the special use permit at 1542 Plainfield Road, and a special use permit for a commercial solar farm near the northwest corner of Route 126 and Schlapp Roads would be on the December agenda. There might also be a rezoning request at the northeast corner of Route 47 and Caton Farm Road.

Member Casey asked if there would be some recognition of Bill Ashton. Chairman Landovitz suggested doing something at the Annual Meeting.

Discussion occurred regarding recognizing Larry Nelson. This has been on hold pending resolution of issues with Larry's family.

Member Wormley thanked the Commission Members for their service.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Member McCarthy-Lange made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to adjourn. With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Matthew H. Asselmeier, AICP, CFM, Director

Encs.: Jason Haggard's Comments
Petition to Oppose Petition 25-19
Marquez Plat of Survey

**KENDALL COUNTY**
**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**
**NOVEMBER 6, 2025**

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE CONTACTED ON FUTURE MEETINGS REGARDING THIS TOPIC, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR ADDRESS OR EMAIL ADDRESS

| NAME | ADDRESS (OPTIONAL) | EMAIL ADDRESS (OPTIONAL) |
|---|---|---|
| NICK & AMBER WILLS WILLS | [redacted] | |
| MATT CLEMENTI STANTEC | | |
| Elizabeth Corrigan | | [redacted] |
| Richard Fitzgibbon | [redacted] | Chris Ormiston [redacted] Gayle Hoddy |
| Josh Haggard | | |
| Maria D'Clement | [redacted] | |
| Brian Redland | [redacted] | |
| Ginny Haggard | [redacted] | |
| Sarah Hughes | | |
| Ryan Hughes | | Dan Hughes |

Brian Mayer
Mary Marquez

**Joshua L. Haggard — Resident, Highway 71, Newark, IL**

**Petition 25-18: JAS Powered by Greenvolt / Blue Sage Project LLC**

**Evidence Highlights**

1. County staff confirms critical analyses are missing.

    - The Kendall County Planning memo (RPC Memo — Petition 25-18, Oct. 15, 2025) explicitly notes: "No glare information." and "No property value studies were provided." These are statements in the County's official staff report.

2. Project proximity to homes and an active flight school.

    - The County memo shows approximately 22 homes within ½ mile of the site and indicates the fenced solar area will be ~20.6 acres within a 51.3-acre parcel. The proposed array comes as close as ~200 feet to nearby residences.

3. FAA/aviation safety risk not evaluated.

    - A professional glare hazard analysis FAA compatible, (e.g., ForgeSolar) is standard for projects near airports. The petition contains no glare study despite the site being less than one mile from Cushing Field — an active flight school and recreational airport.

4. No local property-value evidence provided.

    - The County memo explicitly states, "No property value studies were provided." Independent published research shows measurable reductions in home values near large solar farms, making the absence of a local study an omission of consequence.

5. Developer / corporate context — who is the applicant?

    - The applicant identifies publicly as JAS Power — "Powered by Greenvolt" (a U.S. development brand tied to Greenvolt, an international renewables company recently scaling into the U.S. market). Greenvolt states it entered the U.S. market via acquisitions and partnerships in 2022–2023.

6. County staff's recommendation is neutral due to legal/factual uncertainty.

    - The RPC memo documents staff's neutral stance (legal ambiguity / missing studies) — a clear signal that major outstanding questions remain.

**II. Immediate, binding commitments we should demand before any**

**Committee/Board approval:**

Please require the applicant to provide the following, in writing and subject to enforceable conditions or deferral of action:

1. FAA-compliant Glare Hazard Analysis (ForgeSolar or equivalent) — submitted to the County and FAA, publicly posted, and resulting mitigation measures accepted in writing before any vote.

2.Independent Kendall County property-value impact study covering properties within at least ½ mile — funded by the applicant, conducted by a mutually acceptable appraiser, and subject to public review before any vote.

3. Legally enforceable maintenance & vegetation plan — including: annual County inspections, a defined maintenance schedule, clear responsible party, and monetary performance guarantees tied to failure to maintain (not just decommissioning).

