

**Presentation of Gala Argent
TMP-23-1147— Petition 4616 (Alexander/Johnson, KaneSolar2, LLC)
Kane County Board of Supervisors Meeting, December 12, 2023
530-320-4514 (mobile)**

●●●SLIDE 1●●●

- I. **Intro:** I am Gala Argent and I live with my husband, James Light, at 47W831 II Route 38, Maple Park.

We are generally pro-solar, and we did not protest solar project 4609 that was approved directly across the street from us.

But not all sites are suitable here's one reason why this one isn't.

●●●SLIDE 2●●●

- II. **Problems with the Petition—SCREENING:**

- A. Kane County Ordinance mandates screening and what with. To deal with this, the Petitioners have stated that "this project will have no offsite impacts and will be only marginally visible for neighbors." And specifically, that it is "naturally screened from view on the north by existing vegetation." The fact is, our property cannot be screened.

●●●SLIDE 3●●● Dec 11 PROJECT PLAN

- B. This last-ditch attempt in the latest project map finally acknowledges the view is NOT naturally screened from the north as originally stated. However, this does little to remedy the situation and bring it up to code.

●●●SLIDE 3●●● KITCHEN VIEW

- C. This land is neither flat nor naturally screened. This is the view from our kitchen window.

●●●SLIDE 4●●● BACK YARD VIEW

- D. The project would take up almost the entire 180 degrees of our view south.

●●●SLIDE 5●●● LINE OF SIGHT

- E. Nor is the site "relatively flat" as you were told.

1. As this elevation and line-of-sight tool shows, our property drops off over 40' from the house to the property line. And the elevation to the end of the project is 46' lower than us.
2. Therefore, screening would need to be over 66'. Even if there were, as is called for, a native evergreen that grew 2' a year, that would take 33 years to screen—longer than the project's lifespan. Also at 30' apart, there are nine trees that are supposed to screen 250 feet.
3. This property cannot be screened from the facility as required by law, not in our lifetimes, and likely not in our children's lifetimes either.

●●●SLIDE 7●●●MLS LISTING

- F. This matters because views hold both aesthetic, and monetary, value. A selling point on the MLS listing from which we bought this home states "Picturesque views of the surrounding farmland scenery. Great private location, with a vineyard beside the home, and a 40 acre field behind!"
- G. I've included in the packet I've submitted for exhibit the findings of three peer-reviewed studies showing the value views add to property values averages from 8% to over 100%. And since views hold value, taking them away reduces value.
- H. This matters to us. We bought this place to enjoy and to rehab as an investment. We have put almost \$100,000 into doing that, but we're waiting to see where this goes before doing more. I am 1 year from retirement. Losing this investment of hard cash to property devaluation would harm us immensely.

III. **APPEAL**

- A. This petition does not meet the County requirement for screening, and other regulations noted. Both Findings of Fact 7 & 8 , and statements in this Petition's Application for Special Use Permit narrative that you have in your files. (p. 4) are not factual at all. In fact, these statements clearly misrepresent the topography and the need for screening of this site.
- B. This petition cannot meet §25.4.8.2 B "that the special use will not be 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."

We strongly request that you deny this project.

- a. Please note the project fencing would begin at my property line, cutting into the steep hill of highly erodible soil there, which would likely cause that hill on my property to slough. You can see the farmer has avoided cultivating a large part of this section.

If for some reason you do approve it, we ask that you mandate the project be moved down below the highly erodible soil noted in the Land Use Opinion on p. 14.

- C. Thank you for your time.

PEER-REVIEWED ACADEMIC ARTICLES—VIEWS

- Tomasz Potrawa, Anastasija Tetereva, 2022. **How much is the view from the window worth? Machine learning-driven hedonic pricing model of the real estate market.** *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 144, Pages 50-65.
ISSN 0148-2963,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.01.027>

EXCERPT: Numerous studies indicated that customers were willing to spend up to 9.2% more money on properties with good views such as lakes or green areas (Gillard, 1981, Mok et al., 1995).

- Rodriguez, M. & Simmons, C.F., 1994. **Quantifying the value of a view in single-family housing markets.** American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, ISSN 0003-7087, ZDB-ID 7985009. - Vol. 62(4), p. 600-603.
<http://www.sbuweb.tcu.edu/mrodriguez/research/viewppr.pdf>

CONCLUSION: “An appraiser making an adjustment in the studies geographic areas would add about 8% to reflect market value of a good view.”

- Heather A. Sander, Stephen Polasky, 2009. **The value of views and open space: Estimates from a hedonic pricing model for Ramsey County, Minnesota, USA.** *Land Use Policy*, Volume 26, Issue 3, Pages 837-845.
ISSN 0264-8377,
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0264837708001324>

EXCERPT: The scenic quality of a landscape is also altered as urbanization occurs with consequent affects on values. Changes in scenic amenities may also be reflected in property values. Bourassa et al. (2004) reviewed 35 studies that examined the impact of views on home values. Although these authors found some variation in study conclusions, particularly in earlier studies, they noted that the bulk of studies reported that views positively impacted the values of residential homes. This impact varied widely from 1% (Beron et al., 2001) to as much as 147% (Benson et al., 1997). ... Conversely, views of industrial lands and roads have been found to negatively impact home values (Lake et al., 2000b).

ILLINOIS NATIVE CONFERS

According to the Illinois Extension Checklist of Illinois Native Trees, Technical Forestry Bulletin NRWS-102, there are eight conifers native to Illinois. Three of those are endangered. Several are not native to this area of Illinois and would have a hard time growing.

https://extension.illinois.edu/sites/default/files/checklist_of_illinois_native_trees_0.pdf

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Plant Guide

<https://plants.usda.gov/>

NORTHERN WHITE CEDAR

Thuja occidentalis L.

Mature height 49.5'

EASTERN RED CEDAR

Juniperus virginiana Sarg.

Mature height 33-66'

EASTERN WHITE PINE

Pinus strobus L.

Mature height 50-80'