

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, May 12, 2026, at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room
535 Duane Street

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Roll was called.

Present: Board Members, Todd Buckton, Christine McKnight, Craig Pavlich, and Chairperson Miller

Late: Peter Kelly arrived at 7:15 pm

Absent: Board Members, Matthew Jones, and Noureen Lakhani

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

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.

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

None

C. Approval of April 14, 2026 Zoning Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve April 14, 2026 minutes by Member Buckton, Member Pavlich seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member McKnight moved to open the Public Hearing on 285 N. Main St. Member Buckton seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Sworn in Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Charles and Emily Price, Petitioners 285 N. Main St., Tim Nelson, Petitioner representing Kevin McCarthy (Owner) 593 Lee St., Johnathan Lantz, Petitioner 635 Carolyn Drive.

D. New Business

1. Public Hearing - 285 N. Main St.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 285 N. Main St.

The petitioners Charles and Emily Price, the owners of the property at 285 N. Main Street, have applied for a zoning variation to allow a deck that was built with a setback of five feet and six inches (5'-6") from the south property line in lieu of the required 6-foot, 6-inches (6'-6"). The subject property is zoned R2 Residential District and improved with an existing single-family home. There is a cistern located underneath the deck which caused the shift of the deck.

The petitioners request approval of the following variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-5-5(B)(4)(8) to allow for a deck to be set back five feet and six inches (5'-6") from the interior side yard property line in lieu of the required setback of six feet and six inches (6'-6").

The deck was permitted for construction per permit #20250283 on 4/21/2025. The original deck permit was approved for the construction of a new rear yard deck with a conforming side yard setback of six feet and six inches (6'-6"). According to the applicant, during the construction of the deck in May and June of 2025, the construction team discovered a previously undocumented cistern structure underneath the old deck that was being replaced. According to the applicant, the cistern's location made it structurally infeasible to install four of the concrete piers as originally designed. In order to avoid undermining

the cistern and to maintain proper structural support for the deck, the contractor relocated the affected piers to what he deemed to be the nearest feasible structural position.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Maps
Approved Deck Plan and Deck Construction Photo
Site Plan
Letter of Support

Member Questions:

Chairperson Miller asked who provided the photo with framing and at what stage the need for variance was discovered.

Mr. Harper responded that the photo was provided to Village and the need for variance was discovered at the very end of the project, not at the footing inspection. At the time, the deck was about 90% completed.

Petitioner Keaton Price, the homeowner, explained that during excavation, it was discovered that there was a cistern underneath the deck. To avoid disruption to the structure, the contractor moved footings of the deck, causing an 11-inch move. He added that the neighbors to the south provided a letter of support.

Members asked the homeowner the following questions:

1. What was the cistern used for?
2. When the cistern was discovered, what was the through process?
3. What percentage of the deck is complete?

Petitioner Price stated that his house was built in 1925, and when they pulled back dirt, the cistern seemed to be non-functional. He was not informed until the framing inspection, and they asked the inspector to come back and discuss what the right path was. He added that since footings were poured and they were at the second inspection, they decided to move forward. The deck is currently 90% complete per last inspection.

Member Pavlich added that the house was built in 1925, and the construction of the principal structure predates current setbacks. The deck is substantially aligned with the house now. He shared a photo of the finished deck, which he took on his cell phone, showing that it is aligned with the original setback of the home.

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

Deliberation - (Member Kelly did not participate in deliberation, as he arrived late @ 7:15pm)

Member Buckton explained what a hardship is and how as homeowners, they have all been in positions where they have encountered a hardship with a new build/construction project. He is in favor of this variance and is voting yes.

Member McKnight added that she would be voting yes due to the cistern, which is a hardship.

Member Pavlich stated that he will be voting yes due to the unforeseen cistern that was discovered.

Chairperson Miller will be voting no because he would like to have this go to Village Board. He noted that it's important that they see these types of cases.

Member McKnight recommended approval of the variation based on findings of facts, and Member Buckton seconded the motion. The motion did not pass by vote (3) yes and 1 (no).

Member Buckton moved to open the Public Hearing on 593 Lee St. Member McKnight seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

2. Public Hearing 593 Lee Street

Sworn in, Jordan Frahm, Associate Planning for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 593 Lee St.

Petitioner Tim Nelson, representing Kevin McCarthy, the owner of the property at 593 Lee Street, has applied for two zoning variations to allow for a two-story addition to an existing residence. The petitioner is requesting a side yard setback of 4 feet, 4 inches (4'-4") in lieu of the required 6 feet, 6 inches (6'-6") and requesting a lot coverage ratio of 30.1 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent. The subject property is zoned R2 Residential District and improved with an existing one-story single-family home.

The petitioner, Tim Nelson, and the homeowner, Kevin McCarthy, are proposing an 81-square foot first-story near the front entrance of the home and an 831-square foot vertical second-story addition in the rear yard. The second-story addition is completely above the existing first-story footprint. However, the home is legally nonconforming with regard to both the side yard and rear yard setbacks. The existing rear yard setback is thirty four feet and two inches (34'-2") and complies with the exemption for vertical additions found in the Village Code Section 10-4-1(N)(2), which allows for a vertical addition over the existing foundation walls at a setback that does not encroach greater than thirty feet (30'-0"). The existing side yard setback of four feet and four inches (4'-4") is beyond the exemption for vertical additions found in the Village Code Section 10-4-1(N)(2), which would allow for a vertical addition of existing foundation walls at a setback that does not exceed a side yard setback of four feet and six inches (4'-6").

The proposal would also require a variation from the maximum lot coverage ratio of 20 percent. One-story homes in the Village of Glen Ellyn are permitted to have a maximum lot coverage ratio of 35 percent. The existing home has a current lot coverage ratio of 27.5 percent and is conforming to one-story lot coverage requirements. However, by constructing a vertical addition as proposed, the home would be subject to the maximum lot coverage ratio for two-story homes. Any vertical addition would require zoning relief, as the existing lot coverage ratio is above 20 percent. The applicant is seeking a lot coverage ratio of 30.1 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent.

Within the applicant's narrative, practical difficulties are described regarding the nonconforming area and lot width. The vertical addition would allow for an increase in floor area without increasing the footprint of the home and the proposed addition will not worsen existing setbacks. The applicant notes within the application narrative that the proposal will not alter the essential character of the locality and that the granting of the variances will "not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood."

The petitioner requests approval of variations from the following sections of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(D) to allow for a setback of four feet, four inches (4'-4") from the side property line in lieu of the required minimum setback of six feet, six inches (6'-6").
2. Section 10-4-8(E) to allow for a lot coverage ratio of 30.1 percent in lieu of the required maximum lot coverage ratio of 20 percent.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Maps
Plat of Survey
Building Elevations
Site Plan
Opposed Correspondence

Member Questions:

Member Pavlich clarified with Associate Planner Jordan Frahm that the lot is about 50 feet by 130 feet average, with non-conforming total area around 6418 square feet. He asked if in order to build, they would need a variation.

Mr. Frahm confirmed that it was indeed correct.

Mr. McCarthy, the homeowner, stated that the purpose of the project is to solely build forever home. They have lived in this home for six years and have had their first baby with plans for more. The house has become tight. Their only choice is to build up because of the side yard and rear yard setbacks. The objections come from the neighbor that backs up to them. He stated that they are just talking about 2 inches, and they have 46 feet between their homes. With the rear yard, there is already a code exception for their lot size.

Mr. McCarthy said that the Village stated values, what is best for the community. He hopes that the Members have read the letters of support and that the community has already informed the Members of what is best for the community by reading those letters. They have no front door, which makes it difficult for first responders to locate front door. For safety issues, someone

could hide and cause harm. Their architect is from Geneva, and they would like to maintain the charm of Lee Street and are very happy to live on Lee Street.

Member McKnight asked what the practical difficulty or hardship is.

Mr. Nelson responded that it is the lot size, which causes them to build up and ask for a variance for the side yard.

Member Buckton asked for the total square footage of the additions.

Mr. Nelson stated that it is 800 square feet. The 2nd floor will have 3 bedrooms, a bathroom, and a laundry and small desk area (loft). Currently, the home is a 2-bedroom. The front entrance is created to be more of a vestibule with a covered entry and visible front entrance from the street, as the only entrance is on the side of the house. The garage will stay unchanged.

Member Pavlich asked what the original construction date was.

Mr. McCarthy stated it was about 1952.

Member Pavlich asked if presumably, lots of this size were allowed to be plotted in 1952, presumably?

Mr. Harper responded that typically, about 10% of the lot width was the required setback, and no zoning history was found on this property.

Member Miller asked if they looked at other options to minimize this.

Mr. McCarthy stated that the side yard setback is at their rear, so their homes are 46 feet (46'-0") away. They want to minimize impact and retain of aesthetic charm of Lee Street.

Martin Didera is sworn in, the resident of 735 Crescent Blvd. He stated that he is the neighbor that is perpendicular to Mr. McCarthy's residence. He appreciates the point and understands the growing family. However, in the hardship guidelines, it specifically states that one's family size cannot be included as a hardship. He said that when you look into the other homes, they are essentially about 80 feet (80'-0") away from each other, now he will be 46 feet (46'-0") away from this home. He states that the need of a front door does not necessitate an addition.

He stated that he has worked on a project with Mr. Nelson, and while he appreciates that he is an award-winning architect, it does not mean this is a great project. He said that he has concerns, but rather than address his concerns, the homeowner went around to their neighbors to get their support. This is not about a popularity contest; it is about following the zoning rules. By doing this, they are creating higher density.

Brandy Wilson, an architect and neighbor, is sworn in. She stated that she, too, is an award-winning architect and shares the northeast side of the lot. She lives in a ranch and had to significantly downsize. She said that if she did an addition, she would keep in mind the current setbacks. She noted that it's a tight lot and her yard is deep. She didn't want to shoot down what they were proposing and wanted to be realistic and compassionate. She thought of light and bearings in the diagram she created. It's important to know that a centralized addition would look better and didn't know why they would want to push their addition to the rear of their house. She said that a more balanced and central design should be looked at that is considerate of their neighbors. Density is something to consider here. Every project she has worked on has a budget and has to follow the code, and they will not be able to do the addition without a lot coverage variance. It's a matter of pulling the home in, some offsets would have gone a long way.

Member Buckton wants to confirm that all the things she had mentioned do not refute the fact that the lot coverage ratio goes out the window when you put on a second story.

Member Pavlich said that this lot is such that nothing can be done on this house without a variance. He asked if she would consider being in support of a variance, just not this design.

Ms. Wilson said yes since she understands building and construction. In this situation, she said that the homeowners have to be more considerate. By doing those diagrams today, it spoke to her that by putting the addition in the back, they are causing obstruction to 3 homes.

Member Pavlich asked the homeowner in which year the home was purchased.

Homeowner responded that the home was purchased in June 2020.

Member Pavlich moved to accept Findings of Facts that includes 13 in-favor letters and 3 opposing letters. Member Buckton seconded the motion, and motion passed by unanimous vote.

Member Kelly moved to close the public meeting, Member McKnight seconded the motion, and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Deliberation

Member McKnight stated that the hardship is not met in this case.

Member Buckton said that he is very torn on this one, and without a variation they cannot do anything and must keep home the way it is. He also listened to positive and negative comments about the project. If they let this property do it, then everyone else will look at this property and say, "if they did it why can't I?". He said he cannot say yes on this.

Member Kelly stated that he is firmly on the fence on this. This is the product of a legal non-conforming lot size, but he has to balance that with the neighbor's comments absent the opposition, he would be inclined to say yes. He asked if Mr. Harper was aware of any similar requests for variances that are similar to this.

Member Pavlich said that on 12/10/2024, they heard a similar case, 654 Essex Rd. In that case, they did find in favor of the owner to give them a variance. That is the only time they had a case like this.

Member Miller said his whole neighborhood has lots your size. When his neighbor's house almost burned down completely, they all had discussions with her about her new build. They were all involved in that process because it was a big deal. He said, "We are all neighbors here, we all have a process to follow." He said they have a couple of options, they can table this and can come back with a new design, or they can vote and go to the board and try them.

Motion to table the New Business at 593 Lee Street for the July 14, 2026, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting. The motion passed by unanimous vote (5) yes.

Member McKnight moved to open the Public Hearing on 635 Carolyn Drive, Member Buckton seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

3. Public Hearing - 635 Carolyn Drive

Lindsay and Johnathan Lantz (Petitioners), owners of the property at 635 Carolyn Drive, have applied for a zoning variation to allow a rear yard setback thirty-two feet and nine inches (32'-9") from the rear yard property line in lieu of the required minimum setback of forty feet (40'-0"). The subject property is zoned R2 Residential District and improved with an existing single-family home.

The Petitioners have applied for a variation to the minimum rear yard setback requirement of 40 feet (40'-0") to construct a two-story addition to the rear of the existing home. This proposed rear addition would add 178 square feet to the existing building area of 1,842 square feet for a total building area of 2,059 square feet (including bonuses for the proposed front porch, existing backyard shed, and the removal of the existing rear bay window). The proposed building area meets the maximum allowable lot coverage ratio at 19.9 percent. The proposed addition has living area on first floor, mud room, and 2-story addition to the home. The floorplans are presented at the meeting, but no floorplans were shown online for the 1st and 2nd story. Staff encouraged the applicant and architect to expand with a 2nd floor over the existing home, within the footprint. However, the applicant and architect opted to go for a variation instead. 7 emails in support and 1 email opposing were received.

The Petitioners state that they are requesting the variation due to the non-rectilinear shape of the lot due to its location on a cul-de-sac, which presents difficulties in satisfying setback requirements for the proposed addition. The Petitioners are requesting consideration of the unique lot shape, and state that the design and placement of the existing single-story residence with attached garage are unique to this lot and not generally applicable to other properties within the same zoning district.

The Petitioners request approval of the following variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(D)(2) to allow for a rear yard setback thirty-two feet and nine inches (32'-9") from the rear yard property line in lieu of the required setback of forty feet (40'-0").

The following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Maps
Plat of Survey
Building Elevations
Site Plan
Letters of Support

Member Questions:

Member Kelly asked when the home was built.

The home was built in 1973, per the homeowner

Chairperson Miller asked if Mr. Harper had a topographical map. Mr. Harper said that they did not in this presentation. Regarding storm water, this would most likely trigger the need for a dry well component. If a variation was approved and they submitted a building permit, it would go through that approval process for storm water requirements.

Member Pavlich noted that the existing home currently complies with all setbacks. Mr. Harper noted that there is just a little bit non-conforming on the front yard setback. The overall lot area is 10,356 square feet, the total square footage is 1,842 square feet after bonuses that they receive, which are conforming to the 20 percent.

Member Buckton asked if there was an issue with the lot coverage. He noted that an email that came in opposition called into account lot coverage ratio done by village.

Mr. Harper stated that he did some investigation, but a plat of survey was done by a professional lot surveyor and correlated with what was submitted by architect. His feeling is that the lower lot area number came from DuPage County. In cases like this, they defer to professional surveyors.

Mr. Harper explained that the area highlighted in red on the front elevation shows where the addition is located on the floorplan. The floorplans are not included on the packet online. Nothing exceeds current height.

Mr. and Mrs. Lantz state that they have lived in Glen Ellyn for 13 years and are requesting to improve their living area to make it more functional for family, which includes a mud room and kitchen modernization. Their home layout has not been updated in over 50 years, and due to the cul-de-sac curve, their home sits back farther in lot, limiting the construction. Their architect, Mark Kollias, is also in attendance.

Member Pavlich states that the Zoning Code says that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return and that the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances. He asked what is unique to this home that drives the variation.

Mark Kollias, their architect, is sworn in. He stated that the position of house is locked in front and side. They would try to go back if they could, and their choice was to bump out the rear to achieve that. However, since they are locked in between two lines, going up on top of the garage is an option.

Member Buckton stated that since setback comes into play, the widest part is where family room has an 8-foot (8'-0") addition and asks if they maybe looked at four feet (4'-0").

Mr. Kollias said cutting down in half will shrink living space, and they didn't want to push the 20 percent. They figured it would be just the rear yard setback to consider.

Member Kelly asked how they would respond to their neighbor and if there are any other alternatives that they have considered on the design. The four-foot buildout is part of an existing patio, so they would be covering an existing impervious area, and there are lots of trees in the backyard for privacy.

Mr. Lantz stated that one might see a little bit more as you get closest to the fence and that the storm water in their yard drains very well. Some of the drained water comes from their neighbors' homes, and all of the construction is on impervious ground in terms of water.

They also stated that they had just heard about the opposition yesterday, so they have not had time to discuss and reply to the opposing neighbor.

Kevin Wenta, Mr. and Mrs. Lantz's neighbor, is sworn in. He said that he would 100 percent approve an addition over the garage, but the real issue for them is that the house is up 6 feet (6'-0"), and their gutter dumps water to the south. He said that they are 30 feet (30'-0") up against the fence, so there is only about 10 feet (10'-0") available, and the addition will be overlooking their home. He stated that there is no hardship and that they can easily go above the garage.

Member Pavlich said that what he clearly observes is that storm water is a concern in this case.

Mr. Wenta said yes, and that they are right in their backyard already, where they can just go right above the garage.

Mr. Harper added that initially, when it was brought to the Village, they determined that there was available room to expand square footage if that was the goal. They communicated that with the architect, but the objectives of the property owner were not achieved through their plan, so the homeowner decided to move forward with requesting the variance.

Member Pavlich moved to accept Findings of Fact to include 8 letters of support and 1 opposing letter. Member Buckton seconded the motion, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

Member McKnight moved to close the public hearing, Member Buckton seconded the motion, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

Deliberation

Member Kelly stated that majority of the opposition stems from water drainage, and storm water ordinance was not created until 1991. That particular issue was left to Village to adjudicate. There is nothing that they have control over. He will be inclined to vote yes

Member Buckton stated that the cul-de-sac is a weird shape. They have a letter of opposition, the homeowner has a beautiful backyard, but he can see what is going on with their neighbor's concern. He noted that an administrative variation was not what they are looking for. He is going to vote no. In terms of water, that is not their purview.

Member McKnight says she is also inclined to vote no and sees no practical hardship.

Member Pavlich says they had a similar case, and in that case, and the board did approve of the variation. They do not deal in precedent, and this falls into that gray area of concern. This is not a super ridiculous request and will not impact the community significantly. He doesn't think there is a strong case for hardship. The lot is unique in shape, but it gives them other options to explore. He thinks he will be voting yes.

Chairperson Miller said he struggles with hardship and unique circumstances and that water is an issue. He stated that the homeowners can postpone, or they can vote and go before the board. He does not feel that there is a hardship and is planning on voting no.

Motion to table meeting until July 14, 2026 by Member Buckton seconded by Member Pavlich. The motion passed by unanimous vote (5) yes (0) no.

E. Other Business

None

F. Chairperson's Statement

Members of the Village Board of Trustees have requested that ZBA meeting minutes be provided that are relevant to the cases they will be deliberating at Village Board meetings. What is preventing them from being provided?

Mr. Harper stated that there is discussion on whether it is appropriate to provide draft meeting minutes as part of official agenda packets for the trustees and that he is awaiting directions from village administrators.

Trustee Duncan stated that Village Attorney Paul can look into approving but that he would also work with Paul to get to a resolution.

G. Trustee Liaison Report - Robert Duncan

- The two garage requests were both denied on Main St. and St. Charles.
- There should be better clarity and direction regarding what constitutes a hardship. Providing that clarity is really going to minimize folks that come in. To educate the community on this would be a good idea.

- The big project on the horizon is replacing the Public Works building. Initial discussions are taking place about where to do it and what it will look like. They are looking to move south of Lambert Lake. It will increase square footage and accessibility to vehicles.

Mr. Harper added that when residents have variances come up, he sits with the petitioners to discuss what constitutes hardship and provides guidance.

H. Staff Report

Mr. Harper stated the following:

1. In June, there are variations for:
 - a. 113 S. Parkside
 - b. 565 Hill Ave.
 - c. 253 Anthony St.
2. Village Board on May 26th, a butterfly mural and 250th celebration history center mural are proposed
3. HPC awards presented for projects
4. AAC is looking at reviews of existing appearance guidelines
5. Plan Commission meeting there will be a presentation with a preliminary recommendations report by ZoneCo this month May 28th at 7pm
6. Dutch Bros application for a Special Use Permit in June
7. Consideration of the Metra Station in July or August

I. Adjournment

Member Kelly made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote at 9:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora