

**KENDALL COUNTY  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

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

**Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2025 - 7:00 p.m.**

Chairman Keith Landovitz called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Mr. Asselmeier announced that Bill Ashton had resigned from the Regional Planning Commission.

Members Present: Eric Bernacki, Tom Casey, Dave Hamman, Keith Landovitz, Karin McCarthy-Lange, Ruben Rodriguez, Bob Stewart, Claire Wilson, and Seth Wormley

Members Absent: Bob Stewart

Staff Present: Matthew H. Asselmeier, Director, and Christina Burns, County Administrator

Others Present: Mike Hoffman, Boyd Ingemunson, Fran Miller, Ron Miller, Steven Papaeliou, Tim O'Brien, David Shively, Jeremy Dippold, Ed Kirch, Randy Pertler, Ernesto Ramirez, Patrick McCrimmon, Margaret Pearson, John Pearson, Sharon Robinson, Deb Mayerle, Doug Winsor, Jack Marlowe, Miriam Schneider, Ken Schneider, and Ansar Gafur

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Member Hamman made a motion, seconded by Member Wormley, to approve the minutes of the August 27, 2025, special meeting, August 27, 2025, regular meeting, and September 24, 2025, gathering with a correction to the August 27, 2025, noting that those members listed as being absent for the votes on Petition 25-09 and 25-10 voted against the proposals. With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried.

Chairman Landovitz explained the rules of procedure of the meeting.

**PETITIONS**

**Petition 25-08 Jeremy M. and Samantha L. Dippold on Behalf of Best Budget Tree, LLC**

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

The Petitioners would like to operate a recreational vehicle and boat storage business at the subject property. Best Budget Tree, LLC has been in existence for over ten (10) years and has operated at the subject property since 2022; forestry is a permitted in use in the A-1 Agricultural District.

The application materials, including the business plan, the site plan, including the landscaping plan, and the plat of survey were provided.

The property is located at 2241 Route 52.

The property is approximately forty-eight point three plus or minus (48.3 +/-) acres total with approximately six point five plus or minus (6.5 +/-) acres planned for the parking area.

The existing land use is Agricultural and the property is used for a forestry business.

The property is zoned A-1 Agricultural.

The County's plan calls for the property to be Rural Residential (Max 0.65 DU/Acre). The Village of Shorewood's plan call for the property to be Residential and Commercial.

Route 52 is a State maintained Arterial. Arbeiter Road is a Major Collector Road maintained by Seward Township.

Joliet has a trail planned along Route 52, but the property is on the Shorewood side of the boundary agreement between the two (2) municipalities.

There are no floodplains on the property. There is a wetland near the northwest corner of the property.

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

The adjacent properties are zoned A-1 and R-3.

The County's plan calls for the area to be Rural Residential. The Village of Shorewood's plan calls for the area to be Residential, Commercial, and Institutional. The City of Joliet's plan calls for the area to be Residential.

Properties within one half (1/2) of a mile of the property are zoned A-1, A-1 SU, R-1, and R-3.

The A-1 special use permit to the west is for the sale of agricultural products not grown on the premises.

There are nine (9) homes adjoining the subject property.

EcoCAT Report was submitted on June 16, 2025, and indicated the following protected resources:

Aux Sable Creek INAI Site

Greater Redhorse (*Moxostoma valenciennesi*)

On June 16, 2025, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources submitted a letter stating adverse impacts were unlikely and consultation was terminated. This letter was provided.

The application for NRI was submitted as part of the application from 2022. The LESA Score was 210 indicating a medium level of protection. The NRI Report was provided.

Petition information was sent to Seward Township on July 25, 2025. The Seward Township Planning Commission met on August 5, 2025, and unanimously recommended denial of the proposal. The reasons for the denial were as follows: the property was never intended to allow for such uses and goes against the forestry use on the property, the access was always supposed to be only from Route 52 and not Arbeiter Road, there will be significant property value decreases to the homes along Arbeiter Road, there are major concerns with the aesthetics of adding this use to the property, drainage concerns, and there is no advantage to the Township or County for allowing this use on the property (i.e. no additional tax revenue). The email with this information was provided. The Seward Township Board met on August 12, 2025, and unanimously recommended denial of the proposal. The minutes of the Seward Township Board were provided.

Petition information was sent to the Village of Shorewood on July 25, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Village of Shorewood submitted an email stating they had no objections to this proposal. This email was provided.

Petition information was sent to the Minooka Fire Protection District on July 25, 2025. The Minooka Fire Protection District submitted a letter on August 5, 2025, requesting a Knox gate lock for the gate and that the parking lot conforms to the load of a fire truck and the Petitioner needs to provide a truck turn around analysis plan. This letter was provided.

ZPAC reviewed the proposal at their meeting on August 6, 2025. Discussion occurred regarding the number of employees at the property, the use of Arbeiter Road, and the proposed hours of operations. ZPAC voted to forward the proposal to the Kendall County Regional Planning Commission by a vote of five (5) in favor, zero (0) in opposition, one (1) present, and four (4) absent. The minutes of the meeting were provided.

The Petitioners failed to publish notice fifteen (15) days prior to the September 2, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals hearing. At the August 27, 2025, Kendall County Regional Planning Commission meeting, prior to the vote to remove the Petition from the agenda, Claire Wilson provided evidence that the current operation was not a forestry business. This information was provided.

Per Section 36-282 (54) of the Kendall County Code, storage facilities can be special uses on A-1 zoned property subject to the following conditions:

1. The business shall be located on, and have direct access to, a State, County or collector highway as identified in the County's Land Resource Management Plan, having an all-weather surface, designed to accommodate loads of at least eighty thousand (80,000) pounds.
2. Unless specifically permitted under a special use permit, all storage shall be in enclosed buildings.

If the County Board approves outdoor storage, the above conditions have been met.

According to the business plan, the Petitioners propose to operate an outdoor storage business at the subject property. The outdoor storage would be limited to recreational vehicles and boats.

According to the site plan, a total of three hundred twenty-six (326) parking stalls are proposed. One hundred sixty-three (163) parking stalls are proposed in Phase I and one hundred sixty-three parking (163) stalls are proposed in Phase II. All of the parking stalls would be twelve feet by thirty-five feet (12'X35'). The parking lot would cover approximately six point five (6.5) acres of the site and would be asphalt grindings. Parking stalls would be numbered with signs at the front of each stall.

According to the business plan, hours of operation would be daily from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.

Other than the Petitioners, the business would not have any employees. Rentals would be arranged online and the parking area would be controlled by gated access with tenants assigned a passcode.

If approved, the Petitioners plan to start operations in the fall of 2025.

Per the site plan, there are two existing buildings on the site, one (1) approximately eleven thousand, five hundred twenty (11,520) square foot building and one (1) approximately thirteen thousand, seven hundred fifty (13,750) square foot building. Both of these buildings are related to the existing forestry operations and no new buildings are planned related to the proposed outdoor storage business.

There are utilities onsite serving the forestry business. No utilities are planned to serve the outdoor storage business area.

One (1) eight foot by twelve foot (8' X 12') dumpster enclosure was shown on the site plan east of the parking area. No information was provided regarding the type of fence used for the dumpster enclosure.

The property drains to the south and northwest.

There is one (1) wetland located near the northwest corner of the property.

The site plan shows an existing pond on the property and three (3) four inch (4") field tile lines. There is also a gravel area for the forestry business. These items are located south and west from the proposed storage area.

The Petitioners submitted a stormwater permit application. On August 18, 2025, WBK submitted a letter with questions and comments related to applicable permits, the stormwater management report, and engineer plans. This letter was provided.

Per the site plan, the Petitioners plan to install one (1) twenty-four foot (24') wide gravel driveway from Arbeiter Road. Arbeiter Road has a ten (10) ton weight limit. The outdoor storage area will not have any access to Route 52

On July 25, 2025, Seward Township submitted an email requesting a thirty-three foot (33') deep right-of-way dedication along Arbeiter Road. This email was provided.

According to site plan, the Petitioners plan to install two (2) sixty foot (60') wide driving aisles with parking stalls on both sides of the aisles.

Three (3) pipeline easements exist on the property, but these easements are not in the vicinity of the proposed outdoor storage area.

No lighting is proposed in the outdoor parking and storage area.

According to the site plan, one (1) non-illuminated sign is proposed east of the gravel driveway in the landscaped area. No information was provided regarding sign dimensions or height. Per the Kendall County Code, the total maximum allowable signage is thirty-two (32) square feet of gross surface area.

According to the business plan and site plan, an eight foot (8') tall black chainlink fence is proposed around the north, east, and south sides of the storage area. On the east and north sides, the fence will be five feet (5') off of the property line. The site plan also shows a security access gate.

According to the business plan and the site plan, two (2) rows of evergreens spaced at forty foot (40') centers exist along most of the perimeter of the property.

No information was provided regarding noise control.

No new odors are foreseen by the proposed use.

If approved, this would be the sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) special use permit for storage of recreational vehicles and boats in unincorporated Kendall County. All five (5) of the existing special use permits allow some form of outdoor storage.

The proposed findings of fact were 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, the operation of the special use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. Conditions may be placed in the special use permit ordinance to address hours of operation and control measures for leaks.

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. Appropriate restrictions may be placed in the special use permit to regulate the number of employees, hours of operation, site landscaping, lighting, and noise. Therefore, the neighboring property owners should not suffer a loss in property values and the use will not negatively impact the adjacent land uses.

That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. If a stormwater management permit is issued based on the submitted materials, drainage should not be an issue. If Seward Township approves the access from Arbeiter Road, ingress and egress 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. If the County Board approves the outdoor storage request, this is true. No variances are required.

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. True, the proposed use is consistent with an objective found on Page 9-21 of the Kendall County Land Resource Management Plan which calls for “a strong base of agricultural, commercial and industrial uses that provide a broad range of job opportunities, a healthy tax base, and improved quality of services to County residents”.

Staff recommended approval of the special use permit for outdoor storage of recreational vehicles and boats only subject to the following conditions and restrictions; to date, the Petitioners had not agreed to these conditions:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan.
2. Items stored outdoors at the subject property related to this special use permit are limited to boats and recreational vehicles. No junk or debris, as defined by the Kendall County Code, shall be stored outdoors on the property.
3. Other than the perimeter trees, fencing, and no junk and debris requirements, the conditions contained in this special use permit shall not extend to the forestry operations conducted on the subject property.
4. Within ninety (90) days of approval of this special use permit, the owners of the subject property shall dedicate a strip of land along the perimeter of Arbeiter Road thirty-three feet (33') in depth as measured from the center Arbeiter Road to Seward Township. The Kendall County Planning, Building and

Zoning Department may grant an extension to this deadline.

5. The hours of operation for the business allowed by this special use permit shall be daily from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.
6. Other than the owners of the business allowed by this special use permit, the business allowed by this special use permit shall have zero (0) employees.
7. None of the vehicles or items parked or stored on premises shall be considered agricultural equipment as they relate to the businesses allowed by the special use permit.
8. All of the vehicles or items stored on the premises shall be maintained in good condition with no deflated tires and shall be licensed if required by law.
9. The owners of the business allowed by this special use permit shall diligently monitor the property for leaks from vehicles and items stored on the premises and shall promptly clean up the site if leaks occur.

10. The noise regulations are as follows:

Day Hours: No person shall cause or allow the emission of sound during daytime hours (7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.) from any noise source to any receiving residential land which exceeds sixty-five (65) dBA when measured at any point within such receiving residential land, provided; however, that point of measurement shall be on the property line of the complainant.

Night Hours: No person shall cause or allow the emission of sound during nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) from any noise source to any receiving residential land which exceeds fifty-five (55) dBA when measured at any point within such receiving residential land provided; however, that point of measurement shall be on the property line of the complainant.

**EXEMPTION:** Powered Equipment: Powered equipment, such as lawn mowers, small lawn and garden tools, riding tractors, and snow removal equipment which is necessary for the maintenance of the property is exempted from the noise regulations between the hours of seven o'clock (7:00) A.M. and ten o'clock (10:00) P.M.

11. The owners of the business allowed by the special use permit shall secure applicable permits for the parking area and sign near the entrance of Arbeiter Road. All of the parking stalls shall have signage identifying their stall number and directional signage may be installed throughout the site. Permits shall not be required for the parking stall signage and any directional signage installed on the property. None of the signs shall be illuminated.
12. KenCom and other emergency responding organizations shall be provided the access code to the Knox Box (**Added after ZPAC**).
13. The operator(s) of the business allowed by this special use permit acknowledge and agree to follow Kendall County's Right to Farm Clause.
14. The operator(s) of the business allowed by this special use permit shall follow all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws related to the operation of the business allowed by the special use permit.
15. Failure to comply with one or more of the above conditions or restrictions could result in the amendment or revocation of the special use permits.
16. If one or more of the above conditions is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining conditions shall remain valid.

