

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, September 9, 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 7:00 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, Todd Buckton, Peter Kelly, Noureen Lakhani, and Craig Pavlich

Absent: Christiane McKnight

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

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

None

Chairperson Miller moved to open the Public Hearing on 807 Hill Ave. Member Buckton seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

C. New Business

1. Public Hearing-807 Hill Ave., Lot Coverage Ratio Variation

Sworn in, Petitioners Patrick and Allison Bouchard

Chairperson Miller- Would you like to start with telling us about your project and what you are looking for?

Petitioner- sure we contracted Timber built rooms out of St. Charles to build us a 3 seasons room that is designed to take the space of our existing back. Looking for more outdoor enjoyment throughout the year. Because of the layout of the house, the design we are moving it from one side to centering it, which made it a little bit bigger. But it does not hinder any of our neighbors.

Chairperson Miller- do you have anyone else here with you tonight to speak to this?

Petitioner Patrick Bouchard- Yes, we have Mr. Ben Zell directly to the West of us and Mr. Josh Myer directly to the East of us.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 680 Grand Ave.

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

The petitioner is Patrick Bouchard, the owner of the property at 807 Hill Avenue. He has applied for a zoning variation to allow the construction of an approximately 286 square foot addition to the rear of a two-story single-family home that would be result in a lot coverage of approximately 1,890 square feet or 22% of the lot.

He explained that wood decks do not count as lot coverage, the applicants want to remove wood deck and replace it with a sunroom, which would increase lot coverage. The proposed elevations of 3 seasons room are shown to Members. Mr. Harper explained it would not affect rear setbacks, and the only overall square footage would be affected at 22%.

He stated that the petitioners request approval of the following variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(E)1 – to allow the total lot coverage ratio of the property to be 22% in lieu of the maximum allowed lot coverage ratio of 20% to allow the construction of a rear sunroom addition to an existing single-family home. The subject property is zoned R2 - Residential District and improved with a two- story single-family home.

The existing house was constructed in 1993. The existing lot coverage ratio of the property is approximately 1,608.78 square feet or 18.2% of the area of the 8,780 square foot property. The proposed 286 square foot addition would result in a total lot coverage area of 1,890 square feet or 22% of the property.

Member Questions

Member Buckton- How long have you folks owned the house?

Petitioner Patrick Bouchard- it will be 6 years

Member Buckton- So you didn't build it?

Petitioner Patrick Bouchard- no we did not.

Member Buckton- Daniel says in the item report that the property is currently nonconforming R2, is that because of a change since the structure was built?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- when property constructed in 1992, there was a variation approved, under ordinance 3971 that allowed for the construction of a home on a non-confirming lot.

Member Kelly – I have no questions.

Member Lakhani- no questions for me.

Member Pavlich- If they had an actual minimum width of an R2- they would have sufficient coverage. Their buildable width is restricted by substandard lot width. As follow up question for you Daniel, Decks are included in the lot coverage ration calculations?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- Decks, are not covered under lot coverage, essentially just roofed structures, when speaking of the 20%.

Member Pavlich- So theoretically, after the building of this room, they can build a deck as well.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – if they were to build an additional deck around the side, they would have to meet all the side yard and rear yard setbacks and it would not count as an impermeable surface.

Member Kelly- So it does not cover lot coverage, so they are 2% over which is what is being proposed. If they stick a deck after the fact, it has zero impact.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn -So long as it meets all the other deck requirements.

Member Jones- Daniel, what is min lot square footage for a lot in R2 district?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – the min square footage of property in R2 Zoning district is lot area of 8,712 square feet.

Member Jones- they are at 8780, so they meet the minimum lot area. If they were wider and shorter they would have same lot and be conforming?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- correct.

Member Jones- that is the only question I had.

Chairperson Miller- do you have any practical, unique circumstances that you would like to talk about?

Petitioner Patrick Bouchard- only lot being smaller than the average lot and main purpose is to use more throughout the year. Maintaining the deck is problematic, moldy and mildewy. Looking for more space for our family. If the lot was straight, we would not be having this meeting.

Member Pavlich- I just want to clarify for the rest of the group what Chip was getting at, we have in the zoning variation standards, outlined some goals that we are trying to check boxes on. *Member Pavlich read the goals to the board members and petitioner.* Explained that we needed to establish the first of the read goals and the remaining would be evidence to support.

