



*Italics – Consultant response to comment*

**Red text**– Proposed new text to be added to the document

Page #s are from February draft. Many have changed in the April Public Hearing Draft.

## Revisions based on Open House Workshops and March 25<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Land Plan Committee Meeting

April 2, 2026

### Comments – to be included in revision

- How long will the plan be valid? – *The plan was designed with a 20-year time frame in mind, and a note to that regard can be added to the purpose and use section on page 2 at the end of the first paragraph. “This plan is designed as 20-year vision to manage future growth and development.”*
- On page 29, the third bullet point under Goal 1.1, could this be interpreted that the County should not amend the Future Land Use Map to reclassify properties from Agricultural to something else? – *That is the intent, will add this sentence for clarity “If the County Board determines that it is appropriate to rezone agricultural property, the Future Land Use Plan should also be amended.”*
- Have you done any population projections? – *Yes, see below. These will be included on page 13 under population growth. We also added a note on the split between residents within a municipality (81%) and residents in unincorporated areas (19%).*

Year	Population	10 Year Change
1990	39,413	
2000	54,544	38.4%
2010	114,736	110.4%
2020	131,863	14.9%
2024	143,171	21.5%
2030	155,598	18%
2040	183,606	18%
2050	216,655	18%

- Under the Conservation Foundation on page 57, please mention we have preserved 1,378 acres total in Kendall protecting 23 sites, many of which are now Forest preserves? Also, add “The” before Conservation Foundation as it is a part of the official title of the organization. - yes, *added*.
- Under the Conservation Foundation on page 57 - Can you mention that the Lower Fox River is one of only 33 Conservation Opportunity Areas in the state designated by the IDNR as a high priority conservation area? We have “adopted” this COA, which also includes the LaSalle County portion of the watershed, as one of our top TCF priorities. – **yes, will add this information.**
- On page 66 in the figure, it says protected open space is 4.5%. On page 70 at the top, it says 10%. -*The 4.5% is correct and will change the text on page 70 accordingly.*
- The County Board, when John Church was Chairman, passed an ordinance (05-48 titled The Agricultural Conservation Easement and Farmland Protection Program) promoting the placement of agricultural easements on property. This offers tax benefits to the landowner and preserves agricultural use from future development. Kane County has a similar program, but in their case they have dedicated funds to purchase the easements providing an additional financial benefit to the property owner for creating the easement. Is that policy still in place? – *Staff researched this topic and found:*
  - *The Ordinance was adopted in 2005, and amended in 2008 to reflect the terms of the County Board representatives to correspond with the terms of office for the County Board Members. The Ordinance:*
    - *Creates a Land Trust Commission, responsible for administering the ordinance;*
    - *Authorizes the County Board to acquire conservation easements thru purchase or donation;*
    - *Permits the County to work with a nonprofit to operate and manage the program*
  - *There are no agendas or minutes in the PBZ Department files and the Commission is not listed on the Department’s FOIA posting in 2010. As such, there is also no record of any agricultural conservation easements ever being created by the County.*
  - *In the November 2023 edition of the draft County Code, Ordinance 2005-48 is listed, but it is lined out with note reading “Delete as Obsolete”.*
  - *When the County Board approved the County Code, Ordinance 2005-48 would have been revoked because it was known to exist and was deleted. The revocation may have been inadvertent, but Ordinance 2005-48 and Ordinance 2008-43 were repealed.*

*Since this is a possible tool to promote agricultural conservation that could be restored, we will note the potential to re-instate this ordinance under Goal 1.1 on page 125. New Policy under 1.1: “Promote agricultural conservation easements which offer tax benefits to landowners and preserve agricultural use from development.”*

- Will the future land use map become the zoning map for the County? – No, the current zoning will remain in place. However, the Future Land Use Plan will be used to guide future zoning decisions if a change is requested by a property owner. Text clarifying this will be added to the Future Land Use section around page 70. *“Zoning is the legal tool used by the County to regulate the use of land. Designation of land on the Future Land Use Plan does not change the current zoning of the property. The Future Land Use Plan is a guide for County decisions on requests for future rezoning.”*
- Based on the land use definitions on pages 71-73, the Future Land Use Map does not call for any properties to be rezoned to M-2 or M-3. Is that a correct statement? – *that was not the intent, changing the definition of Industrial to include potential M-2 zoning, and adding a potential mining district to clarify that M-3 would be appropriate in that area.*
  - **Industrial.** The Industrial land use category provides for employment opportunities for County residents while providing a balanced tax base. Appropriate uses include offices, warehousing, highway-oriented commercial businesses, and light industrial uses as permitted within the County’s B-5 Business Planned Development District, B-6 Office and Research Park District, and M-1 Limited Manufacturing District and **M-2 Heavy Industrial District**. ~~Heavy industrial uses as defined for the County’s M-2 Heavy Industrial District are prohibited.~~ Buildings and land in this category should be properly landscaped and developed in an orderly manner that conveys a well-maintained environment, which is particularly important to create an attractive buffer between Industrial and any adjacent residential areas.
  - **Mining.** The Mining land use category applies to existing, active mining quarries. These quarries are located just west of Route 47 between Joliet Road and Sherrill Road. Although the quarries are largely kept out of view by tall man-made hills, the existence of the quarries is fairly apparent by the volume of truck traffic in the area, particularly as the trucks enter and exit off of Route 47 via Quarry Road. Mining uses typically fall under the M-3 Manufacturing District (Earth Material Extraction, Processing and Site Reclamation).
  - **Potential Mining.** As development continues to occur in the region, there may come a time when expansion of existing mines is needed. The potential mining district overlay indicates areas believed to have underlying mineral resources and access to key transportation routes which may make them appropriate for future mining activity and rezoning to M-3. Any specific mining application will be closely reviewed to ensure that it meets

environmental performance standards appropriate to Kendall County and the specific location, including the buffering of such uses from adjacent residential, institutional, or public uses. Road impacts will also be closely evaluated to minimize impact on local transportation systems.

- What is the definition of “additional open space opportunity and riparian corridor as used on the Future Land Use Plan? Will add the following definitions around page 73:
  - **Additional Open Space Opportunity.** Land that contains significant natural features, including but not limited to mature woodlands, prairies, and wetlands. These areas would be ideal candidates for conservation easements and other techniques to maintain their ecological integrity and to protect these important environmental resources. Development still may be appropriate based on the underlying land use, but only after careful review of the existing environmental assets.
  - **Riparian Corridor.** A vegetated area located adjacent to creeks, streams, rivers, and other waterways that should be protected from development, disturbance, or encroachment in order to maintain natural hydrologic, ecological, and water quality functions. The appropriate width of the corridor is variable based on site conditions such as slopes, soils, vegetative cover, etc.
- Is there any mention of incorporating conservation design principles in the Residential and other types of development scenarios? - They county has long support this approach, and the RPD regulations were created for that purpose. *The following text will be added in a call-out box near the definitions of planned rural estate and planned rural residential on page 71. “The Planned Residential land use categories are designed to accommodate conservation design subdivisions. With conservation design, residential lot sizes are reduced in exchange for additional common open space. These open space areas can contain recreational amenities such as trails and playgrounds. They typically include a combination of preservation of existing woodland and prairie and new native plantings. Several conservation design subdivisions were started in the County prior to the recession on the mid 2000s, including Brighton Oaks, Grove Estates, Henneberry Woods, and Rosehill. (including some photo or sketch examples.)”*
- Page 74 - -Under "Character and Land Use, Please give an explanation of the numbers. – *These were GIS area calculations based on the existing and proposed future land use plans. We can add a note explaining this in the document: “Acreage noted in the above table was calculated from the GIS used to create the Future Land Use Plans. These areas represent an ultimate development pattern in 20 plus years*

*after these areas are built out. For the foreseeable future, actual land use will remain closer to the existing land use shown on pages 66-67.”*

- -Page 80, Rt 34 between Eldamain and 47 not a truck route? – *It is designated as a Class II Truck Route by the State, and the map shows this. What we didn’t show was the segment of 34 east of 47 as a truck route, which is per IDOT, so we will add that to the map.*
- Page 87-88 – Trails and Active Transportation
  - Crossing busy state routes like Route 47 or 71 is dangerous. Consider safety improvements (this was particularly noted in Newark with people crossing to go to the school or to Dollar General, and on trail crossings proposed on Route 47) -*Agree this is an issue, and will add some text to page 88 talking about the important of safe crossings (either grade separated or at signalized intersections).*
  - Oswego has planned bridge connections to islands within the Fox River. These should be shown on the trail plan. – *Agreed and can add as requested.*
- Page 93 – great to promote rooftop solar, should also consider adding parking lot solar coverage – *agree and can mention in text, and will add a photo to emphasize use of roof top solar.*
- Page 96, Does the map of sanitary districts reflect current boundaries or proposed? It is important to know their future plans. We should include Joliet's Ridge Rd. Sanitary plant? – *What is shown is their current jurisdictional boundaries based on the GIS maps we have been able to locate. If they have plans for extension beyond these limits that information is not publicly available. If we show the Joliet sanitary plant, we should probably show plants for Plano and the other sanitary districts – and we can and will do that.*
- What is the process to change the plan? – *we will add a short discussion in the strategies section around page 120 to discuss keeping the plan updated as conditions change. This includes continuing to host an Annual Meeting to review the plan and make amendments as-needed. We will also recommend a more in-depth review every 10 years. We will also note that if the County Board determines a project is appropriate but inconsistent with the plan, the plan should also be modified concurrently with the project’s zoning approval.*
  - *Update first paragraph of Implementation chapter to read: This plan outlines a vision for County growth and development over the next 20 to 30 years. Achieving that vision will take hard work, teamwork both within and outside the County government, and perseverance. The Vision outlined in Chapter 3 highlights some policies that should lead to plan success. Implementation of those polices will require close coordination with the County’s partners and*

*modification or creation of some new tools to fund or manage key plan initiatives. It will also require regular updates to this plan. Consistent with current policy, the plan should be discussed at the annual meeting held by the Regional Planning Commission, and updated at least every 10 years. If the County Board determines that a project is appropriate but inconsistent with the plan, the plan should be modified concurrently with the project's zoning approval.*

- Page 123 under Conservation Foundation – should be *Dickson* Murst Farm (not *Dirkson*)
- Funding for the Forest Preserve District should be increased to allow for additional open space acquisition. Other residents expressed concerns regarding high taxes in the county and the potential for an additional sales tax to fund the Forest Preserves. – *We will modify the text on page 126 under resources for Goal 1.3 to note exploring a broader range of funding options beyond sales tax, including user fees.*
  - *Funding for acquisition of open space, including seeking grants, donations, user fees, and potential creation of a dedicated revenue stream through sales tax (with required state authorization)*
- On page 128, Goal 3.1, should we add HOAs as partners? - *Yes, we will add.*
- **Future Land Use Plan Changes**
  - *Industrial north of Galena along Ashe –Match Plano's Comprehensive Plan.*
  - *Scale back the renewable energy overlay east of Grove Road given significant riparian stream corridors and tree cover in this area – While these areas are shown for potential renewable energy by Minooka, we concur with the suggestion and have removed the overlay in this area.*
  - *Remove the Additional Open Space Opportunity overlay on the area south of Reservation Road and east of Minkler Road – the County previously amended the LRMP based on evidence provided by Sheri Pellegrini documenting an ecological study by S/E Group showing that most trees in this area are non-native and/or poor quality. – While the study only covered a portion of the area proposed for additional open space opportunity, we concur and have removed the overlay and removed from the Recreational Open Space map. The areas not covered by the study are all in single-family lots, and while air photography shows heavy tree cover homeowners are likely to maintain the trees as they add value to their property.*
- Page 133, Local Regulations, should expand the discussion on the forestry definition, and also recommend addressing stacked storage containers.
  - *Add the following as an additional paragraph under the forestry discussion: Grundy County includes tree clearing, including forestry, and incidental*

*processing, as part of their definition of agricultural uses. This approach may also be helpful, clarifying that operations that harvest and process trees on-site would be permitted, while businesses that harvest trees off-site and process on another site could be handled with a different zoning approach.*

- **Cargo Containers** – *Cargo containers are increasingly used to transport goods both by rail and by truck. Storage of these containers has been an issue in other counties, particularly at intermodal facilities where these containers can be stacked. Updating the zoning ordinance to address container storage is recommended. Will County has good regulations which could serve as a starting point of any code amendment.*

- **Recreational Open Opportunity Map**

- *Reservation Woods is the highest quality natural area in the State. A must protect. – We were not aware it ranked that high on the state list, but agree it is a wonderful area, and one of the reasons why we show a scenic route along Route 126 to the south. The Forest Preserve District has acquired several properties in the area – and ideally would acquire more as they became available and funding was in place. While we have removed the additional open space opportunities in this area due to a resident request, we support the idea of interconnection of these areas. We propose adding a future trail connecting the existing Forest Preserve properties from Van Emmons Road to Grove Road.*
- *Advise not including golf courses in open space – We generally did not show them as open space on the open space map as suggested. However, we did show the White Tail Ridge golf course as open space on the Future Land Use Plan. Since the course was an integral part of the overall Planned Development, we are comfortable leaving as shown.*
- *We should push hard to buy land along the Fox River to connect existing Forest Preserves to provide the trail system residents want. – Agree, and the plan does show a proposed continuous trail along the Fox River, but it is a little hard to read. We will boost the width of the proposed trail, so it is easier to read. The open space land use category on the future land use map does show a corridor along the Fox River generally consistent with flood plain and wooded areas.*

- **Future Roadway Plan**

- *Why does the plan show an extension of Beecher Road crossing the Fox River west of 47 and east of Eldamain ? Why does the plan show an additional river crossing on the east side of Yorkville connecting to Reservation Road? (these concerns were raised by several participants, who were generally opposed to*

the extensions based on environmental and economic impacts)– *These extensions were both shown on Yorkville’s plan, and their staff requested we show them on our plan. However, given the recent annexation into Yorkville, the cost of extending a road across the river, and the limited regional benefit of these roads, **these extensions have been removed from the plan.***

- Should the western extension of Caton Farm Road west of Lisbon Road swing south and tie into Hughes Road rather than extending all the way to Route 71? - *This seems like a logical suggestion, reducing the cost of future roadway improvements. However, it would add additional traffic to Hughes Road. **This change to the extension of Caton Farm Road west to Hughes has been included in the revised plan.***
- According to residents, there is already a lot of truck traffic on Grove Road, yet seemingly little on Route 47. Connecting Grove with Brisbin Road will only increase truck use of Grove Road, and this connection should not be made. – *The County has planned for this connection for some time, and options have been discussed with the Sterring Committee. **Since this connection is not included in the County’s long-term transportation plan, and capacity exists to handle north/south truck traffic on either Route 47 or Ridge Road, this Brisbin/Grove connection will be removed from the plan.***
- Why is there a proposed minor collector roadway between Van Emmon and Route 126 along the Lyons Forest Preserve? This is an important wildlife corridor. – *This was taken from the Yorkville Plan. You generally want a minor collector every mile or so in an urbanized area, and without this new roadway it would remain over two miles without a north-south connecting route between Route 47 and Reservation Road. However, we appreciate the concern and would not anticipate a lot of dense development in this area. **This proposed minor collector has been removed.***
- A resident asked about the proposed broadband loop. Page 25 generally discusses the proposed Fox Fiber plan –***The committee recommended including a coverage map, which will be more helpful to residents.***
- What happens if there are conflicts between the County’s plan and the plans for Plattville or Millbrook? – *Since these communities rely on county zoning regulations and the RPC to hold hearings, general consistency between the plans is desirable. Both communities are in the process of updating their plans, and County staff and consultants have meet with the Mayors of both communities to improve consistency between the plans and they are in general alignment. Once area noted by a resident is the renewable energy overlay, which is shown on the County’s plan south of 52 and on the draft Plattville Plan at the southwest corner of Caton Farm*

*and Ashley Roads. County staff reached out to Plattville and they have revised their plan to show the renewable energy overlay in the same area as the County plan.*

## **Editorial Changes to be Included in Revised Draft**

(These items were not specifically noted by residents, but have been identified by Teska as appropriate for inclusion in the plan)

- All maps
  - Adjust municipal boundaries of Lisbon and Yorkville per recent annexations.
  - Updated date prepared.
- Update cover with new date and title “Public Hearing Draft.”
- Acknowledgements
  - Add note that Bill Ashton resigned from the committee.
  - Add note that Claire Wilson resigned from the RPC.
  - Add Philip Resendiz to the RPC.
  - Add Todd Volker to list of County Staff
- Table of Contents – adjust page numbers as appropriate.
- Page 13, Population growth, note that 81% live within a municipality.
- Page 29 and Page 125 – Goal 1.3 – clarify the goal is 30 acres of regional open space per **1,000 residents**.
- Page 58 – Existing Open Space and Trails – Make existing trails bolder so they are easier to read. Where trails follow a proposed roadway, if the roadway is realigned the trail will also be realigned (like Caton Farm Road or the potential minor collector on the southeast side of Yorkville near Van Emmon).
- Page 61 – Tree Canopy Map – shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Page 65 – List of Scenic Routes
  - Add Eldamain Road between River Road and Fox Road
  - Add Budd Road between Millbrook Road and the ComEd Transmission Line
  - Add Millbrook Road between Fox River Drive and Walker Road
  - Delete Ridge Road
- Page 67 – Existing Land Use – shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Pages 72-73 – Future Land Use categories
  - Transportation Corridor – clarify that A1-SU is also an appropriate zoning category.
  - Industrial – delete the sentence that says M-2 not allowed.
  - Add definitions for Preserved Open Space, Riparian Corridor, Additional Open Space Opportunity, Potential Mining District

- Page 80 – Existing Transportation Network – shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Page 96 - - shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Page 99 - - shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map, make township lines white so you can read them in darker colored areas.
- Page 101 - - shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Pages 107-110 – add a tone on the air photos showing key industrial opportunities to clarify which areas in the photo are included.
- Page 111 - - shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Page 114 - - shift location of north arrow and scale to enlarge map.
- Page 133 – added text on local regulations (previously provided to the committee)

## Resident Comments – No Changes Needed

- The plan should address Data Centers, particularly the human health and environment. – *Given demands for water, any proposed data center would likely be within a municipality and outside the zoning authority of the County. We could note this under the economic development chapter, but it seemed obvious to us, and we did not propose any change.*
- Not in favor of the Eldamain extension. This is not an ideal place for industrial or expanded truck traffic. It is a hazard to agricultural equipment traveling and residential/rural quality of life. – *We have discussed this with the committee. This plan has been in place for many years, and will aid the north/south flow of traffic and direct it to Walker Road and over to Route 47. As such, we have left as proposed.*
- Page 47 Hoover Forest Preserve is listed as 400 acres? – *Yes, per the county GIS, so no change needed.*
- -Pg.42 , Evelyn site 1650 BC? – *Based on the information we have found (internet search), yes, no change needed.*
- A resident asked about the expansion of passenger rail service to Kendall County. – *The plan addresses this on pages 81 and 82, noting the engineering studies being conducted and the potential alternatives being considered.*
- The speed limit on Fox River Drive goes up to 55 mph right before the entrance to Millbrook South Forest Preserve increases the chance of accidents. – *point well taken, but the Comprehensive Plan does not get to the detail of roadway speed limits.*

- **Economic Development Opportunity Map**

- As with connecting to Lake Michigan water, I don't see mention of water conservation measures or supporting groundwater replenishing/infiltration in plan. – *Correct, currently not discussed – and sends the County does not really operate any public water systems, not sure it is critical to add to this already long document. While we agree water conservation and recharge is important, conservation is more of a municipal issue and recharge is promoted by the extensive agricultural areas shown on the plan.*
- Is air and noise pollution accounted for in this map? – *Not really, proposed industrial areas are generally compact and away from major subdivisions. Addressing air and noise pollution is typically done at the development review stage – not the comprehensive plan stage. No change proposed.*
- I would prefer if residential transitioned to mixed use before industrial. Move industrial away from existing homes. – *We feel most proposed industrial is away from existing homes. We agree that residential transition to mixed use is appropriate, but most of that will occur with municipalities and is not shown on the counties plan.*

- **Recreational Open Space Opportunity Map**

- How many acres is the open space shown along Van Dyke Road? – *The open space opportunity shown on the map is just a bubble, showing the general area. There is no defined acreage.*

- **Future Land Use Plan**

- What future growth is planned south of Yorkville? Given topography, a pumping station would be needed for sanitary sewer if the area was to be annexed and developed. – *Yorkville's Comprehensive show's limited growth south of town, and the proposed County Plan shows only potential commercial development along Route 47 and potential rural residential development west of Route 47 – all of which would be on well and septic.*