

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, October 7, 2025, at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room
535 Duane Street

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Miller called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. Chairperson Miller explained the advisory nature of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and its process for deliberation and recommendation. He described the Public Hearing protocols and announced that the meeting was being recorded.

Roll was called.

Present: Chairperson Chip Miller, Board Members, Matthew Jones, Peter Kelly, Noureen Lakhani, and Craig Pavlich

Absent: Christiane McKnight, Todd Buckton

Also in attendance: Daniel Harper, Planning Manager and Adriana Ohl Zamora, Recording Secretary.

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

None

C. Approval of Minutes

1. Review and Approval of the Minutes of September 2, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.

Member Pavlich made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Member Jones seconded the motion. Motion passed with Members Kelly and Miller abstaining due to not attending the meeting.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of September 9, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.

Member Jones made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Member Kelly seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

D. Old Business

1. Public Hearing-194 S. Ellyn Avenue

Member Lakhani moved to reopen the Public Hearing on 194 S. Ellyn Ave. Member Jones seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, reintroduced the following variation request for 194 S. Ellyn Avenue.

Daniel reintroduced the zoning variation to the Board Members as follows:

After considering the originally proposed variation to allow for an addition to the non-conforming garage at its September 9, 2025, meeting, the Zoning Board of Appeals voted to continue the public hearing of this request to the October ZBA meeting to allow for the applicant to bring new proposals showing reduced eave heights and reduced dormer sizes to reduce the overall impact of the proposed massing of the addition to the existing accessory structure. The applicant has brought two new exhibits (Exhibit A and Exhibit B) to be considered by the ZBA.

Exhibit A: This proposed addition shows an eave height of 12 feet with two 3'-6" wide dormers. The proposed eave height is conforming per section 10-4-8(F) of the Village Code. The proposed dormer eave heights of approximately 17 feet would also be permissible per Section 10-4-8(F)(1)(4) of the Village Code as the dormers are less than 8 feet in width and do not exceed 25 percent of the building's side. This proposed exhibit would eliminate the need for variation request number 1.

Exhibit B: This proposed addition shows an eave height of 14 feet with one 7-foot-wide dormer. This proposal reduces the original eave height request by two feet (2'-0") while still maintaining the higher ceilings that are desired by the applicant. This proposal shows one dormer on the west side of the addition and two skylights on the east side.

Seeing no questions for staff, Chairperson Miller asked the petitioner to make their presentation.

Sworn in, Petitioner Dennis Sheehan

Mr. Sheehan presented a comparative eave height exhibit of the two options that was proposed to the ZBA. He stated that both proposed options would be appropriate for the area. He requested that the 14 feet eave height be considered and claimed that the reduced eave height would reduce approximately 500sqft of "usable space."

Member Questions

Member Pavlich- Do you know the eave height of the principal structure.

Petitioner Sheehan- About 12 feet.

Member Pavlich- My memory from the last meeting was that is around 16 feet in height.

Member Jones – Stated his support for variation requests 2, 3 and 4. He stated his support for both proposed exhibits and was willing to listen to the deliberation of the board members.

Member Pavlich – Stated that he supported Exhibit A that showed the 12-foot eave height request as this is conforming to the code.

Member Kelly – Stated that he supported the application for variations 2, 3 and 4 and supported the design shown in Exhibit A has this elimination the need for the eave height variation.

Member Lakhani – Stated that she agreed with the sentiments of the statements from previous members.

Chairperson Miller – Stated that he would not support application's requests for variations.

Petitioner Sheehan – Stated that the difference between 12 feet and 14 feet is not significant on the outside of the structure but is significant to the interior of the structure as this allows much greater vertical space and allows for much more maneuverability within the structure.

Member Jones – Asked for clarification on if the zoning for the property had changed at any point in the past.

Mr. Harper – I'm sure the details regulating accessory structures have changed but I do not know the timeline or have that information available at this time.

Seeing no further questions from the Board, Chairperson Miller asked a motion to close the public hearing.

Member Kelly made a motion to close the public hearing Member Lakhani seconded the motion. Roll call was called and the motion passed 5 (yes) 0 (no).

Member Jones made a motion to deny the variation request from Section 10-4-8(F) as this is not the minimum variation necessary to make possible the reasonable use of the structure. Member Kelly seconded the motion; roll was called passed by a unanimous vote 5 (yes) 0 (no).

A Motion to approve variations from Section 10-5-4(A)(2)(a), Section 10-5-4(A)(3), and Section 10-5-4(B)(2) on 194 S. Ellyn Avenue was made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Jones. The motion passed with four (4) votes yes and one (1) vote no. Chairperson Miller in the dissent.

Findings of Fact- 194 S. Ellyn Avenue.

The Zoning Board of Appeals, having fully heard and considered the testimony of all those present at the hearing and being fully advised of the premises makes the following findings pursuant to sections 10-10-12 of the Villages Zoning Code. The evidence provided by the applicant and presented in the public hearing shows that three proposed zoning variations meet the above standards because the proposed variation is necessary to construct a second story addition to a previously permitted non-conforming garage as the garage was originally constructed in 1964. Two neighboring residents spoke in favor of the request. The proposed ridge height would be in conforming to the zoning code. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, and the variation will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Pursuant to the authority vested in it by the statutes of the State of Illinois and the Zoning Code of the Village of Glen Ellyn, the Zoning Board of Appeals, hereby recommends to the Village President and Board of Trustees pursuant to a vote of 4-1, that three (3) of the requested zoning variations reflected in these findings be granted and that the Applicant's request for those zoning variations be approved and the zoning variation from Section 10-4-8(F) to allow an eave height for a detached garage to be twenty feet (20'-0") in lieu of the maximum allowed eave height of twelve feet (12'-0") be denied for the property located at 194 S. Ellyn Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

Motion to accept Findings of Fact by Member Jones Seconded by Member Lakhani. Motion was approved unanimously.

E. New Business

1. Public Hearing - 445 Stagecoach Run

Chairperson Miller requested a motion to table the public hearing for the application to the November 4, 2025, ZBA Meeting.

A motion was made by Member Pavlich to table the public hearing for the application to the November 4, 2025, ZBA Meeting. Seconded by Member Jones. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Public Hearing - 734 Meredith Place

Member Jones motioned to open the Public Hearing on 734 Meredith Place. Member Kelly seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Sworn in, Petitioner Dan Wilt, owner of 734 Meredith Place.

Mr. Wilt: Stated that he was proposing to rehabilitate the garage while raising the roof of the structure so as to be adequate for the storage of modern-day cars. The garage is to maintain the same footprint and setbacks.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 734 Meredith Place.

Mr. Harper explained that the property currently has a 500 square foot two-car garage that is located approximately one foot (1'-0") from the eastern property line in lieu of the required twenty-foot (20'-0") corner side-yard setback. The applicant is proposing to raise the roof of the existing garage to allow for a garage door opening of eight feet (8'-0") in height. According to the applicant, the current garage door opening is six feet (6'-0") tall and does not accommodate heights of contemporary cars. The maximum ridge height of the proposed enlargement would be thirteen feet and eight inches (13'-8") and would be the allowed height for a detached garage per village code. Mr. Harper explained that according to a building permit record dated 5/1/1969, a variation was granted on 9/23/1968 to allow for the construction of the detached garage at its current location.

The alteration of the structure requires a zoning variation because a structural modification to a legally existing non-conforming structure is not permissible per village code.

Member Questions

Member Lakhani- is this structure being used as a garage right now?

Mr. Harper – Yes.

Member Kelly – do paver patios count towards lot coverage in the code?

Mr. Harper – no, lot coverage counts towards roofed structures. Paver patios do count towards impervious surface coverage.

Member Pavlich, asked the applicant – the garage will maintain the same area and footprint, correct?

Mr. Wilt – Yes. Yes, we are performing repairs to the garage and raising the roof.

Member Pavlich – Will the existing foundation be replaced?

Mr. Wilt – It will depend on the condition of the foundation while when we begin the rehabilitation.

Member Pavlich – So you will try to rehabilitate the existing structure?