Petitioner Bouchard- our neighbors can speak to this but we are not affecting our neighbor's views, for our unique circumstance is the strange lot size which cannot be changed. Mr. Zell's house extends further but it does not affect their view. We talked about the ration and permeable surface, and should not affect pavement. If you look at the survey, you can see that we are doing the work in the back and that is the most affected part of the house by the situation of the lot.

Member Buckton- you guys refer to this as year-round but the report says it is 3-season, so is it year-round of 3-season?

Petitioner Patrick Bouchard- 3 season room or 9-month.

Neighbors Ben Zell and Josh Myer (813 Hill) sworn in

Neighbor Josh Myer-West side neighbor, 813 hill neighbor- I have been a Glen Ellyn resident for the last six years, living at the same property. We are certainly very supportive of the project, my understanding Patrick was that if you made it smaller, and had it shifted around, it would affect the flow of the kitchen and would maybe start to look at a kitchen remodel as well. That was the comment I was going to add, we are very supportive.

Neighbor Ben Zell- I live to the west of them, 387 Bryant Ave., their deck extends, my kitchen is a little bit further, so we have no objection, and we support it.

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

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

Deliberation

Member Buckton- Glen Ellyn has lots of lots that do not conform, having 22% does not bother me, I think it is a fine project so I will be voting for it

Member Kelly- I have no problem with this other than we need side bar with our Planning Director for a de minis issue once again, this is something that he could have handled

Member Lakhani- I am a yes

Member Pavlich- I am also supportive, I visited the property, a couple of notes on the property, when you walk around, they have a very steep backyard that limits the structures that you can put on it. It is very apparent that this will be transparent to the neighbors, you will not notice the addition. I think it does not interfere with the neighborhood at all. It is a good move so I will be voting for it.

Member Jones- I will be a no, my problem is that there really is no hardship, the front of your property is extended because of the way that the road is, you gain more square footage but as it goes back it is the same width from front to back once you get to sidewalk. Really there is no hardship or unique circumstance to provide the relief today, if you were to come down to 13 by 13, a size, I would be a yes because you are just a little bit over. But when looking at criteria for a unique circumstance or hardship, I do not see it. I am a no.

Chairperson Miller- I walked there and I walked the neighborhood and this is also not unique addition to a house in the neighborhood; there are quite a few that are very similar. Your lot is a little narrower and different than some or them, to me that was a hardship, just the size of the lot. Yes, you bought the lot that way but you also didn't really know that this was going to be a situation, so I am a yes.

Member Buckton made a motion to close the deliberation. Member Lakhani seconded the motion; roll was called passed by a unanimous vote 6 (yes) 0 (no).

A Motion to approve application on 807 Hill Ave. was made by Member Pavlich and seconded by Member Buckton the motion passed with five (5) votes yes and one (1) vote no. Member Jones in the dissent.

Findings of Fact- 807 Hill Ave.

The Zoning Board of Appeals having fully heard and considered the testimony of all those present at the hearing, including Josh Myer of 813 Hill Ave and Ben Zell from 387 Bryant Ave., and being fully advised of the premises makes the following findings pursuant to sections 10-10-12 of the Villages Zoning Code. The applicant seeks a zoning variation to allow the total lot coverage of the property be 22% in lieu of the maximum allowed lot coverage of 20% to allow the construction of a rear sun room addition to an existing single-family home. The proposed addition will follow all other zoning regulations and building regulations related to such structure. The Zoning Board of Appeals considered the following documents which were submitted including the application, plot of survey, location and zoning map, proposed construction plans as well as many of the members actually visited the property. The Zoning Variance is granted with a vote of 5 to 1; pursuant the authority vested by the statutes of the State of Illinois and the Village of Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals herby recommends to the Village of the President Board of Trustees pursuant to a vote of 5 to 1 be approved for the property located at 807 Hill Ave. Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

Motion to accept Findings of Fact by Member Buckton Seconded by Member Jones

Member Jones motioned to open the Public Hearing on 194 S. Ellyn Ave. Member Kelly seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

2. Public Hearing- 194 S. Ellyn Ave. Detached Garage Variation

Sworn in, Petitioner Dennis Sheehan, owner of 194 S. Ellyn Ave.