17. This special use permit 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.

Boyd Ingemunson, Attorney for the Petitioners, stated the Petitioners were agreeable to the conditions as proposed by Staff except condition 5 pertaining to hours of operation; they would like patrons to be able to access the storage area at any time. This time allowance was included in the special use permit for Four Season Storage on County Line Road near Route 52. He stated that the use would be screened, with no noise issues. He felt all of the conditions required in the Zoning Ordinance have been met. He stated that the existing agricultural use has nothing to do with the proposed special use permit.

Member Bernacki asked if the parcel would be split. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners were not requesting a subdivision. The special use permit would be confined to area outlined in the site plan as a condition of the special use permit.

Member Wilson asked about the weight limit on Arbeiter Road. Mr. Ingemunson said, to his knowledge, Arbeiter Road met the weight requirements. Member Wilson said that Arbeiter Road had a ten (10) ton weight limit; Mr. Ingemunson said that Arbeiter Road was weighed as a Collector in the County's Land Resource Management Plan.

Member Wilson provided a history of the previous landscaping special use permit for the property. She questioned whether the use was a forestry operation; she felt the use did not meet the definition of forestry per State regulations. She felt the use was an illegal landscaping business. Mr. Ingemunson said the existing use was irrelevant. He said the definition of agriculture was set by a Supreme Court ruling in *People Ex Rel Pletcher v. City of Joliet*.

Member Bernacki noted the landscape storage bins on the site plan. Mr. Ingemunson said the surveyor that prepared the site plan showed what was existing on the site. The storage bins can be removed from the site plan.

Chairman Landovitz asked about the rating of Arbeiter Road. Mr. Asselmeier provided a letter from the Seward Township Highway Commissioners which discussed the weight limit as ten (10) tones.

Chairman Landovitz asked if the County had any concerns regarding the requested change to the hours of operation. Mr. Asselmeier responded no. The requested change was the same as a condition in another special use permit. The original proposed hours of operation were submitted by the Petitioners; they were not the County's idea.

Member Bernacki asked what would happen if the Petitioners wanted to expand the boat and RV storage on the property. Mr. Asselmeier responded, depending on the nature of the expansion, a major or minor amendment to the special use permit would be required.

Member Hamman did not believe the weight restriction was an issue. Member Wilson said her horse trailer was over the weight limit.

Chairman Landovitz asked how the Petitioners would monitor the site for leaks. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners would patrol the property for leaks. Discussion occurred regarding how frequently the Petitioners would check the property for leaks. The Petitioners will be onsite very frequently. Member McCarthy-Lange asked how the County would know if a spill occurred on the property. Mr. Asselmeier said the County is complaint based and the County would ask the Petitioners for their plans to clean-up the site. It was noted that few private businesses allow non-patrons to access their properties.

Member Casey asked if the Petitioners owned the access point on Arbeiter Road, or if it was an easement. Mr. Ingemunson said that the Petitioners owned the access point on Arbeiter Road. Mr. Ingemunson explained the history of the development of the area.

Member Casey asked if the Petitioners were agreeable to using Route 52 instead of Arbeiter Road for access. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners would entertain using Route 52 instead of Arbeiter Road, but the Petitioners would rather use Arbeiter Road. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners did not want to spend the money on a revised site plan, if the County was going to reject the special use permit.

Member Bernacki asked what the storage business on County Line Road was zoned. Mr. Asselmeier responded it was in a business zoning district.

Steven Papaeliou noted that, in their original request to be landscaping business, the Petitioners did not plan to use Arbeiter Road. He said the mulch pile was as tall as the ceiling. He had concerns about the noise and blowing mulch.

Tim O'Brien, Seward Township Supervisor, explained the votes of the Seward Township Board and Seward Township Planning Commission. The concerns were as follows:

1. Using Arbeiter Road to access the property. The access was between two (2) homes and the Petitioner previously stated they did not have any plans to use Arbeiter Road for their business.
2. Arbeiter Road has a ten (10) ton weight limit. Some recreational vehicles weigh more than the weight limit when fully loaded.
3. Odors, noise, and unsightly appearance of the existing business negatively impacts property values. The quality of life and property values of adjoining property owners will be further negatively impacted by the issuance of the requested special use permit.
4. The addition of a storage business at the subject property does not fit with the current A-1 zoning district and the current forestry use on the subject property.
5. There is no tax benefit to the adjacent residents, Seward Township, or the County as a whole by allowing the proposed use on the subject.
6. There is no public need for the proposed business in Seward Township. Four Seasons Storage currently operates less than four (4) miles from the subject property.

7. Residents have expressed health concerns related to poor air quality and petroleum odors. Dust from mulch piles has caused problems for people with asthma and other breathing conditions. The proposed use of grindings and increased traffic will add to the dust and pollution in the area. There have been numerous traffic accidents at Arbeiter Road and Route 52.
8. Drainage is also a concern and neighbors have had standing water along their western property lines. The proposed use will make drainage worse.

Chairman Landovitz asked about the weight limit on Arbeiter Road. Supervisor O'Brien did not know if the weight limit was seasonal or year-round.

Fran Miller, Seward Township Trustee, said that Kendall County Highway Engineer Fran Klaas stated at ZPAC that the weight limit was ten (10) tons.

Mr. Asselmeier read a letter from Seward Township Highway Commissioner Scott Cryder into the record. The weight limit was ten (10) ton weight limit. He favored access from Route 52. The access off of Arbeiter Road was for farming purposes.

Ms. Miller provided pictures from neighbors' backyards showing the conditions of the existing operations on the subject property. She discussed the odors and dust particles in the area. She expressed concerns regarding potential leaks from vehicles parked on the property, particularly well contamination. She was opposed to twenty-four (24) hour access to the property. She did not believe the proposed use would be operated in a manner that would protect the neighbors. The proposed fencing plan is inadequate. The trees are missing, too short, or dead. She did not see any benefits to the Township or County by the addition of the proposed use.

Ron Miller asked how spills would be cleaned up at the site. The storage facility at County Line and Route 52 has a hard surface.

Dave Shively agreed with the concerns related to the weight limit and other comments against the proposal related to air quality and noise. He said that his property taxes increased and his property value decreased.

Jeremy Dippold, Petitioner, stated that they grind mulch one (1) time per year. He compared the dust produced by his operations with the dust produced by other agricultural operations. He offered to stack pile lowers, but they are constrained by the space they have. He said they installed an eight (8') foot cedar fence along the back of some of the neighbor's properties. The proposed lot will be behind two (2) of the neighboring properties. He noted the need for the proposed business because of increased population in the area; existing storage places are full.

Member Wormley asked about the improvements made to the property. Mr. Dippold discussed the cedar fence. He also mentioned that one (1) of the neighbor's grandchild damaged his property while one (1) neighbor liked the fence.

Member Wormley asked about moving the entrance to Route 52, if it was a requirement to approve the proposal. Mr. Dippold responded that he would consider relocating the entrance. He wanted approval of the proposal before re-doing engineering.

Member Wilson asked Mr. Dippold how many did he discuss the proposal with prior to filing the Petition. Mr. Dippold responded that he talked to five (5) of the neighbors face-to-face.

Mr. Dippold said the mulch pile was forty to fifty feet (40'-50') in height.

Mr. Dippold noted different weights of vehicles when they are empty or full.

Mr. Dippold offered to limit storage to boats and campers and not include recreational vehicles, if they are allowed to use Arbeiter Road. He noted that traffic will increase as the farmland is turned into houses.

Member Wormley discussed the rarity of the types of motor homes that exceed the weight limit. He said motor homes exceed six (6) tons. He noted that CDLs are needed if the vehicle weighs over twenty-six thousand pounds (26,000 lbs). Chairman Landovitz asked why the County had the access requirement.

Member Bernacki noted the weight of farm machinery on the roads and he said that it was unlikely that people will be pulling heavy recreational vehicles on the roads during frost season. He also discussed the existing speed of traffic on Route 52. Mr. Dippold noted the numerous accidents on Route 52 at County Line Road.

Mr. Dippold discussed the white pines that he planted. The trees will grow fast. He discussed why berms were not installed; the trees would uproot.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked why the piles were put behind people's homes. Mr. Dippold responded that they would like to continue in front of the building, but it is expensive and time-consuming to get everything placed. He discussed the installation of the pond and the right to locate things on private property.

Chairman Landovitz asked if the activities surrounding the existing land use was irrelevant to the requested special use permit. Mr. Dippold agreed with that opinion. Mr. Dippold noted that he wanted to keep his existing equipment dry.

Member Wilson asked how often the Petitioner planned to monitor the area for leaks and breaches of the fence. Mr. Dippold responded that he is at the property everyday.

Member Rodriguez said the building was a beautiful building.

Member Bernacki made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to recommend approval of the special use permit and with the conditions proposed by Staff and an amendment to condition 5 allowing patrons to access the storage area at any time.

Member Bernacki noted that the County was working on updating the Land Resource Management Plan. In the existing Land Resource Management Plan, the corner of Route 52 and Arbeiter Road was planned to be

Commercial and the subject property is one (1) parcel west of the commercial area. Seward Township's plan also calls for the corner to be Commercial.

Member Casey favored access along Route 52 instead of Arbeiter Road. Chairman Landovitz asked about the feasibility of changing the access to Route 52. Mr. Asselmeier noted the pipeline easements along the southern part of the property and he noted that no evidence has been provided to date that says they couldn't access the property from Route 52. IDOT would also have to approve the access from Route 52. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners were not adverse to the changing the access, but the Petitioners do not want to spend the money changing the site plan, if the proposal was denied. Mr. Ingemunson did not know how long it would take the Engineer to prepare an amended site plan. The Petitioner agreed to have an amended site plan at the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee, if the Zoning Board of Appeals also recommended approval of changing the access point to Route 52.

Member Wilson felt the Petitioners have been bad neighbors and she did not trust them to do what they say they are going to do. She argued that Petitioners were not engaged in forestry; they are not growing or establishing trees. She questioned the location of the mulch piles behind neighbor's houses. She also questioned putting the proposed lot behind the neighbor's homes.

Member Wormley said the existing use was protected by the Right to Farm Clause. Member Wilson disagreed with that assessment.

Member Bernacki said that the Petitioners could build taller structures on the property by right today.

Member Wilson favored access from Route 52 instead of Arbeiter Road. She favored moving the entire site along the south part of the property away from the houses.

Member McCarthy-Lange favored moving the access point to Route 52.

Chairman Landovitz expressed his opposition to the motion. He noted the requirement that the Zoning Ordinance requires access to a road with a year-round eighty-thousand pound (80,000 lbs) weight requirement. He noted that the existing special uses permits for outdoor storage were in business districts or were located further out in the country without nearby neighbors. He felt that the proposed use was inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, which calls for the area to be Residential and the proposed use was incompatible with neighboring uses.

Member Bernacki withdrew his original motion.

Member Bernacki made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to recommend approval of the special use permit and with the conditions proposed by Staff, an amendment to condition 5 allowing patrons to access the storage area at any time and changing the access point from Arbeiter Road to Route 52.

Member Bernacki asked what happens if IDOT or the pipelines were opposed to the access from Route 52. Mr. Asselmeier said the proposal would go to the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee with a revised site plan showing the access from Route 52 instead of Arbeiter Road.

The votes were as follows:

Ayes (3): Hamman, Rodriguez, and Wormley

Nays (5): Bernacki, Casey, Landovitz, McCarthy-Lange, and Wilson

Absent (1): Stewart

Abstain (0): None

The motion failed.

The recommendation is denial.

The proposal goes to the Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals on October 27, 2025.

### **Petition 25-15 Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Committee**

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

At their meeting on August 14, 2025, the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Committee voted to initiate text amendments to the Kendall County Code pertaining to short-term rental zoning regulations.

The redlined proposal was as follows:

#### Section 36-2 Definitions

*“Short-term rental means a one (1) family dwelling, two (2) family dwelling, or accessory structure with residentially allowed occupancy permits that are rented for a maximum thirty (30) days.”* (No Amendment Proposed)

#### Section 36-971 (a) (15) Accessory buildings, uses and structures:

*“Short-term rentals **subject to the conditions in Section 36-985 provided the property is annually registered with the County Planning, Building and Zoning Department.**”*

#### **Section 36-985. – Short-Term Rentals**

- (a) All short-term rentals shall be registered annually with the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department.**
- (b) Applicants for new short-term rentals and renewals of short-term rentals shall submit the prescribed application form to the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department.**
- (c) Prior to application submittal for new short-term rentals, the short-term rental applicant shall meet with representatives of the Kendall County Health Department, Planning, Building and Zoning Department, and Sheriff’s Department to discuss their business plan, application procedures, and applicable regulations.**
- (d) Prior to approval of placement on the short-term rental registry, the Planning, Building and Zoning Department shall conduct a life safety inspection of the subject property.**

Mr. Asselmeier added a requirement that failure to pass the life safety inspection would be grounds for denial of placement on the registry or revocation of placement on the registry.

- (e) For those properties served by private sewage disposal systems, the private sewage disposal system shall be evaluated by the Kendall County Health Department to determine the occupancy capacity. This evaluation shall occur prior to the placement on the short-term rental registry and when any changes occur to the permit for the private sewage disposal system.**
- (f) The maximum number of occupants shall be set by the evaluation of the private sewage disposal system, if on a private system, or number of bedrooms, if served by a public sewer system. Regardless of sewage disposal system, the maximum number of occupants shall be sixteen (16). Any guests of the person renting the short-term rental shall be included in the occupancy count. Occupants do not include persons engaged in deliveries to and from the property.**
- (g) Upon approval of being placed on the short-term rental registry, but prior to renting the property, the owner of the property shall send a letter by certified, return receipt mail to all of the adjoining property owners of record informing them that the property is a short-term rental. The letter shall include the name, phone number, and email address of the property owner of the short-term rental. The owner shall supply the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department proof of mailing. The property can start to be rented fifteen (15) days after proof of mailing has been supplied to the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department.**
- (h) The Kendall County General Noise Regulations shall apply regardless of the zoning district where the short-term rental is located.**
- (i) The Kendall County Junk and Debris Regulations shall apply regardless of the zoning district where the short-term rental is located.**
- (j) All animals allowed on the property shall be current on all required vaccines and shall be leashed when outdoors. The outdoor leashing requirement does not apply if the animal is in a fenced yard or crate.**
- (k) If a violation occurs at a short-term rental, in addition to any other penalties allowed by law, both the property and property owner shall be suspended from the short-term rental registry for a period of twelve (12) months and will not be allowed to rent the property for short-term rental during the period of suspension.**
- (l) Upon conclusion of the suspension period, if an owner wants their property re-instated on the registry, they must provide evidence showing how the violation that caused the suspension was remedied. This requirement is in addition to the annual registration requirement.**
- (m) The above regulations do not apply to bed and breakfast establishments.**

Mr. Asselmeier added a requirement to have annual inspections of short-term rentals.

A few items to note:

1. This proposal only applies to short-term rentals; it does not apply to properties rented longer than thirty (30) days.
2. This proposal does not apply to bed and breakfast establishments as defined by the Illinois Bed and Breakfast Act. Bed and breakfast establishments are special uses in the A-1, R-1, R-2, and RPD Districts.
3. A party must be found guilty by a court of competent jurisdiction in order for a violation to occur.

A comparison table of short-term rental regulations of neighboring counties and municipalities was provided.

To date, there are thirteen (13) registered short-term rentals in the unincorporated area with one (1) new applicant still under review. The list of short rentals was provided.

Petition information was sent to the Townships on September 2, 2025. To date, no comments have been received.

Petition information was sent to the former members of ZPAC on September 2, 2025. To date, the Highway Department and Health Department were the only agencies that responded and they had no comments.

Petition information was sent to the registered short-term rentals and parties that have recently inquired about running or having an interest in short-term rentals. Ken Schneider submitted comments on the proposal on September 3, 2025, and September 24, 2025. He was concerned about the following:

1. The proposed pet regulations as applied to service animals and duplication of existing regulations.
2. The proposed penalty; he favored a tiered approach.
3. He requested clarification if infants under the age of two (2) years old counted toward the maximum occupancy number.
4. He requested that guests of short-term renters not be counted towards the maximum occupancy number as they do not impact the septic system.
5. Payment of taxes and One Million Dollar (\$1M) liability insurance is required by short-term rental platforms.
6. Certified mailings should be encouraged, not mandated.
7. Policy should guard against bad-faith targeting by unhappy neighbors.
8. Mandatory hearing should not be required.
9. The proposal only applies to short-term rentals and not to long-term rentals.
10. The United City of Yorkville regulates short-term rentals through hotel tax without hearings or mailings.

Doug Winsor, on behalf of the Corneils Road neighbors, also submitted comments. They were concerned about the following:

1. Enforcing the sixteen (16) person occupancy limit and pet vaccination requirement.
2. Process of guiding a violation through the judicial process.
3. They favor requiring letters be sent to neighbors prior to approval of a short-term rental's placement on the registry.
4. Clarification on zoning districts where short-term rentals are allowed.
5. Establishment of a minimum setback of one hundred fifty feet (150') between short-term rental structures and neighboring structures.
6. Have parking requirements similar to bed and breakfast establishments.
7. Maintenance of liability insurance.
8. Payment of the Illinois Hotel Operators Occupancy Tax.
9. Establishment of fees or taxes and the County level.

Chairman Landovitz asked about annual inspections. Mr. Asselmeier said that the current practice was to conduct inspections at time of application and when complaints were submitted. This proposal would require annual inspections.

Member Wilson asked why a person would have to wait a full twelve (12) before re-instatement on the registry could occur. Mr. Asselmeier responded that the Committee was attempting to find an appropriate punishment in addition to fines if someone violated the law.

Member Wilson asked why letters would be sent to neighbors after approval instead of prior to approval. Mr. Asselmeier responded that the County wanted to make sure the property was suitable for placement on the registry from a health and safety aspect and because there are no plans in the current proposal to have public meetings on applications for short-term rental.

Member Wilson asked in which zoning district would short-term rentals be allowed. Mr. Asselmeier responded in every residential district where a single-family or duplex was allowed.

Member Bernacki what could trigger a violation. Mr. Asselmeier said exceeding maximum occupancy, junk and debris violations, noise violations, and pet violations.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked about limiting the total number of days for the short-term rentals. Mr. Asselmeier said there was no discussion about setting a minimum number of days for a property could be rented.

Member Wilson asked about the number of short-term rentals in the County. Mr. Asselmeier responded there are thirteen (13) properties listed on the registry.

Member Wilson asked if there have been any complaints against the properties on the registry. Mr. Asselmeier responded there have been no complaints against the properties presently on the registry. There was a complaint against a property that was previously on the registry, but that property is no longer rented.

Member Wilson asked if there have been any complaints against properties not on the registry. Mr. Asselmeier responded yes. There have been complaints about parties at short-term rentals and properties being rented short-term that were not listed on the registry. Some of the non-registered property have since been brought into compliance by registering, some have ceased operating, and some the County is still pursuing action against.

Member McCarthy-Lange asked if there was a cost to be included on registry. Mr. Asselmeier said no. The County did have a property maintenance code, the County did not do inspections upon point of sale or change in tenancy, and the County did not collect hotel-motel tax.

Member Wilson asked who did the inspections. Mr. Asselmeier said the Planning, Building and Zoning Department and the Health Department in cases where the property is served by a well and septic.

Member Bernacki asked if the County requires other property owners to keep pets on leashes. Mr. Asselmeier said not for private homeowners.

Ed Kirch has forty-eight (48) years in property management experience. He manages over three hundred (300) units. His best tenants are nightly rentals; he kicks out the bad tenants immediately. He does not allow parties. People doing nightly rentals tend to be poorer. Also, monthly rentals put kids in the school district. He said that the problem was people having party houses or banquet facilities disguised as rental properties. He said it is a civil rights violation to go into someone's house for an inspection. Many nightly rentals have large amounts of security, particularly cameras. A one hundred fifty foot (150') setback would shut down many rentals.

Randy Pertler owns a luxury short-term rental outside Yorkville. He noted that rentals pay more in taxes than owner-occupied houses. He was not opposed to paying a local tax in addition to State taxes. His property is professionally maintained, using local companies. If it was not professionally maintained, he would not be able to rent it. The renters spend money locally. He was concerned that the regulations could eventually apply to sixty (60) or ninety (90) days rentals.

Member Bernacki asked Mr. Pertler about capacity. Mr. Pertler said that capacity controls a lot of problems. He has tenants sign an agreement on capacity and tenants are fined if they go over capacity. Member Rodriguez asked how capacity is controlled. Mr. Pertler said they have numerous cameras outside the property. They also track how many people are on the WIFI. The fine comes from the customer's credit card or security deposit.

Member Wilson asked about the difference between nightly and short-term rentals. Nightly and short-term rentals, from an industry perspective, are the same thing. Mr. Pertler said setting a minimum number of nights was not a good idea.

Member Wilson asked Mr. Pertler if he had any objections to anything in the proposal. Mr. Pertler responded the twelve (12) month suspension. A suspension of that length would cause financial hardship for the small business owner. He favors a suspension during the period of time while the issue in question is addressed.

Ernesto Ramirez read his email into the record. He noted the local contractors that he uses to maintain his properties. He does not like parties at this properties; he has cameras at his properties. He noted that long-term

tenants and homeowners also have parties that can cause problems in neighborhood. He did not want to notify neighbors. A landlord cannot require vaccination for pets because of AirBnB rules related to service animals. He does not favor the twelve (12) month suspension.

Patrick McCrimmon operates thirteen (13) short-term rentals in the area. They are managed by a professional company. He also has long-term rentals. The short-term rentals are his best tenants. He was concerned about the one (1) year suspension. The impact of such suspension on the companies they use for maintenance would be bad. He favored a review process over a long-term suspension.

Deb Mayerle expressed concerns regarding the Big Sky Barn House in Bristol. Neighbors have observed teens carrying liquor into the property. She noted increased traffic on Corneils Road. Tenants have used foul and abusive language against the residents of the area. She discussed the noise. She said that timely garbage removal has not occurred and animals have scattered trash around the neighborhood. She questioned the lack of permits for the property.

Margaret Pearson expressed concerns regarding zoning violations at the Big Sky Barn House. The property is not a typical short-term rental and is not authorized. She questioned enforcement of the regulations as it relates to this property. The property is a converted barn that houses forty (40) people. The property has a wiffle ball field and arcade. The property has decreased property values and disrupted the peace and safety of the neighborhood. She discussed issues with the septic systems at the property. She has petition signed by the neighbors and she will bring that petition to the zoning hearing on October 27, 2025.

Member Wilson asked Ms. Pearson if they filed a complaint asked the Big Sky Barn House. Ms. Pearson responded yes. Member Wilson asked if the property had a special use permit. The response was no.

Member Wilson asked Ms. Pearson if she had any comments on the proposed text amendments. Ms. Pearson responded they favored a one hundred fifty foot (150') setback from the short-term rental to a neighboring property, partially because of noise control concerns.

Member Rodriguez said the best way to control the situation was to cap the number of people at the short-term rental.

Member Wormley requested additional feedback on the proposal. He noted the Petitioner was the Planning, Building and Zoning.

Ms. Pearson said that notification of neighbors needs to happen before approval of the short-term rental.

Doug Winsor said the earlier speakers that own short-term rentals do a great job maintaining their properties. He noted that the property on Corneils Road was an outlier. He noted the request for one hundred fifty feet (150') from short-term rentals to neighboring properties. He would like to see the proposal be more encompassing.

Mr. Kirch said the setback would wipe out many units. He also said a good operator will get a short-term renter out in one (1) hour. Evicting a long-term tenant takes multiple months.

Member Bernacki asked if short-term rentals were registered with the State. The response was a LLC would be registered with the State.

Mr. Kirch noted there are three (3) major short-term rental platforms and several other small platforms.

Member Wilson asked Mr. Kirch how the County should balance the bad operators with good operators. Mr. Kirch responded that he did not believe the property on Corneils Road was a short-term rental. He believed the property was a hotel or banquet facility and the County was not enforcing other regulations that could solve the problem. He does not favor a large setback; a setback will not solve a party house.

John Pearson expressed concerns about the lack of inspections at the property. He thanked the County for their efforts of enforcement at the property. The Sheriff's Department has been great.

Sharon Robinson said the property owner of the barn did all of the work behind their backs. He does not have adequate parking spaces and has the property booked most of November.

Someone spoke in favor of the sixteen (16) person capacity.

Jack Marlowe said the short-term rental owners had good comments and the neighbors of the barn had good comments as well. He favored enforcement of the existing regulations and he did not believe the proposal would solve the problem. He discussed the impacts of the shutting down a small business owner for one (1) year. He favored having leash regulations for all properties. He also favored allowing guests that do not spend the night be counted towards the capacity. He was in favor of letting neighbors have contact information of the short-term rental owner. He also questioned why the regulations did not apply for long-term rentals. His daughter owns short-term rentals and they have cameras and monitor their property.

Miriam Schneider is the daughter of Jack Marlowe. He spoke about the impact of homeowners' association rules against short-term rentals. These types of rules prevent people from getting extra income by renting out their house. She discussed enforcing capacity rules as they relate to guests of the tenant. She was also against the one (1) year suspension. She also said that she cannot control tenants keeping pets on leashes. The proposal was not safe for operators.

Ken Schneider disagreed with the proposal except for the maximum occupancy limit. He felt the proposal was created to try address one (1) problem property. He said that the County already had rules related to pets and leashes. He said that their tenants tell them why they were renting the property. He discussed the impacts of not using the septic system properly. The proposal would put him out of business, but would not impact the Barn. He said the setback would put all short-term rentals out of business. He favored enforcing the existing regulations. He was also against the twelve (12) month registry suspension. He does background checks on his tenants.

Mr. Marlowe said the County should make ordinances to address specific problems.

Member Wilson made a motion, seconded by Member Hamman, to recommend approval of the text amendment with the amendments to add failure to pass a life safety inspection shall cause the denial or revocation of the placement of the short-term rental on the registry and a requirement that short-term rentals must be inspected annually.

Member Wilson praised the work of the Planning, Building Zoning Committee to create this proposal and balance the needs of good short-term rental owners and neighbors of the bad short-term rental owner. However, she was against the proposal because endangered the livelihoods of the good short-term rental owners. She felt

the County needed to enforce existing regulations. She felt the County should review the ordinance violation procedures.

Member Wormley discussed the burden of proof regarding violations. He was against putting something in place that would not give the Department the adequate tools to enforce the rules and shutting down illegal short-term rentals. He asked Mr. Asselmeier if the proposal would give the Department the necessary tools to address the short-term rental issues. Mr. Asselmeier responded that capping the number of people, passing inspections, and setting a maximum number based on septic system. Member Wormley asked how the County would enforce an occupancy cap. Mr. Asselmeier responded that the County would need proof that more people were at the property than allowed. The County would then have to follow their enforcement procedures. Member Wilson asked if the tools were not already in place. Mr. Asselmeier said that the Corneils Road property does not meet the definition of banquet hall. Mr. Asselmeier said that the County has to prove that a given property is operating as a business; the Corneils Road property is going through the code enforcement process.

Chairman Landovitz asked if the proposal was needed if the problem property on Corneils Road could be addressed by the existing enforcement process. Mr. Asselmeier said setting the number of occupants, requiring a pre-application meeting, clarifying that failure to pass inspections denies placement to registry, making sure the noise regulations, and making sure the junk and debris regulations are enforced would help with enforcement.

Member Bernacki noted the regulations only apply to the unincorporated areas. He questioned what would happen if two (2) buildings had two (2) different occupancies.

Chairman Landovitz was reluctantly in favor of the motion. He sees the proposal as not fatally defective. He believes enforcement will be done with applicable discretion. The proposal will improve enforcement.

Member Wormley said the County was trying to get the proposal correct for everyone. He requested feedback on the proposal.

The votes were as follows:

Ayes (4): Hamman, Landovitz, Rodriguez, and Wormley  
Nays (4): Bernacki, Casey, McCarthy-Lange, and Wilson  
Absent (1): Stewart  
Abstain (0): None

The motion failed.

The recommendation is denial.

The proposal goes to the Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals on October 27, 2025.

Member Wilson favored having some regulations related to short-term rentals, but the operators of short-term rentals brought some valid concerns and the proposal should be re-visited.

Member McCarthy-Lange agreed with Member Wilson that the proposal should be a work in progress.

Member Casey felt that the proposal was work in progress. He was unsure if a regulation could be crafted that was specific enough to address the problem on Corneils Road.

Member Bernacki questioned the due process of having a strict punishment if someone has one (1) bad tenant. He felt that regulations already existed.

Member Wilson made a motion, seconded by Member Casey to have five (5) minute recess. With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried. The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission recessed at 10:47 p.m.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission returned to order at 10:54 p.m.

Members Present: Eric Bernacki, Tom Casey, Dave Hamman, Keith Landovitz, Karin McCarthy-Lange, Ruben Rodriguez, Bob Stewart, Claire Wilson, and Seth Wormley

Members Absent: Bob Stewart

**Petition 25-18 Ansar Gafur on Behalf of JAS Powered by Greenvolt, LLC (Tenant) and Thomas F. Richards, Junior (Owner) and Petition 25-19 Koswatte Sumanawansa on Behalf of Chicago Buddhist Vihara**

Chairman Landovitz asked if anyone other than the Petitioner for Petition 25-18 was present to speak on that topic. There were attendees that wished to speak on this proposal.

Chairman Landovitz asked representatives of Petitions 25-18 and 25-19 if there would be any issues with their projects if the proposals were laid over. Ansar Gafur said he would try work with the Commission.

Discussion occurred regarding a date for a special meeting and the date of a special meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

A representative from Petition 25-19 said a hardship would not exist if the matter was delayed two (2) weeks.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Member Rodriguez made a motion, seconded by Member McCarthy-Lange, to continue the meeting to November 6, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. With a voice vote of eight (8) ayes, the motion carried.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 11:04 p.m.

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

Encs.: October 21, 2025, Scott Cryder Letter Regarding Arbeiter Road  
Pictures of 2241 Route 52  
October 21, 2025, Ernesto Ramirez Email Regarding Short-Term Rental Regulations

Jack Marlowe  
Miriam Schneider  
Ken Schneider

ANSAR GAFUR

**KENDALL COUNTY  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
OCTOBER 22, 2025**

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

Search  
RAD

NAME	ADDRESS (OPTIONAL)	EMAIL ADDRESS (OPTIONAL)
Fran Miller		
Boyd Ingemanson		
Steve Capachio	[REDACTED]	
Jim Brin	[REDACTED]	
DAVID SAWELY	[REDACTED]	
Jeremy Dippold	owner	
ED KIRCH		[REDACTED]
Brady Pette		

Ernesto Ramirez  
Patrick McErinne  
Margaret Pearson Corneils Rd.

Red Magee  
Doug Winsor

Seward Township Highway Commissioner  
14719 N. O'Brien Rd.  
Minooka, IL 60447  
(815)212-4723  
sewardtwp@gmail.com

October 21, 2025

*In reference regarding Petition 25-08. A1 Special use for Recreation Vehicle/Boat Storage*

As highway commissioner of Seward Township, I am in charge of the road right-of-way, which is 66 feet. Since Arbeiter Road is a township road and not a state highway, there is a 10 ton load limit. I have no problem with what people do with their personal property as long as it goes through the correct process with the county. The reason there was a small field entrance on Arbeiter Road was because it was the only entrance for the farmer to get his equipment in to farm it. When the petitioner was wanting to use the entrance for his mulch and tree service business, we had discussed that there would be no trucks with loads exceeding 10 tons allowed on Arbeiter Road. After this discussion, the petitioner went through the proper channels through the state and got an entrance off of Route 52. If recreation vehicles and boats are allowed to travel on Arbeiter Road, my concern is that we will have semis and other heavier equipment up and down this road as well. I made this clear to the petitioner's attorney and developer in phone conversations.

I am responsible for maintaining the road and I intend on keeping the roads safe for the residents of Seward Township. I understand the area is growing at a very fast pace and of course none of us can control that. We all need to be considerate of our neighbors.

Please consider my recommendation to not travel Arbeiter Road and use a separate entrance off Route 52 so we can maintain the structural integrity of our roads and prevent future damage.

Thank you for your consideration.

Seward Township Highway Commissioner



Scott Cryder

Mounds of firewood, logs and debris  
within feet of property line. Notice  
absence of buffer landscaping



Mounds of firewood, logs and debris within feet of property line. Strong odor of petroleum in this area. Notice absence of buffer landscaping



Mounds of firewood, logs and debris  
within feet of property line. Notice  
absence of buffer landscaping



Proposed entrance off of Arbeiter Rd  
Notice neighbor to the left



Storage of unknown liquid in white totes within feet of property line



View from residents yards.  
Mounds of firewood, logs and debris  
within feet of property line.  
Notice absence of buffer landscaping



Standing water along property line



## Matt Asselmeier

---

**From:** Ernesto Ramirez 1>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:58 PM  
**To:** Matt Asselmeier  
**Subject:** [External]Re: Kendall County Short Term Rental Regulations

CAUTION - This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Asselmeier,

Thank you for your email.

Here is my contribution. Thank you for your attention.

Operating for over 5 years up to 20 units. Several towns, counties, a couple of states. Hosted 6,000+ guests, 230+ pets, 11,000+ nights. Paid tens of thousands to our cleaners, handymen, runners. Paid all applicable taxes.

Airbnb doesn't allow parties, we don't allow parties in our House Rules, we do not want parties. Halloween, graduation season, etc., we get booking requests, "we are having the party somewhere else". Sure. We inform them that we have 24/7 Noise Level Monitoring in site, cameras at entry points, and that we run additional verification for all adults so we know who you are and where you live; then, we will know when a party is happening, and will have Airbnb cancel the reservation with no refund, along with a bad record. What happens to those booking requests? They have the party somewhere else! And that's fine with us, we would rather lose that bad business than host troublemakers.

Long-term tenants and homeowners do have parties, yet our guests don't. Homeowners and long-term tenants will have birthday parties or a quinceañera from time to time, but our guests are explicitly forbidden. We can enforce it, and we do enforce it; a regular landlord can't and won't, since they don't have the aforementioned controls we have.

Most of our units are in multifamily dwellings, we do not want our neighbors or our guests in other units to endure noise or any nuisances. The alert of high noise in a unit is very annoying on our mobile devices, we do not want it to go off at 2 am! By the way, this system also alerts when the CO/smoke detector goes off so we can check with them if everything is ok. It's usually when they are cooking bacon. Yes, bacon!

Contrary to widespread belief, we are not "weekend getaways". Most of our bookings last days, weeks, even months. The minimum length of stay for weekends is two nights, again, to weed out parties from the get-go (they won't even see our units while browsing to book for only 1 night on a weekend). We host families enduring misfortune and loss of home due to fire or flooding. Families moving into town while closing on or building their future home. Immunodeficient travelers who would rather not stay in a crowded hotel. Contractor crews that work hard all day and only use our units to sleep. They

don't have the time or energy to cause trouble, and they are very respectful.

During an informal chat we had after the previous meeting, some of the attendees expressed their aggravation with events that seem to be attached to Airbnb units. However, said problems are already addressed by local ordinances, laws, rules, regulations, or whatnot. Examples: public urination, loud music, underage drinking, brawls, a woman screaming who knows for what reason, etc. Every item is already addressed.

More than additional regulation, we need to enforce what's already in place. And we are fine with that! It's better for us, for our guests to enjoy a peaceful stay, same as neighbors.

For all those thousands of guests during thousands of nights, we only had one law enforcement instance: one guest had an emotional breakdown at the end of their stay, he hurt himself and shed some blood in the bathroom. A staff member reported it to the police as soon as he arrived, and since we had driving licenses and mobile numbers of the guests, the police were able to contact them and make sure everybody was ok. We even checked camera footage and verified that their dog left our unit perfectly fine.

One single instance in 5 years! That's a better ratio than regular long-term rentals, bars, even restaurants and retail stores.

Also, when criminal activity happened around us, we were able to provide camera footage to the authorities for them to have a case to convict them.

We are fine with being registered with the county.

However, nobody wants a Gladys Kravitz calling at 1am because guests arrived from the airport's last incoming flight.

It's impossible to enforce vaccination of our guests' pets since Airbnb forces us to host service animals without the guest showing proof or anything. If we dare to ask, we face penalties or even suspension by them.

12 months of suspension for 1 violation is too much, even for Airbnb... and they are tough!

We wonder why any new regulation wouldn't apply to Bed & Breakfasts. "Airbnb" means "air bed & breakfast", is it just because technology facilitates remote operation and for the owners/managers not to be present? Technology actually facilitates better control than traditional B&Bs.

Respectfully,

Ernesto Ramirez  
RealtyE, LLC

On Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 11:04 AM Matt Asselmeier <[masselmeier@kendallcountyl.gov](mailto:masselmeier@kendallcountyl.gov)> wrote:

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission will meet on October 22, 2025, at 7:00 p.m., in the Courtroom, at 110 W. Madison Street, to consider proposed changes to the Kendall County Code pertaining to short-term rental zoning regulations.

The updated memo on this Petition is attached.