Mr. Wilt – Yes. When we compared alternatives for a new garage, rehabilitating the existing structure was the preferred option.

Member Pavlich – stated that the property has a unique shape and topography.

Member Jones – stated that its proximity to Riford Road created challenges. He asked if the applicant would be willing to move the garage to be 3 feet from the side and rear lot lines as this is the requirement for interior lots.

Mr. Wilt – That was not my intention and would create challenges in utilizing the existing foundation like we have planned.

Chairperson Miller – is the current condition of the garage a safety risk?

Mr. Wilt – Yes, the garage has to be repaired as the structure is potentially dangerous.

Member Jones made a motion to close the public hearing Member Kelly seconded the motion. Roll call was called and the motion passed 6 (yes) 0 (no).

Deliberation

Member Kelly - This seems straight forward and that to require a new garage in a new location would be onerous to the property owner. This appears to be a minimal request, and I support this request.

Member Lakhani - I also support this request.

Member Jones - Stated he would support a 3-foot side yard setback but would not support the 1-foot side yard request.

Member Pavlich - Because the new design would conform to village code and that this would not further increase the existing encroachment, I support this request.

There was discussion on whether the variation would be applicable if new construction was proposed. Mr. Harper stated the zoning request was specific to the proposed structural alteration. If the alteration permit is no longer in effect and a new permit is submitted for new construction, then a new variation would need to be requested.

Chairperson Miller - Because this is an existing non-conforming structure and would not further increase the existing non-conforming encroachment, I support this request.

Member Jones: Stated that 3 feet would be appropriate if the foundation was being replaced.

Member Pavlich made a motion to approve the request as presented. Member Lakhani seconded the motion. Roll call was called and the motion passed 4 (yes) 1 (no). Member Jones in the dissent.

Findings of Fact – 734 Meredith Place

The Zoning Board of Appeals, having fully heard and considered the testimony of all those present at the hearing and being fully advised of the premises makes the following findings pursuant to sections 10-10-12 of the Villages Zoning Code. The evidence provided by the applicant and presented in the public hearing shows that the proposed zoning variation meets the required standards because the proposed variation is necessary to rehabilitate the existing legal non-conforming garage that was permitted and originally constructed in 1969. The proposed ridge height would be in conforming to the zoning code. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, and the variation will not alter the essential character of the locality. Pursuant to the authority vested in it by the statutes of the State of Illinois and the Zoning Code of the Village of Glen Ellyn, the Zoning Board of Appeals, hereby recommends to the Village President and Board of Trustees pursuant to a vote of 4-1, that the Applicant's request for zoning variations be approved for the property located at 734 Meredith Place, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

Motion to accept Findings of Fact by Member Jones. Seconded by Member Lakhani. Motion was approved unanimously.

F. Other Business

1. Review and approval of Rules of Procedure for the Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals

Motion to approve and adopt the Rules of Procedure for the Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals by Member Kelly, Member Jones second all in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Chairperson's Statement

Chairperson Miller asked the Board regarding procedural order on whether the findings of fact should come before or after the motion for the application. The Board concluded that findings of fact should come before the motion for approval or denial of the application.

Chairperson Miller made note that the newly appointed Trustee Duncan will be the trustee liaison to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

F. Trustee Liaison Report

No Trustee Liaison Report

G. Staff Report

Planning Manager Daniel Harper- Stated the following:

- 807 Hill Avenue Variation was approved by the Village Board.
- 236 Sunset Avenue Variation was approved by the Village Board.
- 365 Kenilworth Variation was approved by the Village Board.
- 799 Riford is being considered for a Historic Landmark Designation.
- The Plan Commission will consider a text amendment to allow for restaurant use in the C4 Office District.
- We have four ZBA items coming for the November meeting date.
- Exterior Appearance Review for Maplewood Brewery on October 28.
- Proposed annexation on Ahlstrand Road.
- Legacy Shops of Glen Ellyn variations coming to November Plan Commission.

H. Adjournment

Member Lakhani made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Pavlich seconded the motion and passed by voice vote at 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Daniel Harper