4. Robust decommissioning surety — a bond or escrow that is U.S.-jurisdictional, indexed to inflation, and payable to Kendall County if the owner/operator fails to perform.

5. Local accountability & contact — provide a U.S. registered agent, local project manager contact, and a commitment to a local dispute/inspection process (not just an out-of-state address).

**II. Questions to direct to the applicant now:**

1. Will you commit in writing, now, to fund and deliver an FAA-compliant glare study and accept binding remedies if glare is identified?

2. Will you fund an independent, Kendall County–specific property value study for homes within ½ mile and agree to postpone approval until the County and public can review it?

3. Who will be legally responsible (entity and U.S. jurisdiction) for annual maintenance, vegetative replacement, and enforcement actions — and will you agree to an escrow/performance bond for ongoing maintenance?

4. Provide documented proof of the decommissioning bond: issuer, bond number, beneficiary, and the instrument to be recorded against the property.

5. Has JAS/Greenvolt built projects with homes and airports nearby? Provide three local references, inspection logs, or corrective actions taken at those sites.

# Petition to Oppose Petition #25-19 – Chicago Buddhist Vihara

**Subject:** Special Use Permit for a Place of Worship at 5313 US Highway 34, Oswego, IL

We, the undersigned residents of Oswego and Kendall County, respectfully object to the approval of the Chicago Buddhist Vihara's special use permit request for the property located west of 5313 Route 34. Our concerns include: - Loss of privacy for neighboring homeowners, especially those whose yards and homes directly border the proposed site. - Safety risks for families and children due to increased public access and traffic. - Incompatibility of a public-access facility within a residential neighborhood. - Lack of sufficient buffers, fencing, or visual screening between residential properties and the proposed meditation garden. We ask the Kendall County Regional Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the special use permit or impose strict protective conditions to preserve the privacy, safety, and peaceful enjoyment of nearby homes.

**Submitted by:**
[redacted]
[redacted]3

| Name (Printed) | Signature | Address | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| G. MENDEZ | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-7-25 |
| Mary Margaret | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-7-25 |
| Connie Smith | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-7-25 |
| Vincent Mayer | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-7-25 |
| Ismael Orozco | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-7-25 |
| Jeff Sittler | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-8-25 |
| Darlene Smith | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-8-25 |
| Ariana Reynolds | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-8-25 |
| MICHAEL REYNOLDS | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10-8-25 |
| Shawnna Bauer | [redacted] | [redacted] | 10/8/25 |

# Petition to Oppose Petition #25-19 – Chicago Buddhist Vihara

**Subject:** Special Use Permit for a Place of Worship at 5313 US Highway 34, Oswego, IL

We, the undersigned residents of Oswego and Kendall County, respectfully object to the approval of the Chicago Buddhist Vihara's special use permit request for the property located west of 5313 Route 34. Our concerns include: - Loss of privacy for neighboring homeowners, especially those whose yards and homes directly border the proposed site. - Safety risks for families and children due to increased public access and traffic. - Incompatibility of a public-access facility within a residential neighborhood. - Lack of sufficient buffers, fencing, or visual screening between residential properties and the proposed meditation garden. We ask the Kendall County Regional Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the special use permit or impose strict protective conditions to preserve the privacy, safety, and peaceful enjoyment of nearby homes.

**Submitted by:**
Nicole Mayer
[redacted]

| Name (Printed) | [redacted] | [redacted] | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| MARY ELLERSON | | | 10-7-2025 |
| PATRICK McKENTINE | | | 10-9-2025 |
| Donna MAKOWS | | | 10-9-25 |
| Scott MAKOWSK | | | 10-9-25 |
| Faith Weiffenbach | | | 10-9-25 |
| Sandra J Somocal | | | 10-19-25 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

