

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, April 14, 2026 at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Roll was called.

Present: Board Members, Matthew Jones, Noreen Lakhani, Craig Pavlich, and Chairperson Miller

Absent: Board Members, Todd Buckton, Christine McKnight, and Peter Kelly

Also in attendance: Daniel Harper, Planning Manager; Robert Duncan, Village Trustee, and Adriana Ohl Zamora, Recording Secretary.

Chairperson Miller called the meeting to order at 7:01 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.

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

None

C. Approval of March 10, 2026, Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve March 10, 2026, minutes by Member Lakhani, Member Jones seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member Pavlich moved to re-open the Public Hearing on 718 N. Main St. Member Jones seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Sworn in Daniel Harper, Planning Manager Village of Glen Ellyn, Petitioner Thomas Cornelli, Resident John Adduci, Resident Don Foster

D. New Business

1. Public Hearing-718 N. Main St.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 718 N. Main St.

Mr. Harper introduced the zoning variation to the Board Members as follows:

Beth and Thomas Coronelli, the petitioners and owners of the property at 718 N. Main Street, have applied for two zoning variations to accommodate a proposed detached garage that would be nine hundred and forty-six (946) square feet in lieu of the maximum allowed six hundred and sixty (660) square feet for detached garages. This garage will have a maximum parapet height of twenty feet and nine inches (20'-9") in lieu of the maximum allowed parapet height of twelve feet (12'-0") for detached garages. Petitioners would like to retain the integrity of the existing property. They would like 2nd floor to serve as an outdoor living area, which will have stairs within the garage.

The property is zoned R2 Residential District and will be improved with existing two-story single-family home.

In order to proceed with the project as proposed, the petitioners will need to be granted the following variations from the Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(F) to allow a maximum parapet height of twenty feet and nine inches (20'-9") in lieu of the maximum allowed parapet height of twelve feet (12'-0") for detached garages.
2. Section 10-5-5(B)(4) to allow a maximum detached garage area of nine hundred and forty-six square feet (946) in lieu of the maximum allowed area for detached garages of six hundred and sixty (660) square feet.

The applicants are proposing an approximately nine hundred and forty-six (946) square foot detached garage in the rear yard of the residential property. The proposed garage is a tandem design and would be twenty-two feet (22'-0") by twenty-five feet (25'-0") in dimension with a tandem extension in the rear that is twenty-two feet (22'-0) by eighteen feet (18'-0"). The proposed garage would be located further behind the home than the existing detached garage and would be located approximately one-hundred and sixty-four feet and three inches (164'-3") from the front property line.

The applicants are also proposing a maximum parapet height of twenty feet and nine inches (20'-9") in lieu of the maximum allowed parapet height of twelve feet (12'-0") for detached garages to accommodate for a flat roof design above the tandem structure that could be utilized as an outdoor amenity.

The proposed garage would meet all other zoning requirements regarding setbacks and yard and lot coverage. The proposed garage is set back six feet and five inches (6'-5") from the side property line and sixty-six feet and four inches (66'-4") from the rear property line. The proposed total lot coverage on the 32,839 square foot property is approximately 17.4%, and the proposed garage is not located in the required rear yard area. This is below 20% mark of what is required in R2 district.

Due to the scale of the proposed garage, the building permit would require a Site Development Grading Plan, and a drywell would likely be needed to offset stormwater requirements.

The ZBA should consider the testimony presented during the public hearing and review the written evidence presented as part of the petitioners' application packet. The ZBA should make a findings of fact and determine if a practical difficulty or a particular hardship exists for the requested variation and if the essential character of the neighborhood is maintained. The ZBA may choose to make a recommendation to the Village Board for the approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the request per Section 10-10-12 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Maps
Plat of Survey
Site and Elevation Plans

Member Questions:

Chairperson Miller asked if another permit would be needed for the petitioners to put in the deck.

Mr. Harper explained that it would be part of the building permit package.

Member Pavlich asked what counts as a low sloped roof and how it applies here.

Mr. Harper stated that this roof is flat along the surface, so that is how we counted in that. Mr. Harper later clarified that the definition of a low slope roof in the zoning code is "any roof surface with a pitch less than three inches vertically in 12 inches horizontally (3:12), including flat roofs."

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS

Petitioner Thomas Coronelli stated that they have owned 3 homes in Glen Ellyn and that they have been able to save them all. They love the character of Glen Ellyn, and this house is one that they worked on (Cottage Ave.) This is referring to a picture which he showed Members. He explained that they wanted to create something that was fitting with the neighborhood. They are not doing this for profit; and they are trying to save most architectural elements of the home to retain character. They were able to save columns and molding, and they raised the 2nd floor out of old house. They are trying to preserve the streetscape, house, and pergola in the back of the house.

They hired an architect to try to attach the house to the side of building where current garage is. Currently, there is a chunk taken out of the corner because of the setback. After several attempts, it did not look proper without destroying the large existing tree, and they would need to increase the height of the garage. He stated that they could have attached the garage to the house, as they have the lot coverage, but that is not what they want to do. They don't believe the attached garage fits the character of the house. They did try another option, but they would have created a huge structure next to the neighbor's home. Due to angle of lot and curvature of lot, it would have been difficult to get cars in and out. It would not have been efficient, and many windows would have been blocked.

If the garage was pushed up north, there would be many cars parked out front. There could be 4-5 cars of people living there. They want to pull that from the streetscape of what they think is a beautiful historical home. They are asking for square footage,

not storage, in front of the garage. They didn't want to see a big, long structure, which is why they didn't make the upper portion of the garage go all the way across. The flat part of roof will have a limestone cap around the roof designed to not see a flat roof. They don't currently have the designs to build a deck off the back of garage. They are asking for accommodation because of the size of lot. They have made accommodations for the basement of the house, and the garage's wide space could accommodate someone in the future. They want to stay in Glen Ellyn and make it accessible, as it was built in 1910.

Mr. Adduci, a resident across the street, is also a member of the Police Pension Board. He stated that his neighbor didn't ask him to come here. He saw the sign in front of his house. He stated that Mr. Cornelli's house is a beautiful house, and he has enjoyed looking at the transformation of the house. He said that everything seems reasonable based on the size of his lot.

Mr. Foster, a neighbor at 534 Maple street, said that they get a good view of their entire back yard. They have seen a variety of things in their backyard, and he appreciates what the Canellis have done to preserve that house. They have three car garages, and this lot that he owns is very unique. It has a lot of space, and it's very appropriate for a bigger garage. He knows that the Village is redoing the zoning code, so the lot size might be something to consider. Glen Ellyn has a mix of big, small, and medium-sized houses. It's not like other communities.

Member Pavlich asked why the petitioners needed 946 square feet versus the 660 square foot garage. The petitioners stated that their intention was to compliment the roof line of house. Their old family room needed to be upgraded, and they had to then address that. They did not intend the garage to be as big as it is, and he thinks it is reasonable to request what is essentially a four-car garage for an 8-bedroom house. The square footage that they are asking for is to make it a little wider. It is a shelter for cars as well. The modifications were all made under their ownership. What you see from street and side is the original house.

Member Lakhani asked if there were any other variations granted.

The petitioner stated No

Chairperson Miller asked what the plan was for the 2nd floor of the garage. The petitioners said that they don't have any more need for additional square footage, and there is no purpose for it other than storage. They do not plan on using it for an apartment of any type. The door is there to open and let the air in, adding glass doors which would function as light and air. He owns a van camper which he would put in the garage, and he doesn't want to put a boat in the garage. He doesn't know if you can park a camper in garage. The glass will be filtered. The purpose of a 2nd door is to access the roof, gutters, and chimneys easier.

Mr. Harper stated that for clarity, that the code states that "Unless parked within an enclosed building no more than one recreational vehicle, trailer or boat of any kind or type may be parked in the open, and then only behind the front building line and not in a required side yard."

Findings of Fact; The applicant is seeking for a variance for Section 10-4-8(F) to allow a maximum parapet height of twenty feet and nine inches (20'-9") in lieu of the maximum allowed parapet height of twelve feet (12'-0") for detached garages. They are also seeking a variance for Section 10-5-5(B)(4) to allow a maximum detached garage area of nine hundred and forty-six square feet (946) in lieu of the maximum allowed area for detached garages of six hundred and sixty (660) square feet. We heard from neighbors Mr. Foster and Mr. Adduci.

Member Lakhani moved to accept Findings of Fact, and Member Buckton seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Deliberation

Member Lakhani said that it is hard to accept whatever the petitioners are trying to do, and it does not fall in line with the current Zoning Board and the codes.

Member Pavlich said that he is very pro garage and all things with motors as a resident of Village. All the hardships that the petitioners are speaking of, he feels for them dearly. There are a lot of dynamics, but while they have granted garages for a lot of purposes, they have never granted variations for bigger garages. He understands their position because they have a large lot, and they have spent a lot of money modifying this house.

Member Jones stated that being on this board for 10 years, they have approved garages larger than 660 square feet. Every single garage has passed. The petitioners have two lots there, which would allow them to build two homes as big as they want and two garages of 660 square feet. The Village is looking at the rewriting the code, and if they wait, maybe the petitioners will get their garage. He thinks this should be deliberated at the Village Board. He will be a yes vote, which will end up being debated at the Board.

Chairperson Miller stated that he believes that regardless of our vote, he doesn't see a hardship or practical difficulty that would allow him to vote for it. They can vote to table this and they can go back to drawing board and come back to them. Or, they can have them vote on it now and plead their case before the Village Board.

Member Pavlich recommended denial based on findings of facts and Member Lakhani seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote (3) yes and 1 (no).

E. Other Business

None

F. Chairperson's Statement

Chairperson reminded the audience that there is a survey online to fill out regarding the current rezoning project.

G. Trustee Liaison Report- Robert Duncan

He spoke about the Strategic Plan and re-zoning issues. There are things to be excited about for the 4th of July this year.

H. Staff Report

Mr. Harper- Stated the following:

1. Both garages will be at the May 11th Village Board meeting.
2. 863 Highview, with a sunroom on the deck, withdrew their application.
3. This Thursday, we have the Historic Preservation Commission Awards.
4. Kenilworth Arms Condominiums would like to construct a deck that needs a variation.
5. There is a busy schedule on the ZBA May agenda. There are 3 variations in the queue.
6. The AAC is revising the exterior appearance approval guidelines
7. We are in the first rounds of comment reviews for Dutch Bros.
8. Lens Ace Hardware is looking to add a garden center located in parking lot to the west of the building. Ace Hardware has purchased that property.

I. Adjournment

Member Lakhani made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Pavlich seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote at 8:15 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora