



# United City of Yorkville

*County Seat of Kendall County*

651 Prairie Pointe Drive

Yorkville, Illinois 60560

Telephone: 630-553-8545

Website: [www.yorkville.il.us](http://www.yorkville.il.us)

April 11, 2025

Mr. Matt McCarron  
Pioneer Development, LLC  
30 N. Gould Street  
#38989  
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801

(VIA E-MAIL [MATT@CIRRUSFARMS.COM](mailto:MATT@CIRRUSFARMS.COM))

**RE: Project Cardinal Data Center – Annex, Rezone, PUD & Preliminary PUD Plan Approval  
Plan Council Meeting Follow-Up**

Dear Mr. McCarron,

This correspondence is intended to follow-up on the recent Plan Council meeting held yesterday to discuss the applications for Annexation, Rezone (Map Amendment), Preliminary PUD Plan, and Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for the above referenced project. Per that discussion, below are the comments presented during the meeting for which additional information, and/or a written response was requested.

## **GENERAL APPLICATION COMMENTS:**

1. Petitioner will provide updated Exhibit ‘B’ to applications adding the fourteen (14) parcels and property owners within 500 feet of the subject property located within Kane County.

**Zoning counsel has updated Exhibit B to include all required Kane County parcels and property owners within 500 feet.**

## **GENERAL ANNEXATION COMMENTS:**

2. Petitioner will provide updated applications or ownership status related to the Schramm parcels along IL Rte. 47 (#02-04-100-014 and #02-04-100-009), as well as the two (2) residential parcels located on Baseline Road (#02-05-200-004 Maldonado and #02-05-200-001 Rakas).

**We are actively negotiating with all three referenced landowners. These parcels are reserved strictly as buffer areas with related landscaping. No facilities will be constructed on these parcels, and they are not required for the development or operation of our project.**

## **PRELIMINARY PUD PLAN COMMENTS:**

3. Petitioner will provide a detailed phasing schedule table as a separate document or be depicted on a revised Site Plan.

**The intended phasing schedule is included on the updated site plan.**

Petitioner will provide dimensioned distances in feet (US) of proposed data center buildings/structures to the adjacent property lines on a revised Site Plan.

**Surveyed dimensioned setbacks from proposed buildings to adjacent property lines are in preparation and will be submitted prior to the hearing. Preliminary distances are shown on the updated site plan.**

4. Petitioner will provide dimensioned distances in feet (US) of proposed data center buildings/structures to the nearest existing residential or commercial structures on a revised Site Plan.

**An exhibit showing dimensioned distances from proposed buildings to property lines is being prepared and will be provided prior to the public hearing. Preliminary distances are included on the updated site plan.**

Petitioner will confirm if they intend to meet the recommended maximum overall height for data center buildings within 1,500 feet of a residential structure be 70 feet, inclusive of rooftop equipment, or if they intend to proceed with the currently proposed 78-foot overall building height

**Our current site plan proposes a maximum building height of 55 feet, with rooftop mechanical equipment fully screened by architecturally integrated parapets, resulting in an aesthetically cohesive total height of approximately 78 feet for buildings within 1,500 feet of existing residential structures. Given the substantial setbacks already incorporated, we believe the proposed blanket 70-foot height restriction across this entire buffer is unnecessarily restrictive. We are committed to providing similarly integrated parapet screening for all buildings within this buffer to ensure visual consistency and minimize impacts.**

**For context, data centers in Ashburn, Virginia commonly reach heights of approximately 80 feet, typically with residential setbacks around 250–300 feet. Similarly, Elk Grove Village recently approved a data center campus with building heights up to 120 feet and residential setbacks ranging from approximately 175 to 300 feet.**

**Based on these precedents, our proposed building heights, substantial setbacks, and consistent architectural screening clearly align with or exceed established industry and regional standards.**

5. Petitioner will confirm if they intend to accommodate the recommended extension of E. Beecher Road north through the project site to Baseline Road and aligning with Mighell Road.

**The extension of E. Beecher Road through the site will not be accommodated.**

6. Petitioner will address roadway alignments recommended by City Engineer on a revised Site Plan *(Note: attached is the Floodplain Exhibit referenced in the initial Engineering Review letter dated April 4, 2025 prepared by EEI, but not included).*

**Our engineering team is in ongoing discussions with Kendall County regarding site access and roadway alignments. Any revisions resulting from this coordination will be provided when available.**

7. Petitioner will indicate the recommended easements for trails and proposed sidewalks on an updated Site Plan.

**Necessary site plan adjustments have been made to accommodate this request.**

8. Petitioner will confirm if they intend to install the infrastructure for the required minimum 104 electric vehicle charging stations. If so, must be noted in the Parking Data table on revised Site Plan. If not, Petitioner to confirm the number of electric vehicle (EV) charging stations proposed, if any, and the City will provide an estimate of cost per installation for fee-in-lieu.

**The campus will accommodate 104 EV charging stations. Fee-in-lieu will be paid for any stations not installed, consistent with City requirements.**

9. Petitioner will provide a traffic study and traffic management plan.

**A preliminary traffic study memo has been provided. The full traffic study and management plan are currently in progress and will be submitted prior to the public hearing. We do not anticipate that any adjustments to ingress or egress locations will materially impact the preliminary study's findings.**

10. Petitioner shall provide a landscape detail on a revised Site Plan or separate Landscape Plan indicating the proposed areas they seek relief from the recommended eight (8) foot tall berm within the required 100-foot landscape buffer. Architectural renderings or illustrative view shed exhibits are highly recommended to demonstrate the proposed vegetative screening in the areas seeking relief.

**An undulating berm with a minimum height of 8 feet will be provided where required. In areas where achieving full berm height is not feasible (e.g., utility corridors), alternate landscape screening will be implemented. Updated exhibits and renderings have been provided.**

11. Petitioner shall provide building elevation plans detailing proposed exterior building materials and illustrating a revised façade incorporating greater architectural articulation, variation in materials, and a more dynamic color palette. This is highly recommended for buildings visible from Route 47 as well as those buildings which might have frontage along a central roadway should E. Beecher go through the site.

**Updated architectural elevations and renderings have been provided.**

12. Petitioner shall provide a pre-construction/existing conditions noise study of subject property and narrative of mitigation steps they intend to employ to ensure compliance with the City's noise ordinance standards.

**We acknowledge the City's updated request for a comprehensive noise study dated 5/30. As previously noted, given ongoing refinements to our preliminary site plan, it is not practical or feasible to conduct this study at this stage. Additionally, we have concerns that introducing new requirements after our application has already been submitted, particularly given that our preliminary entitlement is scheduled for consideration within a month, is neither typical nor equitable. It is standard industry and municipal practice for detailed noise studies to be conducted prior to permitting, not during preliminary approvals, especially since equipment specifications continue to evolve. By the time we procure mechanical equipment in the coming years, advances in noise mitigation technology may further reduce potential noise impacts. Consistent with this practice, a detailed third-party consultant noise report will be provided prior to permitting once the site plan and equipment details are finalized. Our current plans already incorporate significant setbacks, undulating berms, enhanced landscaping, and**

precast equipment screening added in response to feedback, and we do not anticipate any compliance issues with the City's noise ordinance.

13. Petitioner shall provide more detailed information regarding the size, placement, and intended use for proposed water tanks south of the Data Center development.

Given our recent transition to a waterless design, we no longer propose water tanks on the parcel south of Galena. This parcel remains reserved on the updated site plan for potential future utility use, subject to separate approval, and will remain open green space in the interim.

Petitioner shall provide a photometric plan for the intended data center and water tank sites.

A preliminary photometric plan complying with City requirements is being prepared and will be submitted prior to the public hearing.

#### **DEVELOPMENT OFFSETS:**

14. Petitioner is requested to provide the planned average and maximum day water use for the development. The anticipated sanitary sewer flows should also be provided. These numbers will then be used to determine the infrastructure needed to serve this development.

Previously provided water and sewer demand figures reflect the project's maximum anticipated usage.

Petitioner is requested to provide estimates of utility taxes and property taxes expected to be generated per building.

At full buildout, estimated annual property tax revenue is approximately \$60,000 per acre and annual utility tax revenue approximately \$100,000 per acre. These estimates may be adjusted based on applicable Illinois Data Center Investment Program exemptions or other negotiated incentives.

Regarding the requested contributions for entryway/gateway signage, regional park development, and other discussed community investments, staff plans to provide a total estimated amount and a per-acre fee for each data center developer, proportionate to the scale and impact of their respective developments. A detailed estimate from the City is forthcoming and will be provided to the Petitioner in advance of the EDC meeting for their consideration.

We are awaiting City estimates for park development, signage, and related community investments. These contributions will be addressed in a separate agreement prior to permitting.

#### **COMMUNITY MEETING COMMENTS:**

15. While not discussed in the meeting, per Section 10-8-5-B-1-a of the Unified Development Ordinance, a community meeting conducted by the petitioner of area/neighborhood property owners, explaining the proposed data center campus development, at their own expense and at a location of their choosing may be required prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing date.

- a. Accordingly, the Petitioner will reach out to homeowners in the Bristol Bay Subdivision (east), Equestrian Estates at Legacy Farms (west), and various adjacent properties along Baseline Road, Eldamain Road, and Galena Road prior to the City Council and Planning

and Zoning Commission (PZC) public hearings to present the plan and gather feedback from residents.

We have conducted a meeting with Equestrian Estates, and the Bristol Bay meeting has been rescheduled to 6/5 due to a scheduling conflict with their board. We remain receptive to community feedback and committed to working with stakeholders to address concerns and protect neighborhood quality of life.

**NOTE: The schedule of meetings is tentative in nature. We understand that your internal timeline for producing some of the requested information may extend beyond the proposed meeting schedule and may require adjustments; however, staff intends to work collaboratively to maintain progress and align timelines as closely as possible to keep the review process moving forward.**