# PLAT OF SURVEY

PARCEL ONE: LOT 56 OF THE HIGHLANDS, IN THE TOWNSHIP OF OSWEGO. KENDALL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PARCEL TWO: THAT PART OF LOT 40 OF OWNER'S SECOND SUBDIVISION OF PART OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 37 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 10 OF SAID OWNER'S SECOND SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG A LINE WHICH IF EXTENDED WOULD INTERSECT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 56 OF THE HIGHLANDS, 104.55 FEET FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LINE 104.55 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 56; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 56, 150 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 56; THENCE SLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE EXTENDED SOUTHERLY OF SAID LOT 56, 86.55 FEET TO A LINE DRAWN FROM THE POINT OF BEGINNING TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE EXTENDED NORTHERLY OF SAID LOT 10 WHICH IS 84.15 FEET NORTHERLY OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 10; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LINE 115.6 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN THE TOWNSHIP OF OSWEGO, KENDALL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

N
W E
S
SCALE: 1"=30'
1" 30'

OSAGE COURT — ASPHALT ROAD

BLACKTOP DRIVE

RECORD=N 79°18'0" W

87°33'24"

150.00

33.0

CONCRETE DRIVEWAY

62.69 68.18 67.27

22.26 30.05 9.17 8.26 4.99 3.17 25.97 43.79

17.23 8.33 12.85 8.17 14.27 7.67 36.01 43.81

27.71

200.00

ONE STORY BRICK & FRAME RESIDENCE HSE. NO. 67

27.72

CONCRETE

Fence 0.53 wly

Nicole Mayer

57

CHAIN LINK FENCE

Our LOT 56 Property

200.00 RECORD=S 8°41'0" W

0.00
=150.42

Fence 0.38 nly 0.42 wly

Shed 1.30 ely 12.35

SHED 12.79

Shed 0.85 sly 0.23 ely

55

DEED=150
Meas.= 149.79

36.20

Open area

Buddhist Vihara

DEED=104.55
Meas.= 109.27

PARCEL TWO

OWNER'S SECOND ADDITION

POINT OF BEGINNING (PARCEL TWO)

Garage 7.42 ely

GARAGE

Garage 8.01 ely

Meas.= 87.88
DEED=86.55

Found Cut Off Post 1.09 nly 0.24 wly

Meas.= 114.53
DEED=115.6

52.15

104.55

84.15

ORDERED BY: GILBERT MARQUEZ

STATE OF ILLINOIS } S. S.
COUNTY OF KENDALL }

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, AN ILLINOIS LAND SURVEYOR, HAVE SURVEYED THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED ABOVE AND THAT THE ANNEXED PLAT IS A CORRECT REPRESENTATION OF SAID SURVEY. THIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONFORMS TO THE CURRENT ILLINOIS MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY.
GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL AT OSWEGO, ILLINOIS, THIS 31ST DAY OF OCTOBER A. D., 2025.

[redacted]

ILLINOIS LAND SURVEYOR NO. [redacted]

(LICENSE SUBJECT TO RENEWAL AND EXPIRES 11/30/2026)

WILLIAM MATTHEW WINGSTEDT
REGISTERED
LAND SURVEYOR
LICENSE NO. [redacted]
OSWEGO, IL
PROFESSIONAL
STATE OF ILLINOIS

FIELD WORK COMPLETED, BUILDINGS AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS LOCATED AS SHOWN ON THE 31ST OF OCTOBER, A. D., 2025.

ORDER NO. 25 J 056 FILE NO. 250970

REFER TO DEED OR GUARANTEE POLICY FOR RESTRICTIONS NOT SHOWN ON SURVEY.
ALL DIMENSIONS ARE SHOWN IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.
LINE DIRECTIONS AND BEARINGS, WHERE SHOWN, ARE BASED ON AN *ASSUMED* DATUM LINE.
PLEASE COMPARE ALL POINTS BEFORE BUILDING AND REPORT ANY APPARENT DISCREPANCIES

67 OSAGE.DWG
● = found iron stake
○ = set iron stake


WILLIAM M. WINGSTEDT
ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
329 WHITE PINES CT., OSWEGO, ILLINOIS 60543
PHONE: (630) 554-8209 FAX (630) 551-1207
Email: Wwing@aol.com