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

Daniel explained that the owner of the property at 194 S. Ellyn Avenue has applied for zoning variations to accommodate the construction a proposed addition to an existing detached garage. The garage was constructed in 1964, permitted in 1964 by Village of Glen Ellyn, now existing non-conforming garage. He stated that the petitioners request approval of the following variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. 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").
2. Section 10-5-4(A)(2)(a) to allow an addition to an existing non-conforming detached garage on a property which has a total square footage for accessory structures of 1,006 square feet in lieu of the maximum allowed total square footage for accessory structures of 1,000 square feet.
3. Section 10-8-6(B)(2) – to allow an enlargement to an existing non-conforming six hundred and ninety square foot (690 sqft) detached garage which exceeds the maximum allowed square footage of six hundred and sixty square feet (660 sqft) for a detached garage.
4. Section 10-5-4(A)3 to allow for two accessory structures of the same type.

The subject property is zoned R2 - Residential District and improved with a two-story single-family home

He explained that the property owner would like 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"). The property currently has a 690 square foot two-car garage that is approximately 12 feet in height to the top of the ridge. Based on the historical building permit records, the garage appears to have been permitted about five years after the construction of the primary structure. The applicant is proposing to raid the roof of the existing garage to allow for a second story storage area. The maximum ridge height of the proposed enlargement would be 22 feet and would be the maximum allowed height for a garage per village code. In order to maximize the total usable area of the proposed second story, the property owner is proposing an elevated eave height of 20 feet for the expansion to allow for greater overhead space for storage.

Section 10-5-4(A)(2)(a) to allow an addition to an existing non-conforming detached garage on a property which has a total square footage for accessory structures of 1,006 square feet in lieu of the maximum allowed total square footage for accessory structures of 1,000 square feet. The proposed enlargement would be to an existing nonconforming property with accessory structures with a combined area of 1,006 square feet. Village code. Ord. 4673 was adopted in 1998, which created the restriction of limited accessory structures to a maximum total area of 1,000 square feet.

Section 10-8-6(B)(2) – to allow an enlargement to an existing nonconforming six hundred and ninety square foot (690 sqft) detached garage which exceeds the maximum allowed square footage of six hundred and sixty square feet (660 sqft) for a detached garage. The proposed enlargement would be to an existing nonconforming garage with a total area of 690 square feet. The maximum allowed area for a detached garage is 660 square feet. The 660 square foot maximum allowed area requirement appears to have been adopted by the Village between 2002 and 2005.

Section 10-5-4(A)3 to allow for two accessory structures of the same type. The property currently has two detached garages on the property. The proposed enlargement would be an enlargement to an existing non-conforming use of an accessory structure. Ord. 5035 was adopted in 2002, which created the requirement that no more than one of each type of accessory structure shall be allowed on a zoning lot unless authorized by a Special Use Permit

Combined total combined lot coverage is 13.48%

Member Questions

Member Pavlich- does that include bonuses for detached garage and accessory structures?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- no it does not, that 13% is with everything combined

Member Pavlich- they could have another 500 square feet plus 100 for the shed

Member Pavlich- I am going to go from memory and quote the code that you get for every detached garage you get a 500 square foot lot coverage bonus and for additional accessory structure, that would be another 100 square feet of lot coverage bonus, so that lot coverage is maybe substantially less than 13%, maybe even 10%- just as a guess

Member Buckton- are you referring to the second garage as a shed?

Member Pavlich- It does not matter what the additional structures are, because for your total lot coverage you get 100 extra for any accessory structure and for a detached garage you get 500 additional square feet so if you were right at the limit right at 20% and you put a 500 square foot garage detached, that would be allowed provided it met all the other rules

Member Jones- Daniel for the 500 sqft bonus, for the detached garage, if his garage is 1,000 square feet is it the first 500 that counts or if it's over 500 does that bonus not count at all?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – that bonus only counts to lot coverages, not the overall square footage. We are over the square footage allowed for accessory structures but we are within the lot coverage.

Member Pavlich- it does not count towards the amount of accessory structure. You can add to house but not structures

Member Jones- Is the house considered a 1 story or ranch or a 2 story?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- it's a 2-story

Member Jones- So they are 20 because it's a 2 story

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- side elevations shown to Members, storage area shown as well, no bathroom that would indicate living situations, proposed height would meet the overall ridge height, issue is eaves. Property owner requesting 20 feet elevated eave height, would like to go vertical with garage.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- it's actually 16 feet, 8 to first level and 8 to the next- structural beam maybe you get to 17, not 20

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- Here is how I interpreted, you have 8ft to the ceiling to the top, 4 feet to the eave; oh I see what you are saying, yes you are correct.

Member Kelly- was 22 to the roof ridge?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn -22 to the roof ridge, 16 to the eave; I misunderstood the elevations diagram. The proposed eave height is 16 feet.

Member Pavlich- in the R2 district rules for eave height in garages there is what is called a low slopped roof provision, so when you reduce the slope of the roof, then you catch that 12ft height limitation. If you make a steeper roof, you can build it to 22 feet without a variation, just to be clear on that. Because of the low pitch of the roof, he falls under the low category instead of the standard ridge height

Member Kelly- if I want to build an A frame garage, I'm fine, can I go 22 ft?

Member Pavlich- Yes, if it's steep enough you can go the 22ft. If its flat enough, 12 ft is the max

Chairperson Miller- Is that because the steeper we go, the less is bulk it shows, there is a reason for it and a good one

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – yes, just to be clear I had notice for 20ft eave height based on the applicant he is correct, I see the mistake. It should be 16ft now.

Member Kelly- 12 is our code limits?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn-yes, 12 is our code's limits

Member Jones- if they were to attach this garage to house, would the eave and ridge height be, ok?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - I believe it would be, as it would still be under the lot coverage ratio. I believe it would be, yes.

Member Jones- what would be considered attached to the house? On Main St. just north of hawthorn they ran a beam to a house to maintain original house to lower taxes?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – that is an interesting question that we have ran into before, theoretically, if you ran a pergola, or something like that, I don't think we would do that. There are fire codes and things like that which you would have to be following. You get into an area that I don't have expertise in.

Member Jones- but then the eave heights would be fine? We would not need any of the variances

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- I believe so, yes

Member Buckton- in 1964 was the garage at 690 feet out of code?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - no it was not

Member Buckton-the garage that was built in 1990, that is only 310 square feet, was code changed after 1990 that does not allow two accessory structures on that property?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- yes, it was created in 2002.

Member Buckton- so when both of these structures were built, they were within code, they were both permitted by village when built

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – yes, they were both permitted by the Village.

Chairperson Miller- would you like to tells us a little bit about your property, why you are here and what makes your particular situation unique?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- Handed letters of support from neighbors. Please go to overall picture, the next house over to left, Pat Mitchell, he is my neighbor, as tall as it will be it will not interfere. If I were to pitch, house 1100 sq feet, in laws will be moving in, move things around, financial component, getting ready to retire, interest rates, too high. I am not changing anything, just grabbing roof and lifting up. I am here for more storage, family issues, and financial issues. Unfortunately, Jordan is not here tonight because I told him I would through him under the bus, when I walked in and brought picture of plot survey and explained what I want to do, and Jordan said your plot of survey is 1992, you should be grandfathered in 1992, but here I am with you guys and my architect just under \$5,000 dollars. If I would have known that I was out in these issues, maybe I would have looked in a different direction and as far as the design of this goes, I didn't take the design lightly, my yard is meticulously maintained for a reason, my architect and I drove around for a few days taking pictures of the houses and the way the double eave and single eave are so we can make this blend in as good as we possibly could, not to obstruct neighbors or bring in an eye sore into this neighborhood.

Member Jones- no questions

Member Pavlich- I don't think that I actually have any questions for you

Member Lakhani- I have nothing right now

Member Kelly- I have nothing at this point

Member Buckton- nobody asked so I am going to; are you related to the guy that your street is next to?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I can't disclose that information, but I don't get a lot of tickets in Glen Ellyn if that is what you are referring to. If it helps, I did serve on our fire dept.

Member Buckton- you want to build this eave at 16 ft and code is 12, I understand that there is a difference in pitch, square footage and size. If you are denied the variation, can you still build it at 12 and be within variation if you don't get the variation?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan -Like I said, I am willing to work with you guys. If we can come up with compromise, I will work with you guys, 12 would be basically a hallway, I can redesign as a barn type of roof but would not be esthetically pleasing

Member Pavlich- what is actual existing ridge house height?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan – it's about 16ft, garage will probably be a little taller in full disclosure

Chairman Miller- Do you have anyone that would like to come up and speak?

Sworn in Neighbors Gianni Pesche and Patrick Mitchell

Neighbor Gianni Pesche- he covered it perfectly, I am on the other side, same lot as well- older homes with very limited storage, will not disrupt esthetic of the lot, as neighbors just showing support

Neighbor Patrick Mitchell-I live to house to north of us, we are here to support him, I look out my window and his garage is right there

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- Patrick Mitchell only neighbor this would impact

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

Deliberation

Member Buckton- Mr. Sheehan, I think that obviously your neighbors like what is going on. I am going to be a stickler for this eave height, difference between 16 and 20 feet is fairly significant in my eyes. I'm sorry 16 and 12. Putting on a second story is fine. My goal would be to adhere to code; I will vote no for the variance.

Member Kelly- question; what is the existing ridge height on detached garage?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn-it's about 8 feet.

Member Kelly- and the ridge height will be 22?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- correct

Member Kelly, my biggest concern and I certainly respect your condition is offering a variance in this case is permitted if and only if we are bringing the structure into conformance, we are taking it further out of conformance it seems to me, do I have that right

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn -We have existing non-conforming- village code would not allow us to do any kind of modification or anything like that, if it's not brought into conformance so this is a variation to do an addition to the garage to an existing non-conforming structure

Member Buckton-But at the end of the day, it sounds to me like we were taking an existing non-conforming structure and making it even less conforming, in terms of height, eave height, density.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- in terms of eave height yes

Member Buckton- I am not going to speak for anyone else but as far as I am concerned, I would never ask the petitioner to reduce the square footage of structure to 600 square feet, right?

Member Kelly- As much as I respect the problems you are having, I just don't see sufficient hardship such as a corner lot where in you have a difficult time with lot coverage because of shape of lot- I am not seeing it here at this point, my vote will be no.

Member Lakhani- I agree, it feels like this is moving to something more nonconforming than allowed, in terms of being able to see the hardship it does not completely comply with all the guidelines that we have, I respect what needs to get done, I feel like maybe there could be another way to explore this. Also, a little bit difficult for me to approve this.

Member Pavlich- I am the most pro garage but that said, I have to agree with the rest of the board, I think you have a valid problem and need. But I don't think we have well considered all of the other design options, that could reduce the increase in variance that we are seeing for this particular solution. I ask about how much square footage we had, to see if an attached solution could create an addition, Dormers in garage, that is where I would look to try to work with the Village to try to come up with designs that would reduce the scale and number of variances that would be required for this project.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I actually do have two dormer designs, that is kind of what I also looked at because the two other smaller eaves do fit under the 12 feet.

Member Pavlich- I will have to look at that separately to be fair, when we approve a project like this, other people will see this and will say, I see this garage and I want the same and we as the Village end up having to answer that question and the other catch is I know that the Board of Trustees is kind of anti-garage, so we have to come with a pretty openly compelling, something that is going to sail because if we don't have a unanimous vote, I don't know if it is getting through the Trustees anyway.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I did drive around Glen Ellyn; I should have brought pictures in because there are garages that are way after code change that are way larger. My next question would be, how do I continue with the project.

Member Kelly- If I may interject, when you spoke to architect, did they offer any other options?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- just on a note on the dormers, is that the total width of the dormer, they shall not exceed 25 percent length of building

Member Kelly- what he or she is proposing here complies with code?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- yes

Member Kelly- it's not the sexiest design but I think it is properly plotted

Chairman Miller- that is also how code winds up changing when things become unpalatable but meet the code

Member Jones- Daniel, you said dormer can't exceed 25% of width of wall, can you have more than one dormer on each side?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - yes, he can have more than one dormer on each side, no dormer shall be greater than 8 feet in width from the outside of the walls space between dormers must have a min of 5 feet. Width of all dormer's shall not exceed 25%

Member Jones- if he reduces dormer to 25%, then he can keep eave height at 20 or 16 feet, correct?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- could we split difference and go 14 ft? Would you be opposed to that?

Member Jones- Not in favor of project but ok with sections of 2, 3 and 4, I would recommend that we break them out and vote.

Chairperson Miller- I am also a no, in your neighborhood I didn't see anything similar,

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- instead of having double dormer, I can drop to 14 ft and split difference, and look into sprucing up a little. Ridge height will stay at 22. *Petitioner was speaking with Commission and attempting to negotiate a plan that would be agreeable with the Members.*

Member Pavlich- having ridge height for a house increased, will be a sticking point for the Board of Trustees, we need a better visualization of how this will look when done.

Chairperson Miller- at this point you are not unanimous, you have two options, because I don't think we will come to an agreement right now, so you can let us vote or you can come back October 7th,

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – The board will meet again on October 7th; I'll give you a 3rd option which will be a split vote of approving variation requests 2-4 to allow for new construction onto garage as long as everything else is within code and then you can do a separate vote on condition 1 for eave height.

Chairperson Miller- I think a cleaner version would be to have to have Mr. Sheehan pull the proposal

Member Jones- would you be willing to bring that from 16 down to 14, can you bring dormer in to 50%?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I want to know exactly required, be as close as we can with the compromises so that I can move forward with the architect?

Member Jones- would you be willing to bring it down to 14, peak at 22

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- Well I can bring it down to 14 and I can take the peak at 22 and possible get to 20 and still get what I want.

Member Buckton- I agree the board might be, see issue with peak but not ZBA with peak at 22, I don't have any problem with it.

Member Jones- if he was 14feet, and dormer at 50% instead of where it is right now, I would be ok with it, question is would everyone else?

Member Buckton- does that open up another can of worms Daniel, that now we have a dormer at 80% and not 25%

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I could remove dormer

Member Buckton- if this was 13.3 inches instead of 12 could it go through an administrative?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - not for an eave height.

Chairperson Miller- how do you feel about the changes you have made with 14ft?

Member Buckton- again I am a code guy but having said that, I want to help Mr. Sheehan out, I can do 14 but I don't know if the Village or the Board will.

Member Kelly- I appreciate your willingness to compromise, I probably still want to see it, the geometry, conceptually I would be good.

Member Lakhani- I would be ok with that too; I think it would make sense.

Member Pavlich- if this was 660 square foot garage everything would be allowed except for eave height. Initial reaction would be that is a huge garage and we don't like it. We have to make clear that this could be done anyway, try to make pitch to minimize negative impact. Would you consider converting this to an attached system like we talked about? Is that out of budget for you?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- It's not a budget issue, it's a tax issue, once it becomes an attached garage, in 5 years I will be reassessed and that would increase tax

Member Pavlich- assessments are made based on estimated value of the house.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- once it becomes attached, the value will go way up, right now it's not attached.

Member Kelly- You don't have mechanical or plumbing, do you; I can't imagine an assessor would look into this as a livable space.

Member Pavlich- you probably will face assessment because assessor will look at permits pulled represent this with additional views of the house. I am just asking what will you be willing to consider. I want to give you guys the best chance to get through. I think we need to come back and represent this with additional views of the house, represent this and try to minimize variations.

Chairperson Miller- I am still struggling with this, the practical difficulties, what is unique about this, looking at everything I am still struggling with it. I am not sure what you can do at this point to change it.

Member Jones- if you are concerned about taxes, go to Milton Township in Wheaton and any of the assessors can explain to you what will happen, in a way we are assuming what could happen. Like I said, I am fine with items 2 through 4, if we have a compromise that everyone speaks about.

Chairperson Miller- where are you with his proposed changes?

Member Jones- if he went 14ft across, I think that is a good compromise, I would approve. I still struggle with the hardship.

Chairperson Miller- exactly, that is where I am and Craig is telling you that you have to come up with good reasons for the hardship and practical difficulties. Read that list very carefully.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- the biggest part of this hardship is moving 50% of my house somewhere, this is a financial hardship.

Member Kelly- But they only consider hardships that pertain to the built environment

Chairperson Miller- that is why I said, take a look at it again, what it is, they take for a good reason the emotional part out of this. You have two choices, we can vote on it and you will get a no, or you can pull eave height right now and ask us to vote on all other 3.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn -no, so what you can make recommendation for approval of items 2-4 and make a recommendation for denial on item 1

Chairperson Miller- Your choice is we vote or suspend until October

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- I will suspend until October since you can't split the items and I will come back. Who do I submit my new drawings to?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn – you will be submitting online again

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- do I have to repay?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- no you do not, this is all the same.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- ok, I will submit various options of eave heights, 12ft, 14ft, 16ft

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- that is ok, right now you can go maximum 20 because of my mistake, and if you want to do options A, B,C on different heights is ok.

Member Pavlich- I think it's a great idea, come back with alternatives that you think we would accept- approve the overall visualization of how this would look with the house for the board. The difficulty is your hardship is only you have non-conforming garage. Other thing I would check is foundation of garage, are you sure this foundation is deep enough?

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan-It is over 4ft deep, I have dug myself. So, if I come back with eaves of 12ft I comply?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- if you come back with eaves at 12ft, they would still need to be voted on by ZBA and Village Board

Chairperson Miller- part of what he is talking about, improving your package, ask your architect to help us visualize what it will look like, show us pictures of neighborhood to help us see how it fits.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan- Right so we will get pictures and have it redesigned; 16, 14 not good enough

Member Pavlich- Zoning is not supposed to consider the Architectural Style but the Board really cares about how it looks.

Member Lakhani- adding to house is a financial hardship which we really can't look at, if you were to consider adding to house, it's not financial but it would ruin the look and character of the look in the house.

Petitioner Dennis Sheehan, the house is a split level so when you go from the lower level to ground floor and bring it straight over you would not have a breeze way.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- I want to be very clear that we need to make a motion to table and state what we are asking applicant to bring back

Member Pavlich made a Motion to table Variance Request on 194 S. Ellyn Ave., Glen Ellyn until October 7, 2025 at which point we will reconsider updated application from Mr. Sheehan including more specifics about alternative design options, more supporting evidence regarding practical difficulties and hardships related to your property and any other alternative designs that you could consider and why they are not feasible Second by Member Lakhani.

Roll call

Member Pavlich- for the record submitting drawing and signatures (20) petition for the record.

D. Other Business

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

Motion to move the review and to October 7th, 2025, by Member Kelly, Member Lakhani second all in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Chairperson's Statement

Thank Matt for his time and service and willingness to stay. I am glad you are staying. I would ask that if you are going to have any changes to the procedures that we will talk about that we discuss them now. Not voting on anything, just bring them out now. This is our Village Attorney saying this.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - essentially, they had changed the quorum section, 3.2. that section does not currently exist, so our Village Attorney is amending a section that talks about physical presence of all boards.

Member Pavlich- majority of seated board now instead of slated board?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn- correct

Member Buckton- are we looking at this again and approving on the 7th?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn - only thing that has changed is section 3.2, if you do have any comments or feedback please submit

Chairperson Miller- is there anything that stuck out that anyone would have an issue with, we can talk about it now

Member Jones- our agenda where we do Findings of Fact, is not in here?

Chairperson Miller- that is Chairman's discretion, when we do at end, we are saying this is what the board did as a whole, it makes sense to have it at end.

Members discussed the Findings of Fact and how the presentation will change to having at end of each case presented. Members discussed having a template that they could read off of when making the Findings of Fact at end of each case and Daniel confirmed that he could provide that to the Board so that it can facilitate the process.

F. Trustee Liaison Report

No Trustee Liaison Report

G. Staff Report

Planning Manager Daniel Harper- Stated the following:

- 365 S. Kenilworth and 236 Sunset both approved by Village Board, finalizing building permits
- September 22, we have annexation of a Property on Butterfield Rd
- Historic preservation we have a landmark nomination request for 799 Rifer Rd
- Application for 574 N. Main St. as an alteration for Historic Landmark
- October meeting, I have 2 items on list as well as today's request to come back, one is eave height for an addition, renovating attic of home for livable square footage. The other is an application for garage setback, side yard set back

- Plan commission for September was cancelled
- Metra on hold, waiting for government to get back from us, waiting on consent and approval from Metra and Union Station.
- Demolition permit has been issued for the shelter, parks district has plans on moving on that this month, phase one and phase 2 project. Take down US bank,
- There is a Village initiated text amendment to allow for C4 zoning district. Danby Station, C4 office district.

H. Adjournment

Member Buckton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Kelly seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora