



Agenda
Village of Glen Ellyn
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, July 14, 2026
7:00 PM
Civic Center, Galligan Room

Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend the hearing and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and participate, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or facilities, are requested to contact the Village at least 24 hours before the meeting.

- A. Call to Order**
- B. Public Comment**
- C. Approval of the Minutes**
 - 1) Review and Approval of the June 9, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
- D. Old Business**
 - 1) Continuation of Public Hearing — 593 Lee Street
 - 2) Continuation of Public Hearing — 635 Carolyn Drive
- E. New Business**
 - 1) Public Hearing - 877 Crescent Boulevard
 - 2) Zoning Code Discussion — Administration and Enforcement, Nonconforming Structures and Lots.
- F. Other Business**
- G. Chairperson's Statement**
- H. Trustee Liaison's Report**
- I. Staff Report**
- J. Adjournment**

Dear Petitioner(s) and Interested Citizens: Once a variation request has been heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Board may make a recommendation and minutes of the hearing are prepared. The variation, along with the minutes, summary report and all related material, is submitted for consideration by the Village Board at a regularly scheduled Village Board meeting. To confirm exact times and dates for Village Board consideration of a project, please call 630-547-5241.



Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals
535 Duane Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 7/14/2026 7:00 PM
Department: Community Development
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan
Category: Minutes
Prepared By: Daniel Harper

AGENDA ITEM (ID # 2026-523)

DOC ID: 2026-523

Review and Approval of the June 9, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Statement of the Issue:

Review and Approval of the June 9, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Analysis:

Review and Approval of the June 9, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Budget Impact:

Contribution to Strategic Plan

Action Requested:

Review and Approval of the June 9, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Attachments:

1. June 9, 2026, Zoning Minutes Draft

DRAFT MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, June 9, 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, Peter Kelly, Matthew Jones, and Chairperson Chip Miller

Absent: Board Members, Craig Pavlich, and Noureen Lakhani

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 7:00 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 May 12, 2026 Zoning Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve May 12, 2026, minutes by Member Buckton, Member Kelly seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member Kelly moved to open the Public Hearing on 113 S. Parkside Avenue, Member McKnight seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Sworn in Daniel Harper, Planning Manager Village of Glen Ellyn, Scott McDonald, Daniel Simoneit, Matthew & Sarah Coe, Louis & Brian Prignano.

D. New Business

1. Public Hearing-113 S. Parkside Avenue

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the following variation request for 113 S. Parkside Ave.

Brian Prignano (Petitioner), representing the owners of the property at 113 S. Parkside Avenue, has applied for a zoning variation to allow a side yard setback of six feet and four inches (6'-4") from the interior side yard property line in lieu of the required minimum setback of six feet and six inches (6'-6") and to allow a lot coverage of 23.53% in lieu of the maximum allowed lot coverage of 20%.

This proposed rear addition would add 254 square feet to the existing building area of 1,401 square feet for a total building area of 1,709 square feet, resulting in a lot coverage ratio of 23.53 percent (including a 140 square foot bonus for the existing front porch and a 498 square foot bonus for the detached garage). The proposed building area requests a variation of 3.53 percent above the maximum allowable lot coverage ratio at 20 percent. The second variation is to allow a side yard setback of six feet and four inches (6'-4") in lieu of the required side yard setback of six feet and six inches (6'-6"). The applicant has reported that this is to maintain the existing setback line of the north wall of the existing structure.

The petitioner states that they are requesting the variations due to the existing condition of the residence being located in the 500-year floodplain. This condition prevented a basement from being constructed within the home. The petitioners are requesting consideration of this condition, and they state that because basement space cannot be utilized, typical residential functions such as storage and recreation must be accommodated within the first-floor footprint. The proposed 254 square foot one-story addition increases lot coverage to 23.53% to provide space that would normally be located below grade. The petitioner states that without the requested variation, the property would be unable to reasonably accommodate these typical residential functions due to the

floodplain restriction.

Due to the proposed addition being located in the 500-year floodplain, the request was reviewed by the Village's development engineer consultant, who has stated that the proposed addition likely will interfere with the overland drainage patterns that currently exist on the property and that, if the variations were granted, the building permit submittal would need to show that stormwater can continue to flow in the same general path to the south. All usable space added to the existing building must be elevated, floodproofed, or otherwise protected so that the lowest entry is at least two feet above the base flood elevation to prevent surface stormwater from entering. Any floodproofing measures must operate without human intervention and must be certified by a professional engineer. The addition must meet the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance.

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

1. Section 10-4-8(D)(3) to allow for a side yard setback six feet and four inches (6'-4") from the interior side yard property line in lieu of the required setback of six feet and six inches (6'-6").
2. Section 10-4-8(E)(1) to allow a lot coverage of 23.53% in lieu of the maximum allowed lot coverage of 20%.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Map
Contour Map
Flood Hazard Map
Plat of Survey
Floor Plan
Building Elevations

Member Questions:

Member Buckton asked if the proposed addition would include the necessary height.

Mr. Harper stated that it would be elevated with a concrete patio to meet the height requirement. Stormwater requirements must all be met. He confirmed that the lot coverage will increase by 3.53%.

Member Jones asked if they were permitted to have a basement. Some of the neighbors do have basements.

Mr. Harper was not sure if the current code would allow them to build a basement.

Member Kelly asked if they are sure that the 500-year flood plain comes with building restrictions and is a little confused, as he checked. To the best of his knowledge, this would not restrict them from building a basement.

Mr. Harper stated that he could not confirm that assertion.

Mr. Prignano, the petitioner representing his parents, described the floodplain and lack of basement, and he stated that they are looking to build an addition for recreational and storage needs. The lot coverage had also changed, and thus, when his parents purchased home, it was 25%. If it did not change, this would not be an issue.

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

Deliberation

Member Jones stated that the rear addition is in line to homes to North and would not stick out. He is undecided.

Member Kelly noted that the homeowners should have known that this home was in flood plain, and an increase in lot coverage is significant. He is leaning towards no at this time.

Member Buckton stated that the petitioners should consider having revised plans to bring lot coverage ratio down and agrees with his fellow Members and will be voting no.

Member McKnight said that the home is on a floodplain. Keeping in mind the fact that the home was built in 1987 and the code changed in 1989, the proposed addition maintains the existing side yard setback. She is inclined to vote in favor.

Chairperson Miller appreciated that the homeowner brought the ratio down in working with staff and plans to vote yes.

Member Kelly wanted to state that the house is barely in the 100-year floodplain.

Motion to close public hearing by Member Jones, seconded by Member Kelly.

Member McKnight recommended the approval of the variation based on the Findings of Facts, Member Kelly seconded the motion; The motion did not pass vote (2) yes and 3 (no).

Member Buckton moved to open the Public Hearing on 565 Hill Avenue. Member Kelly seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

2. Public Hearing - 565 Hill Avenue

Mr. Harper presented the following:

Daniel Simoneit (Petitioner), representing the owners of the property at 565 Hill Avenue, has applied for a zoning variation to allow an interior side yard setback of five feet and six inches (5'-6") in lieu of the required setback of ten feet and three inches (10'-3"). The existing conditions of the property were shown to the Members, which is a 103-foot-wide lot, not a 100-foot-wide lot.

The petitioners have applied for a variation to the minimum side yard setback requirement to construct a one-story addition to the rear of the existing home. The applicant has reported that this is to maintain the existing setback line of the east wall of the existing structure. The applicant is requesting consideration of the property shape that flares wider behind the front property line, which creates a larger required side yard setback. Also, the proposed addition is in line with the existing home which has an existing nonconforming setback of six feet (6'-0"). This proposed rear addition would add 671 square feet to the existing building area of 1,306.91 square feet for a total building area of 1,978 square feet. The proposed addition would raise the proposed lot coverage ratio of the property from approximately 7.5% to 11%, which is under the 20% maximum allowed. This would be a one-story addition.

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

1. Section 10-4-8(D)(3) to allow an interior side yard setback of five feet and six inches (5'-6") in lieu of the required setback of ten feet and three inches (10'-3").

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Maps
Plat of Survey
Site Plan
Floor Plan
Building Elevations
565 Hill Rendering & Existing Photos
Letters of Support

Member Questions:

Member Buckton asked for the distance from the southernmost edge of the addition to the lot line.

Daniel Harper stated that it is five feet and six inches (5'-6").

Chairperson Miller asked for the distance to the neighbors and stated that it looks relatively close.

Mr. Coe, the homeowner, has been a resident since 2016 stated that what is unique about the home is that they chose it based on the opportunity of restoration. The modifications that they are making are keeping in line with the original design of the home. They also have an oddly shaped lot and are trying to maintain the structure of the original home. They would like to extend the kitchen. They have a family of five and would love to host their family.

Mrs. Coe owns a build and design company. They have three children, and the addition will be a sunroom. There will be a slight remodeling to the outside, new windows, and a facelift, but they will maintain the historic aspect of the home. They have 9 letters of approval of the addition from their neighbors. She read a letter from Beverly and Michale Mason, which was in approval of the

variation request. The letter stated the commitment of homeowners to the preservation of the home, and they believed that it is a positive project for the neighborhood.

Mr. Simoneit, the petitioner and architect, stated that the hardships include the layout of lot. The side yards are not perpendicular to the front. The home has a garage that is not original to the home, and they are bringing the home up to more modern standards while expanding the home's kitchen. The home is existing nonconforming and was built in 1981. They are looking to create a new front door at the back of the home, the 1-story portion of the home at 13.25 is actually brick original to the home. The southeast corner has the largest variation percentage request. Even after completing this project, they are only using half of the maximum allowed lot ratio coverage.

Member Jones asked for the depth of the existing three-season room. This will be an extension that will not impact much.

Mr. Simoneit stated he pushed for two stories, but the owners did not want that. They want a kitchen, and a large skylight is also being proposed.

Member Buckton has nothing to say besides that Mr. Simoneit's presentation is clear and concise.

The homeowner's neighbor, 571 Hill Avenue, Connor O'Brien, stated that he has lived in Glen Ellyn since 2024 and is speaking in support of this variance for the home. They are maintaining the home's look and structure. It is only a single-story project, and he is in favor of this.

Mr. Harper state that he had found a 1990 Plat of Survey of 571 Hill Avenue which showed a side setback of 12ft 2inches at the western point of lot.

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

Deliberation

Member Kelly's concern is that they are exasperating an existing nonconformity. The hardships described are all legitimate.

Member Buckton stated that it is a great house and likes the fact that they are not tearing it down and are restoring. He will be voting yes.

Member McKnight agrees with the two Members, notes that they have a neighbor supporting them, and is voting yes.

Member Jones is a yes vote, stating that the addition will look nice. It will be one of the nicest homes on the street. He noted that they are maintaining the home, which is great.

Chairperson Miller noted that both the east and south neighbors are in favor of this project. He is happy that they are restoring it and is a yes.

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

Member McKnight recommended Approval of Variation based on the Findings of Facts, Member Kelly seconded the motion; The motion passed with a vote (5) yes and 0 (no).

Member McKnight moved to open the Public Hearing on 253 Anthony Street. Member Buckton seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

3. Public Hearing – 253 Anthony Street

Scott McDonald (Petitioner), representing the owners of the property at 253 Anthony Street, has applied for a zoning variation to allow an accessory structure less than ten feet from a principal structure to be set back six feet and nine inches (6'-9") from the interior side property line in lieu of the required seven foot (7'-0") side yard setback. The adjacent lots are zoned CR, R2, and C4.

The applicant has proposed an addition to the rear of the home that would meet all other zoning requirements. However, the proposed addition to the existing residence would be located approximately 6 feet 2 inches (6'-2") from the existing detached garage. This changes the required setback for the detached garage as provided in Section 10-5-4(A)(4) of the Zoning Code. Additionally, Section 10-4-1(I) of the Zoning Code requires that no existing building or structure shall be enlarged, altered, reconstructed, converted, or relocated in such a manner as to conflict or further conflict with the bulk requirements of this title for

the zoning district in which such building or structure is located. The proposal of the rear building addition would present a conflict with the required setbacks for detached accessory structures. The renderings of the addition were shown to Members maintained the dormer look in the home with the addition. The home is a Glen Ellyn local landmark as of 2013, and the HPC is something that they would consider after the request goes through the Zoning Board of Appeals first.

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

1. Section 10-5-4(A)(4)(b) to allow an accessory structure less than ten feet from a principal structure to be setback six feet and nine inches (6'-9") from the interior side property line in lieu of the required seven foot (7'-0") side yard setback.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Map
Building Elevations
Site Plan
Variation Ordinance No. 3847 & Local Landmark Ordinance No. 6183

Member Questions:

Member McKnight asked if a variation was triggered because the home is less than 10 feet away from the garage.

Mr. Harper confirmed that it is correct.

Member Jones asked if a variance would not be needed if they moved the garage or constructed an attached garage.

Mr. Harper stated that they could shift it closer to the home 4 inches, and adding an attached garage would potentially not get through the HPC.

Chairperson Miller stated that this is a unique situation, and they will ask them to make changes because the Historical Society will also be looking at it.

Scott McDonald, the petitioner and architect, stated that the home is a historic building. The proposed addition would be just over 6 feet (6'-0") separated from the garage, and the sightlines coming up the street would show that. If they were to construct the addition with the required separation, it would be visually unappealing and have structural issues. Marrying the two second floors becomes difficult, and the proposed plans right now show the ridge lines marrying. If they step the building back, they will lose height. Parts of the code are meant to be fire-resistant. Since there are no neighbors next to us, they will take additional steps to fireproof the structures.

Jake McLain, the homeowner, moved from central Illinois, and he stated that this home is as historic as what they had previously owned. His family is growing, and it's getting a bit tight. They love the landmark property aspect of it. They are working with their architect to maintain the historical nature of the home, which was built in the 1800's. They want to keep the historic charm of the home, and it is important to them.

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

Deliberation

Member Kelly is a solid yes at this point.

Member Jones noted that they don't have any neighbors to make an impact on and what they are doing is bringing the house to last another 100 years.

Member McKnight is going to vote yes and stated that they can say that there is a unique circumstance here. To preserve historical quality, it is required and is a minimal variation.

Member Buckton will vote yes as well.

Chairperson Miller is a yes also, and there is no house like this in Glen Ellyn with two public spaces on either side of them.

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

Member McKnight recommended an Approval of Variation based on the Findings of Facts, Member Buckton seconded the motion; The motion passed with a vote (5) yes and 0(no)

E. Other Business

None

F. Chairperson's Statement

None

G. Trustee Liaison Report- Robert Duncan

- Summer hours have started
- There is a workshop coming up discussing Strategic Plan

H. Staff Report

Mr. Harper stated the following:

1. Regarding the Zoning Code update, at the Plan Commission meeting in May, the Diagnostic Report was presented as an overview of adopted policy documents and how that works with our Zoning Plan. June through August is the Calibration phase, and September they will provide a public update. In November, there will be a draft ready and there will be a December Open House. In January of 2027, there will be a public hearing, and it will go to the Village Board in February for its final adoption.
 - a. The ZoneCo recommendations are vague currently and staff are looking to square that circle. The next step is working to make it work together.
 - b. Chairperson Miller asked if Zoning Board could have a special workshop to discuss the Board's feelings.
 - c. Mr. Duncan stated that a refreshing alignment is a great idea, and if everyone is on the same page, it will go smoothly.
 - d. They held stakeholder focus groups (Residential Professionals, Residential Interest and Commercial & Business)
2. In July and August, we will be discussing non-conforming structures and single-family residential regulations
3. Dutch Bros will be going to the Plan Commission this month.
4. This summer, there will potentially be an addition to ACE Hardware on Roosevelt Rd.
5. The church to the east of Village Hall is in process of selling the southern annex of building, which will require a Special Use Permit.

Chairperson Miller suggested that the Village could perhaps list on webpage the common things that residents need permits for.

I. Adjournment

Member Joens made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member McKnight seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote at 8:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora



Glen Ellyn Zoning Board
of Appeals
535 Duane Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 7/14/2026 7:00 PM
Department: Community Development
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan
Category: Public Hearing
Prepared By: Jordan Frahm

AGENDA ITEM (ID
2026-520)

DOC ID: 2026-520

Continuation of Public Hearing — 593 Lee Street

Statement of the Issue:

Tim Nelson ("Petitioner"), 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 in lieu of the required 6 feet, 6 inches and requesting a lot coverage ratio of 30.1 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent. The original application has been revised based on comments received at the May 12, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals and is reflected in the update section below.

Analysis:

UPDATE: The applicants have submitted a revised site plan and elevation plan based on the comments received by the Zoning Board of Appeals at its May 12, 2026, meeting. The Petitioners are now requesting a zoning variation to allow a lot coverage ratio of 27.8 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent for a multi-story residence. Previously, the requested variation for lot coverage ratio was 30.1 percent. The proposed addition has been revised so that it eliminates the first floor addition. The petitioner had also previously requested a variation from the required 6 foot, 6-inch side-yard setback as their existing side-yard setback was 4 feet, 4 inches. However, the revised plans indicate that the proposed second story addition would conform to the district minimum setback of 6-feet, 6-inches. The packet and minutes for the May 12 meeting can be viewed [here](#).

In summary, the revised plans reduced the proposed setback from 4 feet, 4 inches to the conforming 6 feet, 6 inches, and reduced the total lot coverage proposed by approximately 148 square feet. Therefore, the petitioner is now requesting approval of a variation from the following sections of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(E) to allow for a lot coverage ratio of 27.8 percent in lieu of the maximum permitted 20 percent.

Village staff has received three pieces of correspondence regarding this request since the May 12 meeting: one letter in support of the requested variation, and two opposed. These are provided as attachments in this report.

Below is the report that was provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals at its May 12, 2026, meeting:

REQUEST: 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.

ZONING/USE: The subject property is zoned R2 Residential District and improved with an existing one-story single-family home.

PUBLIC NOTICE: Notice of the public hearing was published in the April 24, 2026, edition of the Daily Herald, mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property, and a placard was placed on the property. Village staff has received one (1) piece of correspondence opposed to the application. This correspondence can be reviewed in the attachments.

ZONING HISTORY: The property is zoned R2 Residential District and has no previous zoning variations.

PERMIT HISTORY:

Year	Permit No.	Type
1990	B11447	Remodel
1990	B11436	Fence
1990	B11303	Electric Service Upgrade
1952	B3547	New Residence

ANALYSIS:

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 34'-2" and complies with the exemption for vertical additions found in 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 30'-0". The existing side yard setback of 4'-4" is beyond the exemption for vertical additions found in 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 4'-6".

The proposal would also require a variation from the maximum lot coverage ratio of 20 percent. One-story homes in the Village are permitted to have a maximum lot coverage ratio of 35 percent. The existing home has a current lot coverage ratio of 27.5% 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."

Per the Zoning Code, a practical difficulty or particular hardship cannot be self-created. A zoning variation runs with the land indefinitely and should be considered only if the property is unique in its particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions specific to the property involved and would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

Budget Impact:

Contribution to Strategic Plan

Action Requested:

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 findings of fact and determine if 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.

Attachments:

1. 593 Lee Applicant Statement
2. 593 Lee Proposed Site Plan
3. 593 Lee Proposed Elevations
4. 593 Lee Proposed Floor Plan
5. July-593 Lee-Support-Neill
6. July - 593 Lee Street - Opposed - DeDera
7. July-593 Lee Street-Opposed-Wilson&Fraccaro

June 29, 2026

Village of Glen Ellyn

Director of Community Development

535 Duane Street

Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Re: Remodeling of and Addition to 593 Lee Street

To Whom It May Concern:

Following the May 12th, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, we carefully considered the comments and feedback provided by the Board, Village staff, and neighboring property owners. In response, we worked closely with our architect to revise the plans with the goal of reducing the visual impact of the addition while bringing the project into greater conformance with the Village's zoning requirements.

The revised plans include the following significant changes:

- **The proposed front entry addition has been eliminated entirely.** This reduces the overall mass of the project and preserves the existing front appearance of the home. Eliminating the front addition also ensures that the project does not increase the home's existing lot coverage. During the hearing, a neighboring property owner pointed out that a new front entry could be incorporated without constructing an addition. We agreed and have revised the plans accordingly.
- **The second-story addition has been shifted to fully comply with the required side-yard setback.** As a result, the previous side-yard setback variance is no longer requested. The application has been reduced from two requested variances to one.
- **The upper level has been redesigned to reduce its perceived bulk and massing.** The second story has been stepped back to create a more residential appearance and lessen its visual impact on neighboring properties. During the hearing, a neighboring property owner asked for "undulation" and additional architectural variation on the rear of the home to make it more visually appealing. The new rooflines and updated elevations incorporate those recommendations and provide a more visually balanced addition.
- **The overall design has been simplified while maintaining the architectural character of the existing home.** We believe the revised elevations are more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and better address concerns raised during the public hearing.

As a result of these revisions, the only variance remaining is for lot coverage. This request is driven by the unique characteristics of our property rather than an expansion of the building footprint. Our hardship is due to the lot being significantly undersized for

the zoning district. Our lot contains approximately 6,418 square feet, while the minimum lot size in our zoning district is 8,712 square feet, making it approximately 26% smaller than the minimum required lot size. Because of this existing condition, even a modest second-story addition requires a lot coverage variance despite the fact that we are not increasing the home's footprint or lot coverage. Instead, we are building upward within the existing footprint while bringing the project into compliance with all applicable setback requirements.


Lastly, I want to note that we explored a front-loaded second-story addition following the comments made during the hearing by a neighboring property owner. We evaluated that alternative with our architect and discussed it with neighboring property owners. While we appreciated the suggestion, we concluded that relocating the addition toward the front of the home would increase its impact on neighboring properties. A rear-loaded design represents the most balanced solution because it minimizes the overall impact on surrounding properties while best preserving the existing architectural character of the home. We believe the significant neighborhood support (15 letters of support) reflects that a rear-loaded design is what's best for the community.

I'll reiterate from our first applicant statement that our proposed addition will not alter the essential character of the locality, and the granting of the variances will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The new second floor has been intentionally designed at the rear of the existing house in order minimize any impact on neighboring properties. The addition will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent houses, nor will it substantially increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property or neighbors. Furthermore, the addition will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or general welfare of the inhabitants of the village nor increase traffic congestion in the public streets or highways. Finally, the addition will not create a nuisance, result in an increase in public expenditures, or diminish or impair property values in the neighborhood. In fact, it should *increase* property values in the neighborhood.

We appreciate the feedback received throughout this process and believe these revisions reflect a good-faith effort to address the concerns raised while preserving the functionality and long-term viability of our home. We respectfully request the Village's consideration and approval of the remaining variance.

Sincerely,

Kevin McCarthy, 593 Lee St. Glen Ellyn, IL



LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,418 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
ALLOWABLE @ 20%	= 1,283 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,787 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
ALLOWABLE to RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL to RIDGE	= 25'-4"
ALLOWABLE to EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL to EAVE	= 19'-1"
LOT COVERAGE: Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (1,835) - first 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (48)	
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 25092
Drawn By TN

Design: 2/5/26
Client Revisions:
2/10/26 6/11/26
2/24/26 6/15/26
Construction
Revisions:

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
421 James, Geneva, IL 60134
Tel (630) 375-5122 FAX (630) 232-1135
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
THE MCCARTHY RESIDENCE
593 LEE STREET
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- OPTION A


Page
4

Of
9
Pages

Page 14 of 170



PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
OPTION A SCALE: ¼" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED RIGHT ELEVATION
OPTION A SCALE: ¼" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED LEFT ELEVATION
OPTION A SCALE: ¼" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
OPTION A SCALE: ¼" = 1'-0"

Project No. 25092
Drawn By: TN

Design: 2/5/26
Client Revisions: 2/10/26 6/11/26
2/24/26 6/15/26
Construction:
Revisions:


TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
421 James, Geneva, IL 60134
Tel: (630) 367-5122 Fax: (630) 252-1135
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
THE MCCARTHY RESIDENCE
593 LEE STREET
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137


PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
- OPTION A

Page
6

Of
9
Pages



PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN
OPTION A
188 Sq. Ft. SECOND FLOOR ADDITION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
OPTION A
14 Sq. Ft. FIRST FLOOR ADDITION
1514 Sq. Ft. FIRST FLOOR
802 Sq. Ft. TOTAL ADDITION
2,302 Sq. Ft. TOTAL HOUSE
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Project No. 25092
Drawn By TN

Design: 2/5/26
Client Revisions: 2/10/26 6/11/26
2/24/26 6/15/26
Construction
Revisions:

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
421 James, Geneva, IL 60134
Tel (630) 367-5122 Fax (630) 252-1135
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
THE MCCARTHY RESIDENCE
593 LEE STREET
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN - OPTION A & PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN - OPTION A

Page 5
Of 9
Pages

July 1, 2026

To the Members of the Village of Glen Ellyn Zoning Board

Our names are William (Bill) and Donna Neill, and we currently live at 612 Riford Road in Glen Ellyn. We are addressing you to express support for the variance requested by Kevin and Rachel McCarthy at 593 Lee Street.

Let us begin by saying that we understand that being a member of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Board is a volunteer position and consequently we should thank you for serving. We are sure that there some rewards in serving the community, but maybe other moments where you are not sure about your commitment. But thank you.

Secondly, we have lived in Glen Ellyn since buying our first home in 1979 when we had two young daughters and literally no extra money. We have since moved three times, but chose to stay in Glen Ellyn because it has become Home to us...a perfect place to raise our family (now three adult children) and to feel very much a part of this community. For two of our properties, we had to seek variances, and luckily both times we were successful.

Having said that, we remember what it takes to buy and settle in our first home. We were young, and we did not have an extra financial cushion, but we felt quite comfortable in our choice to live here. So this is what bothers us. Even though we are now in our 70's, we remember how nervous we were buying our first home and making it all work. We observe that same intensity in Kevin McCarthy. He has a young family, has chosen to improve a relatively small house and make it a positive part of his neighborhood. As far as we know, it will not add any water or flooding problems, and they are not tearing the house down to build perhaps a larger home. So please do not put so many obstacles in their path. In 2020, we downsized to our present home, which was a 1960's ranch. We remodeled and we

added a second story. No neighbors complained about the “density” issue, or the idea that they would be living with a “dark yard” or looking at a big “wall” outside their windows. Nothing horrible is going to happen if Kevin and Rachel improve their property. They are working hard to keep the neighbors happy, and from what I witnessed at the last zoning meeting, all but two neighbors were in complete support. We should be welcoming this young family and unless there is some unforeseen horrible or dramatic impact from their remodel, let's allow them to move forward with their plans. They seem like decent people.

Yes, we do need zoning rules to prevent outlandish building projects, but this request for a variance is not one of them. Their request is reasonable. The passing of this variance will not bring any severe or unworthy consequences to the neighborhood. Let us hope the tone of the next meeting is positive, and even supportive...help them. Do not force them to give up their plans and start again somewhere else. Let's not be that kind of place...not here!

Respectfully submitted,

Donna and Bill Neill

Daniel Harper

From: Martin DeDera [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2026 1:58 PM
To: Daniel Harper
Subject: 593 Lee Street ZBA Hearing 7/14/2026
Attachments: LCR_Variance_Opposition_Brief_20260714.pdf; 593_Lee_Opposition_20260714.pdf; 593_Lee_Photos_20260714.pdf; 593_Lee_Alternative_Proposals_20260714.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Subject: Written Opposition and Supporting Materials: 593 Lee Street ZBA Hearing (July 14, 2026)

Mr. Harper,

Please find attached our written materials in opposition to the variance request for 593 Lee Street, submitted for inclusion in the July 10 packet ahead of the July 14 hearing:

- Letter in Opposition
- Research Brief: ZBA Variance Record and Variation Criteria Analysis
- Alternative 1st Floor Addition Proposals
- Photos from Adjacent Property (735 Crescent Blvd)

Please confirm receipt and that these will be included in the packet.

Thanks,

Marty Deder

735 Crescent Blvd, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Letter in Opposition

593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn — Zoning Variation Request

Submitted by: Dana Logalbo and Marty Dederer, 735 Crescent Blvd, Glen Ellyn, IL

Hearing Date: July 14, 2026

We are neighbors of 593 Lee Street and submitted written opposition and testified at the May 12, 2026 hearing. The applicants have revised their plans in one respect: the second story was pulled back to clear the 4'6" setback threshold, removing the technical requirement for a side yard variance. The design is otherwise unchanged — a large footprint on a small lot, same rear-loaded placement of the second story that maximizes impact on neighbors. The lot coverage variance remains: this application requests approval at 28%¹² lot coverage. The direct impact on our property remains. None of the concerns we raised in May were addressed. We oppose this application for the same reasons we did in May.

I. Approving This Would Set a Significant Precedent

The applicant has reduced the requested lot coverage from 30.1% to 28%. That reduction does not change the analysis. 28% has never been approved for a second-story addition by this board, and it would still be the highest by a significant margin.

This application seeks approval for a second-story addition at 28% lot coverage on a 6,419 sq ft lot. That combination, the highest coverage figure and the smallest lot to come before this board, has never been requested, let alone approved. Every comparable case in the public record dating back to 2018 involved a substantially larger lot: 103 Grove (24.77% coverage, lot 31–42% larger), 240 Glenwood (27.2%, lot 46% larger, elevated deck/carport), 654 Essex (25%, lot 58% larger), 807 Hill (22%, lot 37% larger), 569 Prairie (23.94%, lot 29% larger), and 73 Newton (27.7%, lot 15% larger, porch addition). Even 654 Essex, the highest-coverage second-story addition on record, involved lower coverage on a significantly larger lot (10,137 sq ft, 58% larger than 593 Lee). It is not a true precedent for what is being requested here.

Approving this would signal to every property in Glen Ellyn that the 20% two-story standard is negotiable, not just for small lots, but for any property that can articulate some hardship at a comparable coverage level. There are 1,391 residential parcels in Glen Ellyn at or below this lot's size³. If lot size and coverage alone justify a variance here, the same argument is available to all of them. A variance runs with the land indefinitely.

¹The May 12, 2026 ZBA staff report cites current lot coverage as 27.5%. Based on the plat of survey and original architect plans for the subject property, we calculate lot coverage at 27.8%. At the same meeting, Planning Manager Daniel Harper stated that in cases of discrepancy between county GIS data and professional survey data, the Village defers to professional surveyors. See May 12, 2026 ZBA Draft Minutes.

²Proposed lot coverage calculated based on revised plans informally shared by the applicant: 1,787 sq ft existing footprint + 14 sq ft addition = 1,801 sq ft total, on a recorded lot of 6,419 sq ft (1,801 / 6,419 = 28.05%). This figure has not been confirmed by the Village. The official lot coverage calculation will be reflected in the Village's staff report when published.

³See Appendix A.

When the cases are separated by type, the picture is clear. Every second-story addition variance since 2018 was at 25% coverage or less: 654 Essex at 25%, 103 Grove at 24.77%, 569 Prairie at 23.94%, and 807 Hill at 22%. The two highest-coverage cases in the entire dataset were both non-second-story structures: 73 Newton at 27.7% was a porch addition, and 240 Glenwood at 27.2% (April 2023) was an elevated deck and partial carport. No second-story addition at coverage above 25% has ever been approved. This application, at 28%, would be the first, exceeding the coverage level of both prior high-coverage cases, neither of which involved a second story.

We have also submitted a supplemental research brief documenting the full 11-year variance record and the application of the variation criteria.

II. The Applicants Have Other Options

Going up is not the only path to a larger home. At 27.8% lot coverage, this home is fully code-compliant as a single-story structure. Together, two options available to the applicants today, without any variance, would deliver more space and more bedrooms for a growing family:

First, a single-story addition filling in the open corner between the existing wing wall and the garage adds approximately 231 sq ft — enough to accommodate a range of configurations including the front entrance vestibule the applicants want, additional bedrooms, a bathroom, office space, or combinations of those. The alternative design proposal we have submitted documents several of these layouts. Because this addition is at the front of the house toward Lee Street, it would have some impact on 589 Lee Street, but less than the currently proposed second-story addition does, which sits closer to 589 Lee than this option would. The impact is reduced further by the fact that 589 Lee sits further back from the street than 593 Lee does. It would have no meaningful impact on our property or the neighboring property on Crescent.

Second, basement expansion, improving the existing basement and extending it under a new single-story addition, with egress windows added throughout, adds a bedroom, improves the existing family room, and adds storage and flex space. This option also has zero impact on neighboring properties, including ours.

We have prepared and submitted a detailed alternative design proposal, “593 Lee Street: Alternative 1st Floor Addition Proposal,” documenting both options with layouts, a full zoning compliance analysis, and precedent support, based on Marty’s professional assessment as a general contractor. It is included with this submission.

The applicants have indicated to us directly that a second-story addition is the only option they are willing to pursue. They are choosing the option with the greatest negative impact on neighboring properties while compliant alternatives go unexplored.

III. This Directly Impacts Our Property

The applicants have made only minimal revisions. The impact on our property is unchanged. The second-story addition now clears the 4’6” setback threshold to remove the side yard variance. The addition still sits in the same place on the lot and is barely smaller. The specific concerns raised in

May remain: damage to mature oak trees and shared trees along the boundary, the tall freestanding chimney, drainage impacts, and the loss of light and privacy to adjacent properties.

A rear-loaded second story at 593 Lee would be immediately impactful to our property from both our yard and our home. We raised this at the May 12 hearing: our house sits approximately 46 feet from 593 Lee, measured house to house. In a standard layout, rear yards provide roughly 40 feet of setback on each side, placing homes on parallel streets 80 or more feet apart. Here, because our home faces Crescent and 593 Lee faces Lee Street, our rear yard faces their side yard with no equivalent buffer. In the yard, our patio and the space we use most will be approximately 10 to 15 feet from the addition, a two-story wall at that distance replacing open sky and tree canopy with something significantly taller than what is there today. Inside the house, the impact affects both floors: where we currently look out at trees, we would instead be looking directly at the addition, and at that height and proximity it will block light into our first-floor living spaces in a way the current single-story structure does not. The applicant heard this at the hearing. This revision does not change it.

This impact is also a function of where on the lot the applicants have chosen to place the addition. A second story at the rear sits closer to adjacent properties, with greater impact on their light, air, and sightlines, than it would anywhere else on the lot. Prior applicants, including at 654 Essex, have demonstrated how design choices can reduce this kind of impact. The applicant at 593 Lee Street has not engaged with that question, and cannot claim it is new. It was raised at the May 12 hearing and in multiple written opposition letters. The placement at the rear is a choice, not a constraint.

We are the first house in on Crescent from the corner, 593 Lee sits directly behind our rear yard and 599 Lee is on the adjacent corner. Both are already close. We accepted those conditions when we bought our home. That acceptance was not a concession that things could be made materially worse.

We bought this house in part for the light, the privacy, the view, and the yard itself. This isn't just about our use and enjoyment of our property. A second story at this scale would also negatively affect our property value and the investment we've made in our home. We do not have an alternative to the impact this addition would create.

IV. This Also Fails the Hardship Standard

This application also fails the hardship standard, for the same reasons set out in our prior submission. The lot condition is not unique: 1,391 residential parcels in Glen Ellyn, 10.3% of the residential base, are at or below this lot's size, and the Village's own guidelines direct that a condition shared across many properties should be addressed through a zoning amendment, not a variance. The guidelines are also explicit that hardship "refers to the land and not to the personal circumstances of the applicant or owner." Two of the three examples the guidelines give of requests that do not constitute hardship apply directly here:

"Request to expand beyond conditions created by a previous owner."

"Request to accommodate the size of one's family or personal health issues."

Both apply. The large single-story footprint was inherited at purchase. The desire to add space

for a growing family is understandable, but the guidelines are explicit that personal circumstances are not the standard Glen Ellyn applies. The existing 27.8% coverage does not create a hardship, because it does not prevent reasonable use of the property. As described above, the applicants have options for additional space that require no variance at all. The need for a variance here flows from their choice to build a second story, not from any condition of the land.

The guidelines require that hardship be unique and ‘not generally applicable to other property within the same zoning district.’ The 20% two-story limit applies uniformly across the district; every property over that threshold faces the same constraint. That is not a unique hardship, it is the intended effect of the standard. If existing lot coverage above the two-story maximum were sufficient to justify a variance, the standard would be unenforceable for any property in Glen Ellyn already over that threshold.

Conclusion

What’s being requested here is a preferred form of expansion, one with no true comparable in this board’s recent history, would set significant precedent for Glen Ellyn, and comes at a direct cost to adjacent neighbors with no alternative to the impact.

Glen Ellyn’s zoning standards exist for a reason. When neighbors buy property here, they do so with reasonable reliance on what those standards allow and prohibit. That reliance is not abstract: it shapes decisions about where to buy, what to invest, and what to expect from the neighborhood around you. Approving a variance over 8 percentage points above the two-story lot coverage limit, on the smallest lot to request a second story, with documented negative impact on adjacent property, directly changes what existing property owners in Glen Ellyn can count on.

The applicant has a proper channel available for what they are seeking: a petition to the village to amend the zoning code. The Village’s own variation guidelines state that where a request is not unique or changes the essential character of the area, “the petitioner should seek an amendment to the zoning code that would then apply throughout the district, rather than a variation.” That process exists precisely for situations where an applicant believes the standard itself is wrong. They have not pursued it. Instead they are asking this board to grant the equivalent outcome through a variance, without the process, the scrutiny, or the broader community input that a code amendment would require.

Compliant options exist. The applicants have declined to pursue them. We respectfully ask the board to recommend denial.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Logalbo and Marty Dederer, 735 Crescent Blvd, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Appendix

A. Parcel Search Methodology — Comparable Lot Count

Source: DuPage County GIS Parcel Viewer (gis.dupageco.org), Cadastral Real Estate layer, ZIP 60137 (Glen Ellyn). Total parcels in 60137: 14,704. Residential parcels (acreage ≥ 0.03 acres): 13,530.

Search performed: all residential parcels with acreage ≤ 0.16 acres. Filters applied: ZIP code = 60137; Property Class = R (Residential), excluding commercial, exempt/institutional, industrial, and farm classifications; acreage between 0.03 and 0.16 acres (the lower bound removes slivers and condo/townhome unit parcels that are not standalone single-family lots).

Result: 1,391 parcels, or 10.3% of residential parcels in 60137.

The 0.16-acre ceiling was set as a round number just above the subject property's lot size. 593 Lee St has a recorded lot size of approximately 6,419 sq ft (0.147 acres).

B. Architectural Inconsistencies in the Applicant's Submitted Plans

The applicant's original plans contain internal inconsistencies that were not caught by the reviewing architect or the village planners. The revised plans introduce their own. These details matter because any meaningful analysis of this variance, by the village, the board, or neighbors, depends on the accuracy of the submitted materials.

First, the original proposed first floor plan labels the first floor addition as "81 Sq. Ft." The actual dimensions of the new construction visible on the same plan, including the mud room and the covered entry, total approximately 137.75 sq ft. The mud room does not appear in the labeled square footage addition count at all. The covered entry, labeled "Covered Entry" on the plan, appears to account for the 81 sq ft figure, while the mud room is omitted. The effect is that the plan presents the addition as a modest 81 sq ft when the actual new construction is closer to 140 sq ft.

Second, the revised plans claim a 14 sq ft first floor addition but provide no dimensions from which that figure can be verified. Without dimensions, there is no basis to confirm the stated square footage is accurate, and no way to identify if the actual construction differs from what was submitted.

Third, both the original and revised plans show steps at the rear of the house off the family room. Steps of this kind may not be required to be included in lot coverage calculations, but it is impossible to tell from the submitted plans whether they are or not. No dimensions are provided for this element in either submission. The steps appear on the drawings in the same way as the front addition claimed at 14 sq ft: present, but unverifiable.

Taken together, the absence of dimensions on these elements means approval is open-ended. The board is not approving a specific 14 sq ft addition or steps of a known size. There is nothing in the submitted plans locking down what actually gets built. If the addition ends up larger, or the steps include a landing that adds meaningful coverage, there is nothing in the record to measure against after the fact.

Opposition to Lot Coverage Ratio Variance

593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn, IL

BLUF

Approving this request would set two unprecedented records simultaneously: the smallest lot ever granted an LCR variance, and the highest LCR ever approved for a second-story addition, in 11 years of records. Neither precedent is supported by any prior case, and granting both at once would extend a basis for relief to roughly 1,391 similarly sized lots across the Village. The applicant has other options, including a single-story addition requiring no LCR variance.

The Request

The applicant seeks a lot coverage ratio (LCR) variance under §10-4-8(E)(1) to allow a second-story addition that would leave the property at **28.05% LCR**, 8 percentage points above the 20% maximum for multi-story structures under §10-10-12.

Subject property: 27.8% existing LCR · 28.05% proposed LCR · 1,787 sq ft existing footprint · 1,801 sq ft proposed footprint · 6,419 sq ft lot

***A note on the LCR figures:** At the May 12, 2026 hearing, Village staff listed the existing LCR at 27.5% (based on a 6,418 sq ft lot figure). The plat of survey and architect's drawings put the existing LCR at 27.8% (1,787 sq ft / 6,419 sq ft). The proposed LCR of 28.05% is derived from informally shared final plans showing a total footprint of 1,801 sq ft (1,787 sq ft existing + 14 sq ft new ground-floor coverage). Either way (27.5%, 27.8%, or 28.05%), the proposed LCR exceeds the highest LCR ever approved for a second-story addition in the 11-year record (25%, 654 Essex Road).*

Two Threshold Facts the Record Establishes

1. The request is 8 percentage points above the legal multi-story limit, and 3 points higher than any second-story addition approved in 11 years.

The 20% multi-story LCR maximum is the legal requirement under §10-10-12. At 28.05%, the request is **8 percentage points above that limit**. Separately, across 11 years of records, no second-story addition has been approved above **25% LCR** — 654 Essex Road, February 2025, on a 10,137 sq ft lot (58% larger than the subject property). The remaining confirmed two-story addition approvals are lower still:

Address	LCR	Lot Size
654 Essex Rd	25%	10,137 sq ft
417 Dawn Ave	23.5%	~7,500–9,700 sq ft
727 N. Park Blvd	~23.2%	8,000 sq ft
228 Grandview Ave	23%	7,418 sq ft
Subject Property (requested)	28.05%	6,419 sq ft

The request, at 28.05%, is **3 points above the highest LCR approved for any second-story addition in 11 years**, on the smallest lot in the dataset. Two other cases in the 24–25% range also don't support this request: **103 Grove** (split-level home, sunroom replacing a deck; same footprint, health hardship from adjacent DuPage River floodplain); **612 Riford** (second floor already added under permit in 2019, current request was a sunroom replacing an existing deck; no new impervious surface, irregular lot). Neither involved adding a brand-new second story to a one-story home.

2. No lot this small has received an LCR variance in 11 years of records.

The 11-year dataset covers every lot coverage variance in Glen Ellyn from 2015 through 2026. For every case where lot size is confirmed, the lot is larger than 6,419 sq ft.

Address	LCR	Improvement	Lot Size	vs. 6,419 sq ft
Subject Property	28.05%	Second-story addition	6,419 sq ft	—
73 Newton Ave	27.7%	Porch (outdoor)	7,405 sq ft	+15%
240 Glenwood Ave	27.2%	Elevated deck + carport (outdoor)	~9,400 sq ft	~+46%
654 Essex Rd	25%	Two-story addition	10,137 sq ft	+58%
103 Grove Ave	24.77%	Sunroom on split-level (two-story)	~8,400–9,100 sq ft	+31–42%
734 Highland Ave	24.1%	Detached garage expansion	7,500 sq ft	+17%
569 Prairie Ave	23.94%	Addition on existing 2-story	8,276 sq ft	+29%
660 N. Main St	23.69%	Garage and home addition	8,455 sq ft	+32%
727 N. Park Blvd	~23.2%	Addition to existing 2-story	8,000 sq ft	+25%
228 Grandview Ave	23%	Two-story addition	7,418 sq ft	+15%
807 Hill Ave	22%	Rear addition	8,830 sq ft	+37%

The smallest lot to receive an LCR variance for any structural addition is 228 Grandview (7,418 sq ft) at 23%, approved on a lot 15% larger than this one. The smallest lot to receive any LCR variance is 73 Newton (7,405 sq ft) at 27.7%, still 15% larger than the subject property's 6,419 sq ft, for a porch addition to an already two-story home where the 20% multi-story limit was already in effect independent of the porch, and was continued by the ZBA before the Village Board approved 4-2.

The subject property is the smallest lot in the 11-year high-LCR dataset. No comparable exists.

That gap reflects the variance record, not anything unusual about the lot itself. The subject property's 6,419 sq ft (0.147 acres) is a common lot size in Glen Ellyn: roughly 1,391 of the Village's 13,530 residential parcels (10.3%) are 0.16 acres or smaller, and 499 fall within 10% of this lot's exact size. None of those similarly sized lots has received an LCR variance of this kind before. This would be the first.

Each of these facts is independently without precedent: no second-story addition has received an LCR this high, and no lot this small has received an LCR variance. Together, the combination has no precedent in the record either.

The Closest Comparable Raised at the Hearing Does Not Support the Request

At the May 12, 2026 hearing on this property, Village Planner Harper raised 654 Essex Road as the closest comparable precedent for a two-story addition requiring an LCR variance. That case was approved at 25%

on a 10,137 sq ft lot, 58% larger than the subject property, and still 3 points below the requested 28.05%. Even that approval was narrow: the ZBA voted 4-2, with two dissenting members explicitly characterizing the coverage as "extreme" and "too much for the property." The majority approved only because 654 Essex had three compounding physical factors absent here: an irregular lot with substandard width (63.5' vs. 66' required), a 5-foot grade change from back to front, and a 1954 mid-century home predating all zoning codes whose architecture required second-story height to preserve. None of those factors are present at 593 Lee. Even the closest comparable identified at the hearing falls short of supporting this request.

Summary

Approving this request would set two new precedents at once: the smallest lot ever to receive an LCR variance, and the highest LCR ever approved for a second-story addition. Neither precedent is supported anywhere in 11 years of records. There is no physical hardship here; the lot is a standard size for Glen Ellyn, as documented above, the existing condition was acquired at purchase, and the expansion beyond it is elective. Other options remain available to the applicant, including a single-story addition that would require no LCR variance at all. The official guidelines state that variations "are meant to be used sparingly." This request is the opposite of spare.

The appropriate question from the guidelines: Is the property owner deprived of rights, or deprived of desires?

593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn — Alternative 1st Floor Addition Proposal (Zoning Summary)

Proposed Scope

A approximately 231 sq ft addition at the SW corner of the existing structure, filling in the open area between the wing wall and garage to square off the building footprint. The addition remains single story, consistent with the existing structure and with what is typical for smaller lots in the neighborhood. It adds usable square footage, creates a desired front entry, and opens up several options for reconfiguring the first floor and basement. The project keeps the building well within the 35% lot coverage limit and makes no changes to any other setback.

Lot Coverage

The existing building footprint is 1,787 sq ft on a 6,419 sq ft lot (27.8% coverage). The proposed addition of ~231 sq ft brings the total to approximately 2,018 sq ft, or **31.4% lot coverage** — within the R-2 zoning maximum of 35%.

Front Setback

The addition fills in the corner between the wing wall and the garage, extending toward Lee Street only to the line of the existing wing wall. Since it does not project beyond the wing wall, it remains within the existing building envelope and does not create or worsen any front setback issue. The existing building's nearest point to Lee Street is 30.59', clearing the 30' minimum by 0.59'.

Side Setback — LOT 80 (589 Lee Street) (SW Side)

The existing building is approximately 5.46' from the LOT 80 (589 Lee Street) property line on the SW side, as shown on the plat of survey. If treated as new construction, Glen Ellyn would require the 6'6" (6.5') side yard setback, which the addition falls short of by approximately 1 foot. However, there are three paths forward, any one of which resolves this:

Option 1 — No variance needed (4'6" standard applies). The addition closes in the open corner between the house, the garage, and the wing wall. It is the existing house wall that sits at approximately 5.46' from the LOT 80 (589 Lee Street) line — the addition simply extends that existing wall line to square off the corner. There is a reasonable argument that this constitutes an extension of an existing nonconforming structure rather than new construction, in which case the 4'6" standard applies and the 5.46' setback is fully compliant. (See Precedent Support below for a directly comparable approved case.) This position is further supported by the original plans reviewed by Village staff and submitted for the ZBA May 12 hearing, which included a ~140 sq ft covered entry filling in the same SW corner without triggering a side-yard variance requirement — consistent with treatment as an extension of the existing wall line rather than new construction.

Option 2 — No variance needed (reduced footprint). A modest reduction in the addition's footprint — to approximately 200 sq ft — could pull the SW face back to the 6'6" setback line, eliminating any variance requirement while preserving most of the program.

Option 3 — Minor variance. If the Village treats this as new construction requiring the full 6'6" setback, the variance needed is approximately 1 foot. The home on 589 Lee Street is set back from the street with no structure near this boundary, so the encroachment causes no practical impact. Neighbor consent from 589 Lee Street should be confirmed prior to the variance application.

Precedent Support

A review of the Village's ZBA/Village Board record (covering roughly the last 11 years) supports each of the paths above:

- **168 Crest Road (2021)** is a near-identical case under the same code section (§10-4-8(D)(3)): a house not centered on its lot, where an addition encroaches into the side yard regardless of size, and no LCR variance was needed. There, the ZBA accepted **4'6"** as the operating side-yard standard — more permissive than 593 Lee's existing 5.46' — and the request was approved 7-0 by the ZBA and 6-0 by the Village Board. This directly supports Option 1: treating the addition as an extension of the existing nonconforming wall line, with no new variance required.
- **If treated as new construction (Option 3)**, the ~1' shortfall (5.46' vs. the 6.5' standard) is smaller than every comparable approved side-yard setback variance in the record, including 168 Crest Road (2'), 301 Abbotsford (5' / 22'), 491 Ridgewood (3.2'), 200 Hill (4.5'), 494 Carleton (2'), 180 N. Park (5.5'), and 864 Bemis and 265 S. Ott (8'–10'). All of these were approved, several unanimously.
- The fact that **no LCR variance is needed** here (31.4% vs. the 35% maximum) removes what is often the main complicating factor in these cases — most of the precedent variances above involved an LCR component as well.



Note: these cases were drawn from the Glen Ellyn ZBA and Village Board records.

Summary

Requirement	Standard	Proposed	Status
Lot Coverage	35% max	31.4%	✓ Compliant
Front Setback	30' min	No change	✓ Compliant
NW Side Setback	6.5' min	No change (~17.9')	✓ Compliant
SW Side Setback (589 Lee Street)	6.5' (new construction) OR nothing if 4'6" applies	~5.46'	✓ Compliant if 4'6" standard; ⚠ ~1' variance if new construction standard
Rear Setback	40' min	No change (39.4')	Pre-existing nonconformity, not worsened

First Floor Addition — Option 1

Adds a desired entry and mudroom, bedroom, and office space without reconfiguring much of the rest of the house. Laundry is relocated to the first floor and adds a kitchen pantry. Provides 3 bedrooms + office. Also improves the master closets. Optionally access from the garage could be added to the mudroom.



LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	+ 6,428 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
A. ALLOWABLE F. # 35%	+ 2,246 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	+ 1,161 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
A. ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	+ 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	+ 11'-2"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	+ 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	+ 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (2,500) - First 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (60)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 2020-01

Client No. 01

Design 10/08

Client Name 2/1/20

Construction

Residence

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.

Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling

2210 Lee Street, Suite 100

Lee, Minnesota 55041

763.437.1111

tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:

RESCUE RESIDENCE

2210 LEE STREET



LEE, MINN. 55041

EXISTING SITE PLAN & EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Page 1 of 4

First Floor Addition — Option 2

This is a more substantial renovation that shifts the living space towards the front and reconfigures much of the remainder of the home. It ensures bedrooms are located in the back if that is preferred. Improves the master bedroom, bathroom and closets. Moves the laundry to the first floor and adds a kitchen pantry. Provides 3 bedrooms + office and a large great room/living space.





Laundr

LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,418 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
A. ALLOWABLE % 35%	= 2,246 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,161 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
A. ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	= 17'-2"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	= 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (2,500) - First 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (60)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 202001	
Owner Mr. J. B.	
Design: 1/1/20	
Client Name: 2/1/20	
Construction:	
Residence:	
TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD. Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling 4311 Sunset Court, Suite 100 San Jose, CA 95128 Tel: 408.261.1111 tim@timnelsonarchitect.com	
ADDITION & REMODELING FOR: "EYE-CATCHER" RESIDENCE 293 LEE STREET GLENVIEW, ILLINOIS 60037	
EXISTING SITE PLAN & EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN	
Page 1	of 4

First Floor Addition — Option 3

Relocates the kitchen, adds a desired front entry and mudroom, pantry, and half bath, while moving the garage entry into the mudroom. Laundry is relocated to the first floor. Provides 4 total bedrooms or 3 bedrooms + office, and 2.5 total bathrooms. Improves the master his/hers closets.



Laundr

LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,428 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
ALLOWABLE	= 22.46 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,181 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	= 17'-0"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	= 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint, 4 roofed over structures (2 BDR) - first 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (0)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof

Project No. **2020**
Drawn By: **RL**

Design: **5/1/20**
Client Name: **2/1/20**

Construction:
Revisions:

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
24 James Street, E. Suite 200
Toronto, Ontario M5E 1B5
416-593-9999
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
TIM MCCASTY'S RESIDENCE
593 LEE STREET
GLENEVILLE, ILLINOIS 60037



EXISTING SITE PLAN & EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Page **1** of **4**

Image

First Floor Addition — Option 4

A more substantial alternative that adds bedrooms, relocates the kitchen, adds a desired front entry and mudroom, pantry, and half bath, and moves the garage entry into the mudroom. Moves the laundry to the main floor. This option adds a family room while maintaining 4 total bedrooms or 3 bedrooms + office, and 2.5 total bathrooms. Improves the master his/hers closets.



LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,418 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
A. ALLOWABLE % 35%	= 2,246 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,161 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
A. ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	= 17'-2"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	= 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (2,557) - First 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (67)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 2020-01
Owner Mr. & Mrs. J.B.
Design: 1/1/20
Client Reference: 2/1/20
Construction:
Revisions:

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
2311 Sunset Drive, Suite 100
San Jose, CA 95128
Tel: 408.261.1111
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com



ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
"EQUESTRIAN" RESIDENCE
2935 LEE STREET
GLENVIEW, ILLINOIS 60037

EXISTING SITE PLAN & EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Page 1 of 4
14 pages

First Floor Addition — Option 5

This alternative relocates the kitchen, adds a desired front entry and mudroom, pantry, and half bath, and moves the garage entry into the mudroom. Moves the laundry to the main floor. This option adds a desired family room while maintaining 3 total bedrooms, and 2.5 total bathrooms. Improves the master his/hers closets.



LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,418 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
A. ALLOWABLE % 35%	= 2,246 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,161 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
A. ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	= 17'-2"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	= 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (2,500) - First 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (60)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 2020-01
Owner Mr. & Mrs. J.B.
Design 1/10/20
Client Meeting 2/10/20
Construction
Revisions

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
2310 Lee Street, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063
Tel: 816.221.1111
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com



ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
"EYECATCHER" RESIDENCE
293 LEE STREET
LEE'S SUMMIT, MO 64063

EXISTING SITE PLAN & EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Page 1 of 4
1 4
1 page

First Floor Addition — Option 6: Blank Slate

Rather than choosing a preset layout, the entire first floor — the existing footprint plus the proposed addition (shaded gray below) — can be redesigned and laid out however works best: kitchen, bedrooms, entry, laundry, pantry, or another arrangement entirely, without the constraints assumed in the options above. All spaces within the shaded area would be reconfigured. The existing 1-car garage (unshaded) is shown for reference and would remain unchanged.



LOT REQUIREMENTS - R-2 ZONE	
AREA OF LOT:	= 6,428 Sq. Ft.
LOT COVERAGE:	
ALLOWABLE = 35%	= 2,246 Sq. Ft.
ACTUAL	= 1,781 Sq. Ft.
HEIGHT:	
ALLOWABLE TO RIDGE	= 32'-0"
ACTUAL TO RIDGE	= 17'-2"
ALLOWABLE TO EAVE	= 22'-0"
ACTUAL TO EAVE	= 9'-10"
LOT COVERAGE:	Includes only the building footprint & roofed over structures (2,500) - First 140 sq. ft. of open front porch (0)
HEIGHT:	Measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof.

Project No. 2020-01
Owner By JH
Design JH/CR
Client Reference 2/2/20
Construction
Revisions

TIM NELSON ARCHITECT, LTD.
Custom Homes • Additions • Remodeling
222 Jarvis Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5R 3A8
416-593-9100
tim@timnelsonarchitect.com

ADDITION & REMODELING FOR:
"EYECART" RESIDENCE
503 LEE STREET
GLENNVIEW, IL 60041

EXISTING SITE PLAN
& EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Page 1 of 4

01
1.000

593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn

Basement Layout Options


Schematic options for finishing the basement beneath the existing house and proposed addition. Each option uses the same overall footprint (1,510 sq ft). Options A–C divide it differently between bedrooms, family/media space, full bath, and mechanical/storage; Option D leaves it as an open footprint to be laid out however works best.

Option A — Bedrooms Front and Rear + Full Bath

Option B — Open Entertainment + Full Bath

Option C — Bedroom at Entry

Option D — Blank Slate




Option A — Bedrooms Front and Rear + Full Bath

Bedroom (or office) in the addition with two egress windows. Family room takes most of the main body. Second bedroom and full bathroom at the rear. Mechanical/ storage remains at the rear.

Bedroom 1	210 sq ft
Family room	832 sq ft
Bedroom 2	216 sq ft
Full bath	112 sq ft
Mechanical / storage	140 sq ft
Total	1,510 sq ft

Schematic only. Stairs not shown — existing location is fixed and will need to be carved out of whichever layout is chosen. Window marks shown along the front, rear, and both long (left and right) walls.

▲ front / Lee St



▼ rear

10 ft


Option B — Open Entertainment + Full Bath

Bedroom (or office) in the addition. Large open family/media room spanning most of the main body. Full bathroom and mechanical/storage in the rear.

Bedroom	210 sq ft
Family / media room	988 sq ft
Full bath	96 sq ft
Mechanical / storage	216 sq ft
Total	1,510 sq ft

Schematic only. Stairs not shown — existing location is fixed and will need to be carved out of whichever layout is chosen. Window marks shown along the front, rear, and both long (left and right) walls.

▲ front / Lee St



▼ rear

10 ft


Option C — Bedroom at Entry

Bedroom (or office) in the addition. Family room takes the rest of the main body, with a larger mechanical/storage along the rear.

Bedroom	210 sq ft
Family room	832 sq ft
Mechanical / storage	468 sq ft
Total	1,510 sq ft

Schematic only. Stairs not shown — existing location is fixed and will need to be carved out of whichever layout is chosen. Window marks shown along the front, rear, and both long (left and right) walls.

▲ front / Lee St



▼ rear

10 ft

Option D — Blank Slate

Rather than choosing a preset layout, the entire interior of the basement can be redesigned and laid out however works best — bedrooms, family space, mechanical/storage, or another arrangement entirely — within this open footprint.

Open / unallocated	1,510 sq ft
Total	1,510 sq ft

Schematic only. Stairs not shown — existing location is fixed and will need to be carved out of whichever layout is chosen. Window marks shown along the front, rear, and both long (left and right) walls.





















Brandi Wilson & Kyle Fraccaro

737 Crescent Blvd.

Glen Ellyn, IL 60137



7/6/26

Subject: **Objection Letter #3** to home addition at 593 Lee Street / Zoning Variation

Dear Mr. Harper,

I am writing this letter in response to the proposed public hearing for 593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn, IL. I write this correspondence being a registered architect with over 25 years' experience and our home shares a fence line to the applicant's Northeast property line which is 49.39' in width.

After the hearing on May 12th, I sat down with the applicant to express my concerns about his proposed addition. He seemed receptive to the feedback. However, upon reviewing his updated design I realized the points discussed during the hearing and after were sadly ignored. I request the board reject this addition based on the following points:

- The lot is undersized and does not support this addition. Section 10-4-8(E)(1) of the Glen Ellyn Code rightfully addresses this.
- The updated design is a regurgitation of the original nonconforming proposed design, which does not address any of the main concerns I reviewed with the applicant.
- The proposed second story addition as proposed directly impacts our backyard's privacy and light. This will *lower* our property value. {Reference Objection letter #2 sketches}
- Historically approved lot coverage percentage data does not favorably support the applicant's case. We should applaud previous board members for their insight to prevent such density from occurring. Only one example (654 Essex Road @ 25% lot coverage has been approved). A 28% lot coverage far exceeds what is permissible in an R-2 residential district for a two-story home. **I ask again - is the Zoning Boards**

of Appeals prepared to allow this precedent for all existing ranch homes in Glen Ellyn? This would significantly alter the scale of homes in our community. Density would be greatly impacted. As I mentioned during the last hearing, most of us leave the city – craving more privacy. The applicant’s proposed design disregards this.

- I have since visited our neighbor’s home that reside at 735 Crescent Blvd (Dana Logalbo and Marty Dederer). Views from both their family room and primary bedroom would be significantly compromised by the applicant’s proposed addition - in fact, that is all they would have a view of. If the applicant had truly set out to work alongside his neighbors to design an addition with minimal impact, he would know this. However, he chose not to perform the most basic due diligence and consider negative contextual implications on his neighbors. I refer to this as ‘arrogant design’.
- Ignoring zoning regulations for economic purposes is not a responsible design approach.
- I offer no other potential design solutions for this site. The site dictates the home remain a one-story structure. Neighborhoods should consist of a variety of scaled homes to accommodate all life phases; not morph into something the site can’t support.
- All of us purchased our homes (and paid a premium) accepting and acknowledging the existing context, lot size and square footage with some consideration and insight of our future needs. If a neighbor outgrows their home, it should not be a burden on the rest of the neighbors to accommodate them. There are plenty of larger homes for sale.

I am attaching my two previous objection letters as reference.

Respectfully,

Brandi Wilson, Architect - [ARC.0714487](#)

Brandi Wilson & Kyle Fraccaro

737 Crescent Blvd.

Glen Ellyn, IL 60137



5/12/26

Subject: **Objection Letter #2** to home addition at 593 Lee Street / Zoning Variations

Dear Mr. Harper,

I am writing this letter in response to the proposed public hearing for 593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn, IL. I write this correspondence being a registered architect with over 25 years' experience and our home shares a fence line to the applicant's Northeast property line which is 49.39' in width per the drawings dated 2/5/26 provided by Tim Nelson Architect, LTD.


After reviewing the documents that were posted to the city's portal on Friday, I'd like to provide some additional comments and questions for the board for consideration.

Including:

- How many second-story additions exceeding a 30% lot coverage exist in the R-2 residential district? Is the Zoning Boards of Appeals prepared to allow this precedent for all existing ranch homes in Glen Ellyn? This would significantly alter the quaintness and scale of homes in our community. Density would be greatly affected.
- Daniel Harper provided all recent approved zoning cases pertaining to second-story additions requesting variances. In none of the examples provided does an applicant ask for such drastic nonconforming construction as it pertains to multiple setback violations and exceeding lot coverage. Only one example proposes violations for both, and that example only requested a lot coverage increase of a mere 23%.
- Ignoring zoning regulations for economic purposes is not a responsible design approach. There are multiple more compliant and viable design options.
- The applicant states that by positioning the proposed second-story addition at the back of the property would minimize negative impact to surrounding properties. This statement is not factual, and I am providing sketches to illustrate this point. The proposed design deliberately infringes on three setbacks. Front loading the design to the street is a better


solution as it provides consistency in the streetscape and provides uniformity. No one lives in the street; thus, no privacy or light is disrupted and/or contested.

- I offer another potential second-floor design solution below. No set-back variance required. Diagrams are included on the following page to depict how a more thoughtful and centralized design solution would benefit all surrounding properties. While providing more sunlight to penetrate all yards, including the applicants.




Respectfully,

Brandi Wilson, Architect - [ARC.0714487](#)



Light and exterior yard privacy are impacted at three property locations.

Proposed second story addition location relative to existing context.



More light will penetrate the applicant's backyard.

Proposed second story addition in this example does not impact exterior privacy at any adjacent property location, nor does it impact setbacks.

Recommended second story addition relative to existing site context.



Current backyard view



View with addition

Brandi Wilson & Kyle Fraccaro
737 Crescent Blvd.
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137
[REDACTED]

5/8/26

Subject: **Objection** to home addition at 593 Lee Street / Zoning Variations

Dear Mr. Harper,

I am writing this letter in response to the proposed public hearing for 593 Lee Street, Glen Ellyn, IL scheduled to occur on Tuesday May 12, 2026. I am a registered architect with over 25 years' experience and interested party as our home shares a property line with the applicant's Northeast boundary with a length of 49.39'.

I am disappointed that the design ignored all required current setbacks, when a solution exists to avoid doing so. It is both inconsiderate of the neighbors' sightlines and light exposure and out of harmony with the neighborhood aesthetic.

Points:

- Assuming current side yard setback requirements of 6'-5", approximately 29% of the proposed second floor addition is in **direct** noncompliance of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code with setback infringements. *{Is it acceptable to exacerbate the existing non-conforming condition to this degree?}*
- The existing single-story footprint of the home extends into the existing 40' rear setback from approximately 4'-2" on the top Northeast corner to approximately 5'-9" on the Southeast corner. This deviation occurs for the full length of the widest part of the existing portion of the home which measures 39'-4". *{Even the slightest offset or undulation in the façade was ignored by the architect when designing the proposed second floor and/or deemed too costly to investigate}.*
- To accommodate for unique situations and sites the zoning ordinance specifically states that an owner can build a second story with nonconforming setbacks-- *assuming* a minimum side yard of 4'-6" (which applicant does not meet)-- AND that all other applicable bulk regulations are met (again applicant does not meet because they exceed maximum lot coverage by 10% which violates section 10-4-8(E). This code section should directly preclude this design from being 'grandfathered' in. Section of Zoning Code included below for reference:

10-4-1(N)

The requirements of the individual zoning districts notwithstanding, the owner of a single- family detached house located in the R2 Residential District which existed prior to March 13, 1995, and which is located on a lot which does not meet the minimum required lot width or lot area, or which is nonconforming with respect to one or more of the following building setbacks:

1. Front yard: Provided the front perimeter wall encroaches five feet or less into the minimum required front yard;

2.Side yard: Provided the minimum setback of the affected side yard(s) is not less than four and one-half feet;

3. Corner side yard: Provided the minimum corner side yard setback is not less than 20 feet;

4. Rear yard:


(a) Interior lot: Provided the minimum rear yard setback is not less than 30 feet;

(b) Corner lot: Provided the minimum rear yard setback is not less than 25 feet;

*May construct a vertical addition over the perimeter walls of the house, or reconstruct or enclose an existing portion of the house which has an existing foundation or footing that complies with the requirements of the Village Building Code, provided, however: that such addition does not result in the front, side, corner side or rear yard setbacks being less than the minimum existing setback; that the addition does not extend the footprint of the house; that the existing nonconforming setback (s), lot area or lot width was not the result of a variation previously granted by the Village; **and that all other applicable bulk regulations are met;***

As a resident of Glen Ellyn and an architect, I cannot endorse the proposed design because it infringes upon what should be protected space and light.

I would fully support my neighbor's second-floor addition without reservation if the architectural plans were revised to conform to current setbacks with a balanced design constructed more centrally over the existing home boundary and encapsulating the chimney. Depicted below is a sketch of a potential solution (and there are many) that would meet the setbacks requirements while granting a variance for overall lot coverage %.



PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN

831 Sq. Ft. SECOND FLOOR ADDITION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Respectfully,

Brandi Wilson, Architect [- ARC.0714487](#)



Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of
Appeals
535 Duane Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 7/14/2026 7:00 PM
Department: Community Development
Department Head:
Category: Public Hearing
Prepared By:

AGENDA ITEM (ID # 2026-
521)

DOC ID: 2026-521

Continuation of Public Hearing — 635 Carolyn Drive

Statement of the Issue:

UPDATE: The applicants have submitted a revised site plan and elevation plan based on the comments received by the Zoning Board of Appeals at its May 12, 2026, meeting. The Petitioners are now requesting a zoning variation to allow a rear yard setback thirty-four feet and nine inches (34'9") from the rear yard property line in lieu of the required minimum setback of forty feet (40'0"). The packet and minutes for the May 12 meeting can be viewed [here](#).

The revised plans show a 2-foot reduction in the requested rear yard setback variation from thirty-two feet and nine inches (32'-9") to thirty-four feet and nine inches (34'-9"). The modification has reduced the total lot coverage ratio on the property from the originally proposed 2059 square feet or 19.9% to 2028 square feet or 19.6%. The applicant has included an updated narrative statement explaining these changes for the member of the board to review.

Below is the report that was provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals at its May 12, 2026, meeting:

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").

Analysis:

REQUEST: 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").

ZONING/USE: The subject property is zoned R2 - Residential District and improved with an existing single-family home.

PUBLIC NOTICE: Notice of the public hearing was published in the April 24, 2026, edition of the Daily Herald, mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property, and a placard was placed on the property. Village staff has received eight (8) pieces of correspondence in support of the application. These correspondences can be reviewed in the attachments.

ZONING HISTORY: There is no zoning history associated with the property.

PERMIT HISTORY:

Year	Permit No.	Type
2022	20221503	Fence
2020	20200964	Roof Replacement
2015	20150590	Interior Remodel
2006	B25809	Fence
2005	B24718	Sewer Service Repair
1999	B18964	Screened Porch Addition
1999	B18965	Shed

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The Petitioners have applied for a variation to the minimum rear yard setback requirement of 40 feet 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 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 they 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.

Per the Zoning Code, a practical difficulty or particular hardship cannot be self-created. A zoning variation runs with the land indefinitely and should be considered only if the property is unique in its particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions specific to the property involved and would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

Budget Impact:

Contribution to Strategic Plan

Action Requested:

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 findings of

fact and determine if 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.

Attachments:

1. Updated Narrative Statement
2. Updated 635 Carolyn Site and Elevation Plans


Updated Narrative Statement:

We are requesting a revised variance based on guidance from the Zoning Board of Appeals and feedback from our rear neighbor. After the May Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, we, the owners of 635 Carolyn Drive, contacted our rear neighbor at 780 Lenox in good faith. We met at our property on June 14 to review the plans and discuss his concerns. We explained the exterior impact of the proposed addition, including the current patio (no expansion planned) and new landscaping. We also invited him into our home and showed him the existing layout challenges that make the house less functional for our family. Although our neighbor was unwilling to make concessions, we revised our plans to address his concerns. The updated plans now include a 6-foot addition, which is a 2-foot reduction from the original proposal, along with large arborvitae trees along the fence to increase privacy.

A variance is requested to allow reduction of the required 40' rear yard setback to 34'-9" to allow construction of an addition to improve the current living space for the family. (owner seeks an exception to zoning code section 10-4-8(D)2).

Thank you,

Lindsay



ZONING CRITERIA - R2

SETBACKS -
 30' FRONT (CLOSER OF ADJACENT HOMES ON EITHER SIDE ;
 641 SETBACK = 30'-0")
 SIDES = 10% OF LOT WIDTH
 WIDTH = 92.16' ; MIN 9'-3" REQ'D
 REAR = 40' MINIMUM *

LOT COVERAGE-
 MAX 20% ALLOWED
 LOT AREA = 10,356 SF
 ALLOWABLE COVERAGE = 2071 SF

EXISTING COVERAGE ;
 RESIDENCE = 1842 SF
 FIRST FLR BAY = 10 SF
 EXISTING SHED = 139 SF
 (100 SF EXCLUDED)

TOTAL EXISTING LOT COVERAGE = 1891 SF
 AVAILABLE COVERAGE = 180 SF

PROPOSED LOT COVERAGE ;
 EXIST COVERAGE = 1891 SF
 REMOVE BAY = -10 SF
 PROPOSED ADDITIONS = 147 SF
 PROPOSED COVERED PORCH = 54 SF (EXCLUDED)

TOTAL COVERAGE = 2028 SF
 2028 / 10,356 = 19.6 %

* A VARIANCE IS REQUESTED TO REDUCE THE REQUIRED REAR SETBACK TO 34'-9" IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 40'-0" SETBACK PER ZONING CODE 10-4-8 (D) 2

FOR VARIANCE REVIEW ONLY
 NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

MARC KOLLIAS
 -ARCHITECT-

25W767 DUFEE RD.
 WHEATON, IL. 60189
 PH: (630) 690-8211

1




1 OF 3

BY: MK 6-22-26

PROPOSED ADDITION AND REMODELING FOR
 JONATHAN AND LINDSAY LANTZ

GLEN ELLYN, I L.

635 CAROLYN



PROPOSED ADDITION AND REMODELING FOR
JONATHAN AND LINDSAY LANTZ

635 CAROLYN

GLEN ELLYN, I L.

FOR VARIANCE REVIEW ONLY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

MARC KOLLIAS
-ARCHITECT-

25W167 DUFEE RD.
WHEATON, IL. 60189
PH: (630) 690-8211

3

3 OF 3

BY: MK 6-22-26



Glen Ellyn Zoning Board
of Appeals
535 Duane Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 7/14/2026 7:00 PM
Department: Community Development
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan
Category: Public Hearing
Prepared By: Daniel Harper

**AGENDA ITEM (ID
2026-522)**

DOC ID: 2026-522

Public Hearing - 877 Crescent Boulevard

Statement of the Issue:

Chris Scheid (Petitioner), the owner of the property at 877 Crescent Boulevard, has applied for a zoning variation to allow a corner side yard setback of ten feet and four inches (10'-4") in lieu of the required corner side yard setback of twenty-one feet and three inches (21'-3").

Analysis:

REQUEST: The Petitioner requests approval of the following variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code:

1. Section 10-4-8(D)(4) to allow a corner side yard setback of ten feet and four inches (10'-4") in lieu of the required corner side yard setback of twenty-one feet and three inches (21'-3") for existing nonconforming detached homes in the R2 Residential District.

ZONING/USE: The subject property is zoned R2 - Residential District and improved with an existing single-family home.

PUBLIC NOTICE: Notice of the public hearing was published in the June 25, 2026, edition of the Daily Herald, mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property, and a placard was placed on the property.

ZONING HISTORY: There is no zoning history associated with the property.

PERMIT HISTORY:

Year	Permit No.	Type
2020	20200334	Primary Bathroom Remodel
2019	20191219	Fence Replacement
2014	20141115	Roof, Window, & Door

		Replacement
2012	20121300	Water Service Connection
2009	20090933	Remodel Existing Pool
2002	B21636	Fence Replacement
1999	B19040	Electrical
1953	B2994	New Single-Family Residence

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The Petitioner has applied for a variation to the minimum corner side yard setback requirement to construct a second-story dormer addition within the footprint of the existing home. The proposed second-story addition would not add additional lot coverage to the property as the addition exists within the current 1,530-square foot footprint of the home. The existing lot coverage of the property is 13.5%. The property has a nonconforming corner lot width of seventy feet and ten inches (70'-10") and complies with the exemption for vertical additions found in Village Code Section 10-4-1(N), which allows for a vertical addition over the perimeter walls of the home on a corner lot that does not meet the minimum required lot width of eighty feet (80'-0"). However, the existing nonconforming corner side yard setback of eight feet and ten inches (8'-10") is beyond the minimum required corner side yard setback of twenty feet (20'-0") per Section 10-4-1(N)(3) of the village code. The variation request is to permit a corner side yard setback of ten feet and four inches (10'-4") for the proposed addition in lieu of the required corner side yard setback of 30% of the lot width, or twenty-one feet and three inches (21'-3"), for existing nonconforming detached homes in the R2 Residential District. The proposed two-story addition meets the Village's building height requirements.

The applicant reports in their petition that the practical difficulties lie in their unique building placement on the lot, which prevents the modification of limited living space that occupies a large portion of the home's second story. The petition states that the structure's existing sloped ceiling and knee wall impede the family's ability to utilize the available building area. The proposed shed dormer addition would remove the knee wall and sloped ceiling along the south side of the home to allow for a more navigable second floor living space, and that without a zoning variation, the available improvable area would be limited.

The applicant states that the proposed variation will not negatively affect the surrounding properties or alter the character of the existing home. The nonconforming corner side yard setback has existed since the original 1953 construction of the home and is not due to the actions of the applicant.

Per the Zoning Code, a practical difficulty or particular hardship cannot be self-created. A zoning variation runs with the land indefinitely and should be considered only if the property is unique in its

particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions specific to the property involved and would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

Budget Impact:

Contribution to Strategic Plan

Action Requested:

The ZBA should consider the testimony presented during the public hearing and review the written evidence presented as part of the petitioner's application packet. The ZBA should make findings of fact and determine if 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.

Attachments:

1. Application - Zoning Variation
2. Aerial Map
3. Zoning Map
4. Plat of Survey
5. Proposed Plans & Elevations



VILLAGE OF GLEN ELLYN

Zoning Variation Application Packet

*Community Development Department
535 Duane Street – Glen Ellyn, IL 60137 – Telephone 630.547.5250 – Fax 630.547.5370*

APPLICATION FOR ZONING VARIATION

Date Filed: 6/9/2026

Application No: 2026-0036

Name of Applicant: Chris Scheid

Address of Applicant: 877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Property Interest of Applicant: Owner

Name of Owner: Christopher W Scheid

Address of Owner: 877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Type	Name	Address	Phone	Email
Petitioner	Chris Scheid	877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
Web Administrator	Chris Scheid	877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
	Christopher W Scheid	877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
Parcel Owner	Scheid	877 Crescent Blvd Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		

Property Address: 877 Crescent Blvd

Project Name: Web Project

Project Description: A shed dormer addition to the existing second floor, rear side of residence.

Legal Description of Property:

LOT 10 IN WRIGHTWOOD, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF SECTION 11 AND 12, TOWNSHIP 39 NORTH, RANGE 10 EAST OF THE 3RD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JUNE 9TH, 1927 AS DOCUMENT 237389, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Zoning: R2, Single Family Residential District
Lot Dimensions: 73.3' by 160'
Lot Area: 11,364 square feet
PIN: 0512105011

Present Use: Applicant occupied.

Estimated Date to Begin New Use/Construction: 9/1/2026

Narrative Statement:

The corner property is non-conforming due to existing lot width less than 80' and corner side setback less than 21'-3". Per zoning ordinance 10-4-1 (N), the owner of an existing single-family residence that is non-conforming due to lot width, lot area, or an existing setback may construct a vertical addition over the existing perimeter walls of the house if the existing setback criteria stated in items 1 through 4 are met. Given the existing corner side setback of 8'-10", an exception to item 3 (existing corner side setback = minimum 20') is requested to allow the construction of a 2nd floor shed dormer along the rear (south side) of the residence. (Edit: The statement was later revised to request a variation from Section 10-4-8(D)(4) to allow a corner side yard setback of ten feet and 4 inches (10'- 4") in lieu of the required corner side yard setback of twenty-one feet and three inches (21'-3") for existing nonconforming detached homes in the R2 Residential District.

EVIDENCE RELATING TO ZONING CODE STANDARDS FOR A VARIATION:

1. Provide evidence that due to the characteristics of the property in question, there are practical difficulties or particular hardship for the applicant/owner in carrying out the strict letter of the Zoning Code:

The existing 2nd floor area has sloped ceilings on both the north and south sides. The proposed dormer will remove the slope along the south side of the 2nd floor, which will greatly improve the usability of the space. Without the variance, the space will not be functional, as the allowable area that can be improved will be very limited.

2. Provide evidence that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Code (i.e., without one or more variations) OR Provide evidence that the plight of the applicant/owner is due to unique circumstances relating to the property in question:

The plight of the owner is due to the original placement of the home on the property. The existing corner side yard setback does not meet current standards. The existing 2nd floor

area is located below the slope of the existing roof and therefore limits the use of the space. Without a variance, the functionality of the space cannot be improved.

3. Provide evidence that the requested variation(s), if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality of the property in question:

If granted, the request will maintain the existing character of the property.

4. Provide evidence that the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the property in question would bring particular hardship upon the applicant/owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the Zoning Code were to be carried out:

Given the position of the house on the property, denial of the request for variance would not allow for a functional living space on the second floor since the space that could actually be improved would be very limited.

5. Provide evidence that the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district:

The placement of the existing home and the non-conforming existing setback at Roger's Rd. creates a hardship for the owner that is not generally typical of properties within the zoning district.

6. Provide evidence that the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property in question:

The goal of the request is to improve the living space for the family as opposed to monetary gain.

7. Provide evidence that the alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property in question or by the applicant.

The nonconforming corner side yard setback has existed since the home was originally constructed and is not due to action by the current owner.

8. Provide evidence that the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property in question is located.

Granting of the variance will not be detrimental to public welfare and will not affect other properties or the neighborhood.

9. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property.

The proposed variation will not affect the light or air supply to adjacent properties.

10. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Substantially increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to the property in question or adjacent property.

The proposed variation will not increase dangers to this property or adjacent properties.

11. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village.

The proposed variation will in no way negatively affect the wellbeing of Village inhabitants.

12. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

The proposed variation will not impair the property values in the neighborhood.

13. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highway.

The proposed variation will have no effect on traffic.

14. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Create a nuisance.

The proposed variation will not create a nuisance.

15. Provide evidence that the proposed variation will not: Results in an increase in public expenditures.

The proposed variation will not increase public expenditure.

16. Provide evidence that the variation is the minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure.

The proposed dormer will remove the slope ceiling on the second floor and therefore make the existing space functional for the family.

17. Please add any comments which may assist the commission in reviewing this application.

**Legend**


0 50 100
ft

Print Date: 7/6/2026

Notes

Disclaimer: The GIS Consortium and MGP Inc. are not liable for any use, misuse, modification or disclosure of any map provided under applicable law. This map is for general information purposes only. Although the information is believed to be generally accurate, errors may exist and the user should independently confirm for accuracy. The map does not constitute a regulatory determination and is not a base for engineering design. A Registered Land Surveyor should be consulted to determine precise location boundaries on the ground.

GIS Consortium | Zoning Map - 877 Crescent Boulevard



Legend

Zoning and Development

Zoning

- R1: Single Family Residential District
- R2: Single Family Residential District

0 100 200
ft

Print Date: 7/7/2026

Notes

Disclaimer: The GIS Consortium and MGP Inc. are not liable for any use, misuse, modification or disclosure of any map provided under applicable law. This map is for general information purposes only. Although the information is believed to be generally accurate, errors may exist and the user should independently confirm for accuracy. The map does not constitute a regulatory determination and is not a base for engineering design. A Registered Land Surveyor should be consulted to determine precise location boundaries on the ground.



PLAT OF SURVEY

BY
GENTILE AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS


550 E. ST. CHARLES PLACE
LOMBARD, ILLINOIS 60148
PHONE : (630) 916-6262

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

LOT 10 IN WRIGHTWOOD, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF SECTIONS 11 AND 12, TOWNSHIP 39 NORTH, RANGE 10 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JUNE 9, 1927 AS DOCUMENT 237389, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

TOTAL AREA: 11,364.92 SQ.FT., 0.26 AC. MORE OR LESS

PROPERTY COMMONLY KNOWN AS: 877 CRESCENT BOULEVARD, GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS



BASE SCALE : 1 INCH = 20 FEET
DISTANCES ARE MARKED IN FEET AND DECIMAL PARTS THEREOF
ORDERED BY : CHRIS J. AIELLO, P.C.
DRAWN BY : RWG
CHECKED BY : JFG
SURVEYED BY : RG

COMPARE ALL POINTS BEFORE BUILDING BY SAME AND AT ONCE
REPORT ANY DIFFERENCE. FOR BUILDING LINE AND OTHER
RESTRICTIONS NOT SHOWN HEREON REFER TO YOUR ABSTRACT DEED,
CONTRACT, AND ZONING ORDINANCE.

ORDER NO. 26-23049

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF DuPAGE

S.S.

WE, GENTILE AND ASSOCIATES, INC. HEREBY CERTIFY THAT A SURVEY HAS BEEN MADE AT AND UNDER MY DIRECTION, OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED ABOVE, AND THAT THE PLAT HEREON DRAWN IS A CORRECT REPRESENTATION OF SAID SURVEY. THIS PLAT CONFORMS TO THE MINIMUM STANDARD REQUIREMENTS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY.



BY : Joseph F. Gentile MARCH 23, A.D. 20 26

ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 2925
MY LICENSE EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2026
ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE NO. 184.002870

CRESCENT BLVD

R2 ZONING DISTRICT -

LOT COVERAGE = 20% MAX
LOT AREA = 11,364 SF
ALLOW COV = 2272 SF
EXISTING COVERAGE = 1530 SF
PROPOSED COVERAGE = 1530 SF
(NO CHANGE)

SETBACK REQUIREMENTS -

FRONT = 30' MIN (NO CLOSER THAN THE SETBACK
OF THE CLOSER OF EITHER ADJACENT HOME)
INTERIOR SIDE = 10% OF LOT WIDTH
= 70.83 (0.1) = 7'-1"
CORNER SIDE = 30% OF LOT WIDTH
= 70.83 (0.3) = 21'-3"
REAR = 40' MIN
MAXIMUM RIDGE HT = 35 '
MAXIMUM EAVE HT = 25 '
(ABOVE AVERAGE OF EXIST. GRADES)

ROGER ROAD

THE PROPERTY IS NON-CONFORMING DUE
EXISTING LOT WIDTH LESS THAN 80' AND
CORNER SIDE SETBACK LESS THAN 21'-3"
PER ZONING ORDINANCE 10-4-1 (N) THE OWNER OF
AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE THAT IS
NON-CONFORMING DUE TO LOT WIDTH, LOT AREA,
OR AN EXISTING SETBACK MAY CONSTRUCT A
VERTICAL ADDITION OVER THE EXISTING PERIMETER
WALLS OF THE HOUSE IF THE EXISTING SETBACK
CRITERIA STATED IN ITEMS 1 THRU 4 ARE MET.
GIVEN THE EXISTING CORNER SIDE SETBACK OF
8'-10" AN EXCEPTION TO ITEM 3 (EXISTING CORNER
SIDE SETBACK = MINIMUM 20') IS REQUESTED TO
ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A 2ND FLOOR SHED
DORMER ALONG THE REAR (SOUTH SIDE) OF THE
EXISTING RESIDENCE.

* A VARIANCE IS REQUESTED TO REDUCE THE
REQUIRED REAR SETBACK TO 10'-4"
IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 20'-0" SETBACK
PER ZONING CODE 10-4-1 (N) 3

FOR VARIANCE REVIEW ONLY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



MARC KOLLIAS
-ARCHITECT-

25W767 DUFFEE RD.
WHEATON, IL. 60189
PH: (630) 690-8211

1

1 OF 2

BY: MK 6-8-26



SITE PLAN


1" = 16' - 0"

PROPOSED DORMER ADDITION TO EXISTING RESIDENCE FOR

CHRIS AND ANNA SCHEID



877 CRESCENT

GLEN ELLYN, I L.




EXISTING 2ND FLOOR PLAN

WITH PROPOSED DORMER AND REMODELING 1/8" = 1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED DORMER ADDITION TO EXISTING RESIDENCE FOR

CHRIS AND ANNA SCHEID

877 CRESCENT

GLEN ELLYN, I L.

FOR VARIANCE REVIEW ONLY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

MARC KOLLIAS
-ARCHITECT-

25W767 DURFEE RD.
WHEATON, IL. 60189
PH: (630) 690-8211

2

2 OF 2

BY: MK 6-8-26



Glen Ellyn Zoning Board
of Appeals
535 Duane Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 7/14/2026 7:00 PM
Department: Community Development
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan
Category: Discussion Item
Prepared By: Daniel Harper

AGENDA ITEM (ID
2026-537)

DOC ID: 2026-537

Zoning Code Discussion — Administration and Enforcement, Nonconforming Structures and Lots.

Statement of the Issue:

As part of the ongoing zoning code rewrite project, ZoneCo has prepared recommendations for possible improvements to the Nonconformities and Administration and Enforcement sections of the Village's zoning code. The Zoning Diagnostic Report included a list of recommendations to improve these sections. The primary objective of these recommendations is to assess the current zoning code regulations and provide suggested improvements to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the Village's future.

Analysis:

Administration and Procedures

ZoneCo's analysis of Chapter 10 of the Village's Zoning Code is located in Section 6 on page 63 of the Diagnostics Report. In their findings, ZoneCo identifies strengths and gaps in the current structure of the chapter, stating that "Chapter 10 generally covers the appropriate topics and assigns authority to village bodies, but it could be more predictable, transparent, and efficient with restructuring, clearer standards, and better alignment with how staff and applicants use the code in practice."

The report includes recommendations that are designed to provide greater clarity and predictability to the users of the code. A list of the recommendations can be found in Section 6 as well as the recommendations Matrix in Section 7 of the report.

Nonconforming Structures and Lots

During the public outreach and small group interviews, regulation of nonconforming lots and structures were a major topic of discussion. These regulations primarily impact existing single-family residential properties. Using GIS, staff conducted an analysis of the parcels within each of the Village's residential districts to understand how well the current lot size requirements fit the properties within each district. Maps visualizing compliance within each single-family residential zoning district (RE, R0, R1, R2, R2B) are attached.

The following table illustrates the rates of compliance of single-family zoned properties to the minimum area and width requirements.

	<u>RE</u>		<u>R0</u>		<u>R1</u>		<u>R2</u>		<u>R2B</u>		<u>RE-R2B</u>	
<u>Parcels within Each District</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Compliant	35	69%	71	97%	167	54%	3172	47%	129	>99%	3574	49%
Nonconforming Area	9	18%	0	0%	17	6%	223	3%	0	0%	249	3%
Nonconforming Width	0	0%	2	3%	84	27%	1294	19%	1	<1%	1381	19%
Nonconforming Width and Area	7	14%	0	0%	39	13%	2115	31%	0	0%	2161	29%
Totals	51		73		307		6,804		130		7,365	

Less than half of the single-family zoned lots within the Village meet the minimum lot area and/or width requirements. This mismatch between the Zoning Code and existing properties is particularly acute in the R2 District, which represents 92% of the Village's single-family residential parcels. This condition contributes to the demand for residential zoning variations as many typical additions to single-family homes cannot be approved due to non-compliant conditions.

ZoneCo performed an analysis of the 82 residential lots with approved variations from 2019 through 2025 and found that 76 of those properties were in the R2 District. They found that 41 of the 82 lots that received variations were nonconforming, and 40 of those nonconforming lots were in R2. Twenty (20) lots were nonconforming in both width and area. ZoneCo states that this pattern does not necessarily mean that all R2 dimensional standards are inappropriate, but it does show that R2 contains many older or constrained lots where current dimensional standards and related nonconformity rules regularly conflict with routine residential improvements. Examining minimum lot width and area standards could be a productive path to encourage improvements of existing single-family homes.

The report recommends that the code rewrite create a clearer by-right path for modest reinvestment on smaller or nonconforming lots where the improvement is compatible with neighborhood character and introduces a suggested "nonconformity framework," meaning an individual section in the residential portion of the code would create a clearer by-right path for maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and modest expansion of existing homes on smaller or nonconforming lots, subject to compatibility standards. A detailed analysis of nonconformities and existing residential development can be reviewed in Section 3.11 and the recommendations Matrix in Section 7 of the Diagnostics report.

Budget Impact:

Contribution to Strategic Plan

Action Requested:

Review Sections 3, Sections 6 and the Recommendations Matrix of the Zoning Diagnostic Report and provide feedback to Village staff regarding its findings and conclusions. Staff is seeking the Zoning Board of Appeals's direction on the following questions:

Administration and Procedures

1. The report finds that Chapter 10 is organized as a long list of procedures (certificates, appeals, variations, amendments, special uses, PUDs, fees, penalties) without a roadmap or visual process summary; stakeholders have explicitly asked for clearer, more concrete directives and removal of ambiguity. Staff is considering including visual graphics (i.e. flow charts, timelines) to better illustrate these processes. Do you think this is an appropriate solution to the stated issues?
2. The report recommends that the new code include a policy statement that repeated, similar variation approvals should trigger code amendments rather than continued case-by-case relief. Do you agree with this recommendation? If so, what thresholds of repeated zoning relief should be considered to trigger potential zoning code amendments?
3. The current code has a "two-tier" criteria system for evaluating variation requests found in Sections 10-10-12(E) which require that the ZBA and Village Board find evidence of:
That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located; and that the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality; or
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances; and that the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality;

And Section 10-10-12(F) which provide the following supplemental standards when evaluating applications:

1. That the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the specific property involved would bring particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulation were to be carried out;
2. That the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district;
3. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property;
4. That the alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property or by the applicant;
5. That the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located;
6. That the proposed variation will not:
 - (a) Impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property;
 - (b) Substantially increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property or adjacent

property;

(c) Otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village;

(d) Diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood;

(e) Unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways;

(f) Create a nuisance; or

(g) Result in an increase in public expenditures;

7. That the variation is the minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure;

8. In the case of a planned unit development, that granting of the variation will not significantly compromise the character and concept of the planned unit development;

The report recommends collapsing the two-tier variation standards into a single, clearly enumerated set of plain-language criteria applicable across districts. Do you agree with this assessment? If so, how would you prioritize the variation standards being considered?

4. The report recommends that the new code introduce an administrative adjustment or minor variation tool for small, quantifiable deviations that the Community Development Director can approve under clear criteria. Currently, administrative variation approvals are possible under Section 10-10-12(A) of the Zoning Code for existing single-family homes that request a variation for (a) an increase in the allowable lot coverage ratio of no more than 10% for homes that are more than one story or (b) a yard setback decrease of less than 20 percent of the minimum setback requirement. However, staff is required to evaluate these requests using the same standards as the Zoning Board of Appeals when determining if the standards for variations have been met. What criteria would be considered clear and quantifiable when determining eligibility for administrative variations?

Nonconforming Structures and Lots

5. The report recommends that the Village review corner-lot width premiums to determine whether they are necessary in each district or whether they create avoidable nonconformities. Currently, corner lots are required to have a large corner side yard setback along street frontages. An example is the R2 Zoning district, which requires a minimum 30-foot corner side yard setback which is the same dimension of the required minimum front yard setback. This requirement impacts improvements to existing non-conforming properties that were platted in the late 19th and early 20th century, preventing improvements to existing homes. Do you think this is appropriate in existing residentially zoned areas?

6. The report recommends that the Village consider whether side-yard formulas should be simplified or whether a separate standard should apply to legally existing narrow lots. An example is in the R2 zoning district, Section 10-4-8(D) of the code requires a minimum interior side yard setback of six and one-half feet or ten percent of the lot width, whichever is greater. Because many of the residential properties in the R2 zoning district are narrower than the minimum required 66-foot width, these lots are required to provide a side setback greater than ten percent of their lot widths, unlike conforming lots. A possible equitable solution to this would be to require a minimum side yard setback of 10% of the lot width for all lots in the zoning district. This would create side yard setback standards for each individual residential property depending on their existing widths. Do you think that this would be appropriate?

The items above were also reviewed by the Plan Commission at their June 25, 2026, meeting.

- The Plan Commission was receptive to the inclusion of graphics and charts to illustrate administrative processes and to provide a visual guide to the timelines for application.
- The Commission was not receptive to having a threshold number of similar variations being approved to trigger a code-amendment process. They suggested that staff consider having an annual zoning code review to offer suggestions to possible code amendments in lieu of mandatory triggers for consideration.
- The Commission was receptive to reevaluating the standards for approval for variations and asked staff to review neighboring communities for possible improvements.
- The Commission was split on the topic of providing quantifiable criteria for approving administrative zoning variations. The primary concern was that if a minimum threshold was needed to automatically qualify for a variation, then that threshold would become a de facto zoning regulation rather than a tool to be used sparingly.
- The Commission was receptive to reviewing standards for corner side yard setbacks for existing nonconforming corner lot structures. This has been a consistent variation request in the past and that considerations should be made to allow for improvements to the existing housing stock.
- The Commission was split on having side yard setbacks being determined by individual lot widths in lieu of a universal minimum standard. The commission raised concerns that this would create a non-uniform zoning requirement that would create inconsistent expectations for residential properties throughout the Village.

Attachments:

1. Zoning Diagnostic Report May 2026
2. LotDimension_Analysis_2026_RE
3. LotDimension_Analysis_2026_R0
4. LotDimension_Analysis_2026_R1
5. LotDimension_Analysis_2026_R2
6. LotDimension_Analysis_2026_R2B



Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Zoning Diagnostic Report

May 2026



Glen Ellyn Diagnostic Report

Executive Summary

Introduction to a Zoning Diagnostic Report

The development of this Diagnostic Report represents the first step in the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code Update project. This report evaluates the Village's existing zoning code and its effectiveness in achieving the goals and objectives established in the Comprehensive Plan. Glen Ellyn has a strong tradition of community-based planning and proactive policy development. In addition to the Comprehensive Plan, the consultant team has reviewed several other relevant plans, studies, and initiatives with implications for zoning—such as those addressing housing, downtown development, and sustainability. The primary objective of this Diagnostic Report is to assess, in detail, how well the current zoning regulations support the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the Village's future.

It is important for the community to understand how this Diagnostic Report differs from the Comprehensive Plan.

A Comprehensive Plan is the product of a broad, community-driven process that establishes a long-range vision for growth, development, and preservation. The goals derived from this process often vary in scale—from broad aspirations such as “Maintain and enhance the character of established neighborhoods” to more specific objectives like “Encourage mixed-use redevelopment in the downtown.”

While the Comprehensive Plan provides the overarching roadmap for the Village's future, the zoning code is a regulatory document that gives that vision legal force. The zoning code translates policy direction into enforceable standards for land use, building form, and development character. This Diagnostic Report serves as a vital link between the high-level vision of the Comprehensive Plan and the day-to-day application of zoning regulations.

This report was prepared by a team of planning and zoning professionals through an independent review of Glen Ellyn's adopted plans, policies, and regulations. The team drew upon the Glen Ellyn Comprehensive Plan, national best practices in zoning reform, and extensive professional experience working with peer communities to evaluate the existing zoning code and identify areas for revision, clarification, and modernization.

Methodology

This diagnostic assessment was conducted through a multi-step methodology designed to evaluate the effectiveness, clarity, and implementability of the Village's zoning regulations in relation to adopted plans and policy direction.

The consultant team started by reviewing key Village planning documents, including the Comprehensive Plan, Housing Assessment, Active Transportation Plan, Downtown Strategic

Plan, and the Streetscape and Parking Study. This review established the community's adopted vision, goals, and implementation priorities related to land use, housing, transportation, and economic development.

The team conducted a detailed evaluation of the residential standards and zoning districts (RE, R0, R1, R2, R2B, R3, R4, and R5). This included analyzing the purpose and intent of each district, permitted and special uses, dimensional and bulk standards, accessory structure provisions, massing and building form, definitions, and measurement/interpretation rules. The residential analysis specifically considered how well the current regulations support the goals of the Housing Assessment, Comprehensive Plan, related strategic documents, including policies related to housing diversity, accessory dwelling units, and neighborhood character.

The team evaluated the commercial and mixed-use zoning districts (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C5A, C5B, C6, I1, and CC). This assessment focused on district purpose, use permissions and mixing of uses, form-based standards, and overall alignment with Comprehensive Plan goals to grow and diversify key commercial districts, enhance physical form and site design, and ensure appropriate transitions to adjacent residential areas. Special attention was given to subareas and key opportunity sites, including Downtown Glen Ellyn, the Roosevelt Road Corridor, Stacy's Corners, C4 office areas, and areas identified for potential annexation.

The organization, clarity, and usability of the zoning ordinance were assessed. This included a review of overall document structure, the consistency and use of terms, cross-references, and the clarity of standards and graphics from the perspective of both administrators and end users.

The team evaluated the administration and procedures of the zoning ordinance, including the roles and responsibilities of decision-making bodies, application types and thresholds, review procedures and sequencing, approval criteria and decision standards, timelines and extensions, the allocation of administrative versus discretionary authority, enforcement provisions, planned unit development (PUD) procedures, and the framework for nonconformities and appeals.

The zoning code was also compared against results from stakeholder interviews and a community survey. The results of this engagement are described in greater detail in Section 2 of the Zoning Diagnostic Report.

Together, these steps provide a comprehensive basis for identifying targeted revisions, structural improvements, and policy updates to better implement the Village's adopted plans and goals related to housing, land use, and economic development while improving the user experience.

Key Findings and Themes

The diagnostic confirms that Glen Ellyn's zoning code broadly supports long-standing community values but is not well aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's more contemporary expectations for housing variety, commercial reinvestment, and a clearer, more user-friendly regulatory framework. Across residential and commercial districts, the code remains heavily oriented toward conventional single-use zoning, detailed use lists, and lot-size-driven districts, rather than a structure organized around housing types, mixed-use form, and consistent transitions between more intense areas and single-family neighborhoods. The result is a system

that can preserve character in many locations, but that often makes it unnecessarily difficult to deliver the modest, context-sensitive infill and mixed-use projects envisioned in recent plans.

On the residential side, the analysis finds that the district framework and dimensional standards are not well calibrated to Glen Ellyn's current housing needs or existing lot patterns. The code continues to favor detached single-family development on relatively large lots, even as the Comprehensive Plan and Housing Assessment call for more townhomes, duplexes, small multifamily buildings, and accessory dwelling units in appropriate locations. Minimum lot area and width, side-yard formulas, lot coverage limits, and height standards in core districts such as R2–R4 tend to push redevelopment toward larger replacement homes while making it harder to maintain and modestly expand smaller, more attainable homes or introduce missing-middle housing near centers and corridors. Nonconformity rules and the pattern of recent residential variations further demonstrate that many common improvements—additions, garages, porches, and driveways—routinely require relief, indicating that baseline standards are out of step with the built fabric and typical homeowner projects.

In the commercial and mixed-use districts, the code only partially implements the subarea visions for Downtown, Roosevelt Road, Stacy's Corners, the C4 office areas, and other key corridors. Downtown's C5/C5A/C5B framework correctly emphasizes a compact, pedestrian-oriented environment with upper-story housing and parking credits, but it relies on highly specific use lists, layered special uses, and frequent PUD triggers that make it hard to adapt to evolving business models and to deliver context-compliant infill without discretionary negotiations. Along Roosevelt Road, Butterfield Road, and in C2–C3 corridor areas, district purposes and standards still tilt toward auto-oriented patterns, with limited mixed-use permissions and only general expectations for building placement, access management, and screening at residential edges. Office, industrial, and institutional districts (including C4, I1, and CC) also lack fully articulated form and transition standards, making reinvestment, adaptive reuse, and campus evolution more dependent on case-by-case approvals than on clear, predictable rules.

The report also identifies organization, terminology, and procedural structure as significant contributors to user frustration and inconsistent administration. The zoning ordinance is lengthy and text-heavy, with key standards and definitions scattered across chapters, overlapping terminology for similar approvals and use types, and measurement rules that are not always intuitive, even for experienced users. Use permissions are spread through narrative sections rather than consolidated in clear tables; numeric standards are often embedded in paragraphs rather than supported by graphics; and definitions sometimes contain substantive regulations that should appear in operative provisions. On the procedural side, multiple application types, unclear thresholds between administrative and discretionary review, and PUD requirements that are applied to a wide range of projects can make the path to approval slow, uncertain, and highly dependent on interpretation.

Taken together, these findings point to a code that is doing too much of its work through complexity, exceptions, and case-specific relief, and not enough through clear, well-structured standards that reflect adopted policy direction. The recommended zoning update therefore focuses on four overarching themes: reorganizing and simplifying the ordinance so it is easier to

navigate and apply; restructuring residential and mixed-use districts around housing types and form rather than only lot size; recalibrating dimensional and nonconformity standards to better fit Glen Ellyn's existing neighborhoods and desired infill patterns; and modernizing commercial, corridor, and campus districts to support reinvestment and mixed-use while providing more predictable, context-sensitive transitions to adjacent residential areas.

REPORT CONTENTS

1.	Review of Village Planning Documents	8
1.1	Comprehensive Plan	8
1.2	Housing Assessment	9
1.3	Active Transportation Plan.....	15
1.4	Downtown Strategic Plan.....	16
1.5	Streetscape and Parking Study	17
2.	Community Input	18
2.1	Stakeholder Group Interviews.....	18
2.2	Community Survey	20
3.	Assessment of Residential Zoning Standards	26
3.1	Overview: Review of Residential Zoning Standards.....	26
3.2	Reform Framework	26
3.3	Residential District Structure and Housing Choice	27
3.4	Code Organization and Administrative Usability	28
3.5	Common Residential Improvements and Accessory Structures	29
3.6	Driveways, Parking Placement, and Impervious Surface.....	31
3.7	Definitions, Terminology, and Measurement Rules.....	32
3.8	Lot Size Standards.....	33
3.9	Yard Standards.....	34
3.10	Lot Coverage and Height.....	36
3.11	Nonconformities and Existing Residential Development.....	37
3.12	District-Specific Findings and Reform Direction.....	38
3.13	Implementation Priorities	40
3.14	Recommended Code Reorganization	41
4.	Review of Commercial Zoning Districts	41
4.1	Analysis of Commercial Zoning Districts	41
4.2	C1	42
4.3	C2 Community Commercial District.....	42
4.4	C3 Service Commercial District.....	44

4.5	C4 Office District	45
4.6	C5 Central Business District.....	47
4.7	C5A Central Retail Core Subdistrict.....	48
4.8	C5B Central Service Subdistrict.....	49
4.9	C6 Commercial/Multiuse Planned Development District	51
4.10	I1 Light Industrial District	52
4.11	CC Community College District.....	53
4.12	Use Permissions and Mixing Uses.....	54
4.13	Form-Based Standards	55
4.14	Alignment with Long Range Plans.....	56
5.	Assessment of Organization, Clarity, and Style	58
5.1	Document Organization	58
5.2	Consistency	59
5.3	Graphics	63
6.	Administration and Procedures.....	63
6.1	Overall structure and roles	64
6.2	Procedures: Clarity and Predictability.....	64
7.	Recommendations Matrix.....	69

1. Review of Village Planning Documents

1.1 Comprehensive Plan

1.1.1 Overview of the Plan

The Glen Ellyn Comprehensive Plan (adopted 2023) – hereby referred to as the “Plan” or the “Comprehensive Plan” - is the Village’s primary long-range policy document guiding land use, development, transportation, community facilities, and investment over the next 10–20 years. It establishes a shared community vision, goals, and objectives, and coordinates the actions of elected officials, boards and commissions, staff, and other stakeholders. Developed through a multi-year, highly participatory process with surveys, workshops, and subarea planning, the plan focuses on reinvestment, redevelopment, and placemaking in a largely built-out community. It is organized into chapters on vision and goals, land use and development, subarea plans (Downtown, Roosevelt Road, Stacy’s Corners), transportation, community facilities, parks and open space, and implementation. The plan is intended as a living document that guides regulatory updates, capital improvements, and intergovernmental coordination.

1.1.2 Land Use & Development Recommendations in the Plan

The Land Use & Development chapter defines desired future land use and development character for all areas within the Village limits and its extraterritorial jurisdiction. It aims to preserve Glen Ellyn’s existing neighborhood character while identifying strategic opportunities to maximize development potential through redevelopment, reinvestment, and higher-intensity mixed-use areas. The plan emphasizes building on the strong single-family base while expanding the range of housing types, including attached and multi-family housing in appropriate locations. It also links land use with corridor image, subarea visions, transportation, and parks to support walkability, transit access, and a high-quality public realm. The Future Land Use Plan assigns every parcel to a land use category that is intended to guide zoning, development review, and future zoning code updates.

Key land use categories and related recommendations from the Comprehensive Plan:

- Single-Family Detached: Maintain this predominant housing type (about 51 percent of the land area is single family lots, and 64 percent of housing units are single-family detached) and continue to preserve neighborhood character and stability.
- Single-Family Attached: Expand townhomes and similar attached forms, especially around Downtown, near Roosevelt Road, along Swift Road, and near the College of DuPage, to increase housing diversity and support higher density where appropriate.
- Multi-Family: Support apartments and condominiums near Downtown, near COD, along Roosevelt Road, and at the edges of single-family neighborhoods as transitions between commercial and residential uses and to meet downsizing and diverse housing needs.
- Neighborhood Commercial: Reinforce Downtown and Stacy’s Corners as neighborhood-serving commercial nodes, with Downtown remaining the core district emphasizing attractive streetscapes and a pedestrian-oriented environment and Stacy’s Corners better serving adjacent neighborhoods.

- Corridor Commercial: Concentrate and intensify larger-scale and auto-oriented commercial uses along Roosevelt Road and Butterfield Road, including reinvestment in centers such as Market Plaza, Pickwick Plaza, and Baker Hill.

Key subareas and related recommendations from the Comprehensive Plan:

- Downtown Glen Ellyn: Continue to enhance Downtown as a compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented district with an active blend of shopping, dining, entertainment, public uses, and a growing supply of upper-story and nearby housing to support a vibrant, transit-served core.
- Roosevelt Road Corridor: Pursue reinvestment and redevelopment of underutilized and aging commercial properties along Roosevelt Road, focusing on improved site design, enhanced corridor image, and opportunities for higher-quality, context-sensitive commercial and multi-family development.
- Butterfield Road Corridor: Intensify and modernize corridor commercial uses along Butterfield Road, supporting larger-scale retail, service, and mixed commercial development that serves residents, visitors, and passing motorists while improving access, circulation, and appearance.
- Stacy's Corners: Evolve Stacy's Corners as a mixed-use neighborhood gateway with a historic character, strengthening neighborhood-serving commercial uses and compatible residential development while respecting and enhancing local historic resources.
- Areas near College of DuPage and transition edges: Encourage multi-family and attached residential development adjacent to the College of DuPage and at the edges of single-family neighborhoods to provide a wider range of housing options and serve as appropriate transitions between commercial and lower-density residential areas.

1.2 Housing Assessment

1.2.1 Overview

The 2023 Glen Ellyn Housing Assessment is a data-driven study intended to help the Village understand current and emerging housing challenges and to inform policy, zoning, and investment decisions. It combines demographic, socioeconomic, and market data with community input from engagement events and a survey to identify unmet housing needs and gaps in the local housing supply. Glen Ellyn is characterized as a predominantly residential “bedroom community,” with stable population and household counts, an aging and increasingly affluent population, and a housing stock dominated by single-family detached homes built largely between the 1950s and 1980s. The assessment documents rising home prices, constrained for-sale supply, especially smaller and more affordable homes, and an older multifamily rental stock concentrated in three main locations. Overall, it concludes that Glen Ellyn needs additional housing across a broader range of price points and housing types to better serve current and future residents.

1.2.2 Housing Assessment Findings and Recommendations with Implications for the Zoning Update

(a) Predominantly Single-Family Housing and Constrained For-Sale Supply

Glen Ellyn's housing composition is heavily weighted toward single-family detached homes, which make up about 64 percent of units, with relatively limited attached and multifamily options. The detached for-sale market is highly constrained: prices have risen significantly since 2015, days on market have dropped to roughly two weeks, and smaller, more affordable homes are often demolished and replaced with larger, more expensive houses.

The zoning code should respond by creating more pathways for a broader mix of housing types while still respecting established neighborhood character. The issue is not simply that the Village needs more units, but that the code should better accommodate smaller homes (including existing homes), attached homes, low-rise multi-family structures, and modest infill in locations where those forms can provide additional housing choices without overwhelming existing blocks.

Zoning recommendations:

- Amend district purpose statements and use permissions in the residential and mixed-use districts, including R1-R4, R5, C5, and C6, to recognize a broader range of housing types such as duplexes, single-family attached homes, and low-scale multifamily near centers and corridors.
- Add or expand by-right permissions for duplexes and small multi-unit structures, such as 4- to 6-unit buildings, in appropriate R3 and R4 locations.
- Clarify and strengthen permissions for upper-story residential and mixed-use residential in C5 and C6 at moderate densities.
- Revise minimum lot area, lot width, lot coverage, and FAR standards in R2-R4 to create alternative small-lot, or modest infill options.
- Calibrate height and yard standards in R3 and R4 to allow 2- to 3-story missing-middle housing types while maintaining neighborhood-appropriate scale.
- Update residential PUD standards to encourage mixes of small-lot single-family, townhomes, and small multifamily on larger infill or redevelopment sites.
- Consider density or flexibility incentives for projects that provide a diversity of unit types, smaller units, or attainable price points.

(b) Limited Options for Downsizing and Aging in Place

The Village has gained nearly 1,000 households headed by someone age 55 or older since 2010, and residents and stakeholders report a shortage of condos, townhomes, and other smaller, low-maintenance homes that would suit empty nesters and seniors who wish to remain in the community.

The zoning code should make it easier to provide smaller, lower-maintenance housing near services, transit, Downtown, and other walkable areas. Downsizing and aging-in-place options are most feasible when the code allows attached housing, small multifamily buildings, elevator-served buildings, and accessible units in locations where residents can remain connected to daily needs and community life.

Zoning recommendations:

- Broaden by-right or special-use permissions for townhomes, stacked flats, and small elevator-served multifamily in R3 and R4, particularly near Downtown and along transit corridors.
- Establish clear form standards for attached and small multifamily housing, including height, massing, façade rhythm, open space, and transitions to adjacent lower-density homes.
- Consider adding senior housing or age-restricted housing as a distinct use category so parking, circulation, accessibility, and design standards can be tailored to the use.
- Consider use-based standards that encourage step-free entries, visitable ground-floor units, and accessible common areas in multifamily and townhome projects.
- Allow modest height, density, or parking flexibility for projects that meet defined accessibility benchmarks, such as a specified share of units meeting enhanced accessibility standards.
- Reduce or right-size parking requirements for age-restricted, senior, and small-unit housing within walking distance of Downtown, transit, and services.
- Allow shared parking and transportation-demand strategies for senior and downsizing-oriented housing where actual vehicle ownership is likely to be lower.

(c) Housing for People with Disabilities and Other Special Needs

About 8.5 percent of residents, representing more than 2,350 people, live with a disability. Many need housing that is both affordable and physically accessible, and the assessment notes that these options are limited locally and regionally.

The zoning code should clearly accommodate accessible housing, supportive housing, community residences, and group living arrangements in a manner consistent with fair housing principles. The goal should be to treat small community-based residences similarly to comparable household living arrangements while creating clear, objective standards for larger supportive or specialized residential facilities.

Zoning recommendations:

- Update Chapter 2 definitions to clearly define group home, supportive housing, community residence, and related terms.
- Distinguish small community-based homes from larger residential care or supportive facilities based on scale and operational characteristics.

- Identify larger supportive housing or specialized residential facilities as special uses in appropriate residential and mixed-use districts.
- Replace ad hoc conditions with clear, objective standards for larger supportive facilities, including scale, access, parking, life-safety, and compatibility criteria.
- Add supplementary regulations addressing reasonable occupancy, spacing, and design standards without imposing unnecessary separation requirements.
- Align parking requirements for supportive housing with likely vehicle ownership and staffing patterns rather than applying conventional household parking ratios.
- Ensure zoning procedures allow reasonable accommodations where needed to comply with fair housing obligations.

(d) Workforce Housing and Local Employees

More than 10,000 people work in Glen Ellyn but live elsewhere, and average wages in major employment sectors are generally under 60,000 dollars, limiting employees' ability to live in the Village.

The zoning code should support more moderately priced multifamily and mixed-use housing in locations where additional density can be accommodated, particularly near transit, Downtown, Roosevelt Road, and other commercial or employment areas. Workforce housing will be difficult to produce if zoning limits multifamily development to too few sites or requires parking, height, setback, or approval standards that make moderate-density projects infeasible.

Zoning recommendations:

- Amend commercial district standards, especially C2-C6, to explicitly allow upper-story residential and mixed-use multifamily in appropriate commercial and corridor locations.
- Allow mixed-use residential along key corridors, including Roosevelt Road, where redevelopment can add housing while strengthening the commercial environment.
- In C5 and C6, refine permissions for standalone multifamily and mixed-use residential.
- Provide height and FAR allowances sufficient to produce meaningful numbers of units, such as 4- to 6-story buildings where context-appropriate.
- Modify parking requirements to reduce ratios for multifamily and mixed-use projects near transit, Downtown, and commercial corridors.
- Allow shared parking between commercial and residential uses in mixed-use buildings and planned developments.
- Streamline approvals for context-sensitive housing projects that meet adopted form, parking, affordability, and transition standards.

Shared Parking Efficiency

CityGate Centre in Naperville succeeds as a shared parking model - it assembled a use mix with complementary peak demand periods across a single unified campus.

(e) Entry-Level For-Sale Housing Shortage

There is a limited supply of lower-value for-sale homes. Entry-level buyers often stretch beyond affordability thresholds, and smaller, naturally affordable homes are being lost through teardown and replacement. The average square footage of detached homes sold increased by about 9 percent between 2015 and 2021.

The zoning code should address both sides of the entry-level ownership issue: preserving existing smaller homes where appropriate and allowing new smaller ownership options to be built. Bulk standards that unintentionally encourage oversized replacement homes or make modest additions difficult can accelerate the loss of naturally attainable homes. At the same time, the code should create intentional pathways for smaller-scale residential structures.

Zoning recommendations:

- Revisit bulk standards in R2 and R3, including minimum lot area, lot width, setbacks, maximum lot coverage, and FAR, to better align with the community need for accessible housing formats.
- Create calibrated FAR or lot coverage controls that discourage oversized replacement homes while allowing reasonable modernization of existing smaller homes.
- Allow modest reductions in minimum lot area or lot width through alternative small-lot standards where block patterns support smaller homes.
- Amend compliance and nonconformity provisions so small, older homes on nonconforming lots can be modestly expanded or reconfigured without triggering requirements that make teardown more likely.
- Coordinate zoning with subdivision and platting standards so context-sensitive lot splits can create smaller entry-level lots where appropriate.

(f) Housing for Lower-Income Renters and Affordability Pressures

Approximately 38 percent of renters are cost burdened (defined as spending 30% of its gross income on housing-related costs), with more than 80 percent of those cost-burdened renters earning under 35,000 dollars annually. Median gross rents in Glen Ellyn are somewhat lower than the county median, largely due to an older rental stock, and the supply of deed-restricted affordable housing is limited.

The zoning code should increase realistic opportunities for multifamily, mixed-income, and affordable housing in targeted areas. Because land is limited and development costs are high, affordability goals will be difficult to achieve if the code restricts multifamily housing to too few districts, requires excessive parking, or imposes dimensional standards that reduce feasible unit counts. The code should pair broader housing permissions with clear form and transition standards so additional density is predictable and context-sensitive.

Zoning recommendations:

- Expand by-right multifamily permissions and increase allowable density in R4 and R5 where additional units can be accommodated.
- Use residential PUD standards to support mixed-income housing and a range of unit sizes on larger infill or redevelopment sites.
- In C5 and C6, ensure multifamily housing is clearly permitted and that height, FAR, yard, and parking standards allow achievable unit counts.
- Reduce minimum parking requirements for affordable, mixed-income, small-unit, and transit-proximate multifamily projects.
- Permit smaller unit sizes and flexible open space standards where projects meet adopted building form, common-area, and livability criteria.
- Consider incentive-based affordable housing provisions, such as density bonuses, parking reductions, height flexibility, or fee waivers where feasible.
- Maintain clear design criteria so affordable and mixed-income housing can be reviewed predictably rather than through discretionary negotiation.

(g) Dependence on Limited, Strategic Development Sites

The assessment notes that because available land is limited, most new housing will need to come from multifamily development and small-lot or attached infill rather than large-scale greenfield single-family projects.

The zoning code should align housing capacity with the Village's limited opportunity sites. Downtown, Roosevelt Road, areas near I-355, areas near College of DuPage, and other corridor or center locations should have zoning that actually allows the housing types and intensities contemplated by the Housing Assessment and Comprehensive Plan. If the code continues to rely heavily on discretionary PUDs without clear density, form, and approval expectations, strategic sites may underperform or remain underutilized.

Zoning recommendations:

- Align zoning districts and overlays with the Comprehensive Plan's subarea and corridor strategies for Downtown, Roosevelt Road, areas near I-355, College of DuPage, and other opportunity sites.
- Reassess maximum heights, FARs, densities, and dimensional standards in C5, C6, R4, R5, and nearby transition areas to ensure the code enables the housing capacity expected for strategic sites.
- Revise PUD standards to clarify when residential and mixed-use PUDs are appropriate for assembling, intensifying, or redeveloping key opportunity sites.
- Establish clearer expectations for minimum density, mix of uses, housing affordability, public benefits, site design, and transition standards in residential and mixed-use PUDs.

- Streamline approval for projects that meet or exceed desired housing-unit yield, affordability, and design criteria.
- Allow small-lot, attached, and multifamily infill by clear standards in appropriate locations rather than reserving most new housing capacity for large discretionary projects.
- Coordinate height, parking, access, stormwater, open space, and public-realm standards so strategic sites can be redeveloped efficiently and predictably.

1.3 Active Transportation Plan

1.3.1 Overview

The Move Glen Ellyn Active Transportation Plan (“Move GE”) is a village-wide strategy to expand safe, functional walking and bicycling options and to integrate them into everyday travel patterns for residents, workers, students, and visitors. It proposes to grow the current 5.5-mile bike network by about 9.75 miles using a mix of on-street routes, traditional bike lanes, sidepaths, and connections through parks and regional trails such as the Illinois Prairie Path and Great Western Trail. The plan emphasizes north–south connectivity across the village’s rail and arterial barriers, better access to the Metra station and schools, and safer crossings of major roads like Roosevelt Road and IL-53. Community input from surveys and an open house strongly shaped the recommendations, highlighting demand for low-stress routes, improved crossings, and more visible, convenient bike parking.

1.3.2 Zoning-Related Recommendations

The plan recommends using zoning and development regulations to institutionalize active transportation infrastructure, especially bike parking, in new private projects. It notes that Glen Ellyn’s current zoning code largely lacks direct bicycle parking requirements (outside of a PUD bonus provision), and calls for adopting explicit minimum bicycle parking standards and incentives for commercial, multifamily, and mixed-use developments. As an example model, the report points to the City of Madison, Wisconsin zoning rewrite, where bicycle parking ratios and design standards were embedded in the ordinance, and suggests adapting a similar approach for Glen Ellyn.

The plan also encourages treating bicycle and pedestrian facilities as standard site plan elements, rather than optional amenities, in zoning and subdivision review. This includes requiring multi-use paths consistent with the village and DuPage County bike plans (as already referenced in local code), and using planned unit development tools to secure internal bike circulation, indoor storage, and connections to regional trails. For downtown and transit-adjacent areas, the report supports using zoning (and related tools like TIF) to prioritize higher-quality bicycle facilities—such as covered, long-term parking near the Metra station and along the Illinois Prairie Path—and to encourage more compact, mixed-use development patterns that make short bike and walk trips more viable.

1.4 Downtown Strategic Plan

1.4.1 Overview

The Downtown Strategic Plan is a 20-year framework to make Downtown Glen Ellyn more economically viable, reduce vacancies, and strengthen its role as the community's civic and commercial heart. It responds to rising retail vacancies and regional competition by combining community input, expert market analysis, and physical planning into an integrated program for land use, circulation, parking, urban design, and implementation. The plan's physical vision centers on a greenway "glen" through the downtown valley, a stronger Main Street corridor with two- and three-story mixed-use buildings, a landmark Metra station, and improved multimodal access and parking north and south of the tracks. A key strategy is to increase the number of residents, office workers, and visitors downtown—via new housing, office and service space, cultural programming, and civic uses—so that daily activity supports a healthier retail and restaurant mix.

1.4.2 Zoning-Related Recommendations

The plan calls for updating the zoning code so it actively supports the desired mixed-use, higher-intensity downtown pattern rather than constraining it. It recommends revising district boundaries and use permissions to increase the supply of mixed-use buildings with ground-floor retail/restaurant and upper-story residential or office, maintain a "no net loss" of core retail space, and encourage more office and service uses at the downtown periphery and above first-floor retail. The plan specifically urges allowing entertainment and cultural uses by right in the downtown (rather than as special uses) and exploring a form-based code to more directly regulate building form, street frontage, and historic compatibility while simplifying approvals.

Historic preservation is to be reinforced through the Historic Downtown District and zoning/overlay tools that protect contributing buildings, support context-sensitive infill, and enable use of tax credits and local incentives for rehabilitation. Parking and access policies are to be realigned with downtown objectives by adopting lower, context-sensitive parking ratios (e.g., 0–3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail, 1 space per 1,000 square feet of office, and 1 space per dwelling unit for new construction), accommodating structured parking with active ground-floor frontages, and recognizing bicycle facilities and covered bike parking as standard site elements near the train station and Illinois Prairie Path.

The plan also recommends zoning support for increased residential density downtown—including at least 450 new dwelling units in mixed-use and residential buildings—and consideration of accessory dwelling units on single-family lots in and near the study area to add "gentle" density. Circulation and streetscape recommendations (such as converting key

People Over Parking Act (SB 2112)

The Illinois People Over Parking Act, prohibits local governments from imposing or enforcing minimum automobile parking requirements for qualifying development projects near transit. It applies to projects within one-half mile of a public transportation hub or one-eighth mile of a public transportation corridor, with some exceptions.

one-way streets to two-way, creating “plaza streets,” and implementing unified streetscape and wayfinding along the full two-mile Main Street corridor) are intended to be embedded in zoning, subdivision, and design standards so they become routine requirements for public and private projects. Finally, the plan calls for amending sign regulations and appearance review guidelines to align with the desired downtown character and for simplifying and partially “administrativizing” approvals, reducing the perception of government hurdles to business openings and reinvestment.

1.5 Streetscape and Parking Study

1.5.1 Overview

The Downtown Streetscape Plan and Parking Study provides a coordinated framework for upgrading streets, sidewalks, public spaces, and parking management in Downtown Glen Ellyn to reinforce its historic character while improving comfort, safety, and access for all users. It inventories existing conditions, defines three streetscape character zones (Urban Core, Urban Transitional, Urban Residential), and proposes a phased, block-by-block toolkit of elements including street trees, lighting, crosswalks, parklets, enhanced alleys, and Prairie Path improvements. On the parking side, the study concludes that overall supply is generally adequate but poorly distributed and signed, and it focuses on better management, wayfinding, and selective structured parking opportunities rather than simply adding more surface spaces. Implementation is explicitly intended to be incremental, coordinated with capital projects (e.g., 2015–2016 resurfacing), and sensitive to maintenance, accessibility, and long-term costs.

1.5.2 Zoning-Related Recommendations

While primarily a design and operations document, the plan implies several zoning and development-code directions that matter for a zoning assessment. First, it establishes clear design expectations for different street types—materials, tree placement, lighting, screening, and pedestrian amenities—that can be translated into zoning-based streetscape standards, corridor overlays, or form-based regulations for the downtown districts. This includes preferred treatments for intersections, mid-block crossings, sidewalk widths, outdoor dining platforms in the parking lane, and parking-lot buffers and rain gardens that zoning and subdivision regulations can require as part of site plan approval.

Second, the study recommends strengthening requirements for parking-lot design and screening, sustainable landscaping, and stormwater practices, which can be incorporated into parking and landscaping sections of the zoning ordinance. Examples include mandatory landscape buffers and low walls along the public realm, tree spacing standards, use of decorative or modular walls where grades require retaining, and support for rain gardens, permeable bases, and “sustainable parking lot prototype” features in public and private lots. The plan also points toward recognizing and encouraging on-street and shared parking (e.g., with churches and private lots) within parking standards and suggests that any future structured parking be integrated with active ground-floor uses—something that can be reinforced through district use and frontage requirements.

Third, the plan emphasizes consistent downtown wayfinding, gateway treatments, and a coherent family of furnishings and lighting, which can be backed by zoning-linked design

guidelines or an overlay requiring conformance for new development and substantial façade or site changes. It also supports continued accommodation of bike racks and future bike facilities in the right-of-way and near the Metra and Prairie Path, reinforcing the case for explicit bicycle parking and access provisions in downtown zoning. Finally, the parking management principles in the study—tiered time limits, employee parking locations, flexible use of lots, and potential future meter technology—provide a basis for revisiting minimum parking ratios and allowing greater reliance on shared, managed public parking in lieu of traditional on-site minimums for downtown uses.

2. Community Input

Much of the analysis in this report draws on the land use goals from the Comprehensive Plan and the extensive engagement that informed that project. In addition to the goals from the Plan, the project team undertook stakeholder interviews (March 2026) and a community survey (March-April 2026). The results from those efforts are summarized below.

2.1 Stakeholder Group Interviews

Three focus groups met over two days as part of the Glen Ellyn zoning code update. On March 18 from 3–4 pm, a Residential Professionals Focus Group convened builders, architects, and long-time practitioners who regularly work with the code. That evening from 6–7 pm, a Residential Focus Group brought together residents, commission members, and a housing advocate to discuss lived experience with the code and housing needs. On March 19 from 3–4 pm, a Commercial & Business Focus Group of downtown business and property owners, a broker, a developer, and a commission chair focused on commercial corridors and the downtown.

2.1.1 Residential Professionals Group

The Residential Professionals group emphasized that widespread nonconformities are the central residential challenge, with many existing homes requiring three to five variances just to complete typical remodels or additions. They pointed to frequent Class 1 and 2 alterations and supported allowing existing nonconforming setbacks to be extended with additions, citing peer communities that differentiate one- and two-story additions and permit extension of nonconforming side yards without variances. Participants highlighted that current lot coverage ratios (often in the 20–25 percent range) and restrictive rear yard setbacks significantly constrain reinvestment, and they suggested raising coverage caps or providing tailored allowances for ranch homes and additions.

Height and accessory regulations were also a focal point for this group. They explained that current ridge and eave height rules, measured from average grade, make certain historic styles difficult to build and create inconsistency across varied topography, recommending instead a mean and maximum height standard measured from a fixed point like the curb, similar to Burr Ridge, Downers Grove, and La Grange. Detached garage standards—especially percentage-based setbacks tied to lot width and a 660-square-foot size cap—were seen as illogical and misaligned with contemporary needs, with participants preferring larger garages (around 720 square feet) and tiered size allowances based on lot width. They also criticized limits on pergola

height, shed and pool house size, and the treatment of decks over seven feet, and asked for code incentives to encourage permeable surfaces.

Finally, the professionals noted that while the administrative variance process generally works, applicants must plan for extended time and cost, and they stressed a strong desire to simplify the zoning code so average residents can understand and use it. They warned that cumbersome regulations, combined with nonconformities, are contributing to teardowns and the loss of naturally occurring affordable housing as owners choose to move rather than seek approvals for renovations. The group also identified inconsistencies such as updated generator setbacks but outdated, more restrictive air conditioning setback standards, suggesting that these mechanical regulations be aligned with peer communities and current technology.

2.1.2 Residential Focus Group

The Residential Focus Group underscored how the zoning code disproportionately impacts historic homes and small lots, many of which are already nonconforming. Routine investments in these properties often trigger variances for setbacks, lot coverage, and garages, adding cost and delay for homeowners. Participants stressed the importance of clearly disclosing a property's nonconforming status at the time of sale so buyers might understand renovation limits and approval requirements, and they praised detached garage bonuses that encourage rear garages and support a more cohesive neighborhood character.

Historic preservation and housing diversity were central themes for this group. Members of the Historic Preservation Commission expressed a strong interest in reducing barriers for designated historic properties by minimizing or eliminating variance requirements for additions and renovations, particularly around lot coverage and setbacks, to make preservation more economically viable. On housing types, participants described obstacles facing community-integrated group homes (typically six to eight residents) that require special use permits and advocated for enabling accessory dwelling units, duplexes, and triplexes, along with mixed-income residential projects that combine market-rate and affordable units, citing Wheaton and Hyde Park as peer examples.

The group also raised concerns about design, environment, and process. They observed that current height and design-related rules can limit context-sensitive or innovative design and noted that residential parking standards downtown constrain the feasibility of higher-density housing. Environmental recommendations included introducing incentives for permeable surfaces, updating lighting and dark-sky standards, reevaluating asphalt sealants and colors to address heat island effects and runoff, maintaining robust landscaping requirements, and emphasizing preservation of native species such as oak trees. On administration, the group felt that cases driven only by existing nonconformities should qualify for administrative variances, that hardship criteria need clearer definitions and examples, and that guidance on underground encroachments and carports (including enclosure standards) is currently lacking. Some participants also suggested creating an Architectural Review Board for residential projects to help protect the Village's identity.

2.1.3 Commercial & Business Focus Group

The Commercial & Business Focus Group focused on aligning commercial zoning with changing market conditions and strengthening downtown vitality. Participants emphasized the need for more flexibility to allow mixed-use and residential development in selected commercial districts, pointing to a large office property on Roosevelt Road that struggled to sell in a weakened office market and highlighting how lengthy rezoning processes can be a barrier. Downtown stakeholders expressed strong interest in preserving a retail-focused core in the C5A Downtown Business District by prioritizing high-activity uses—retail, boutiques, and restaurants—and discouraging low-traffic service uses that diminish foot traffic.


They recommended a more flexible, performance-based use framework rather than long, prescriptive use lists, suggesting, for example, a requirement that a minimum share of floor area be dedicated to active or retail uses. The group noted that property owners and landlords need clearer guidance on permitted uses and procedures and expressed a desire for the Plan Commission to have final decision-making authority in more cases to avoid delays and uncertainty from additional Village Board approvals. They also felt that PUD guidelines are too rigid and not well suited to adaptive reuse or incremental redevelopment, citing parcel consolidation requirements as barriers for sites that are not undergoing full teardown.

Process predictability and public realm activation were recurring themes. Participants suggested engaging the Village Board earlier in major projects—such as through an initial workshop—to align expectations and reduce risk, time, and cost for applicants. They pointed to peer communities like Naperville, Elmhurst, and Wheaton, where patio seating and rooftop patios are often allowed with minimal or no additional permitting, as models for supporting vibrant commercial areas, and encouraged Glen Ellyn to revisit its rules accordingly. Finally, they called for updated retail signage, lighting, and landscaping standards that balance aesthetics and safety with business visibility, and for a stronger role for the Architectural Appearance Commission in reviewing development along key corridors such as downtown and Roosevelt Road.


2.2 Community Survey

2.2.1 Overview of Respondents

The electronic survey received 377 responses, of which the vast majority reported that they currently live in Glen Ellyn, with only a small share indicating they do not currently live in the village (2%). Nearly half of respondents have lived in Glen Ellyn for more than 20 years (48%), about one-fifth for 11–20 years (20%), and another fifth for 5–10 years (17%), while roughly one in eight are more recent residents with less than 5 years in the community (13%). Only seven respondents reported that they do not currently live in Glen Ellyn (2%), underscoring that the sample is dominated by people with a long-standing local perspective. In terms of how they interact with zoning, about nine in ten respondents selected “Resident” as a role (90%), with the remaining 10% not selecting a specific interaction role in that field; other roles such as business owner, property owner, architect/engineer, builder/developer, and board/commission member were less represented among survey respondents relative to Village residents.




How long have you lived in Glen Ellyn?




In what role have you personally interacted with the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code?

Respondents generally report low to moderate familiarity with Glen Ellyn’s zoning code, with only a small share describing themselves as extremely familiar. About one-third rated their familiarity as “2” on the scale (32%), another quarter as “3” (25%), and roughly one quarter explicitly selected “1 (Not at all familiar)” (25%), indicating that more than 80% fall in the lower-to-middle range of familiarity. A smaller group rated their familiarity as “4” (13%), and only about one in twenty chose “5 (Extremely familiar)” (6%), typically those with direct professional or board experience.



How familiar are you with the current Zoning Code?


When asked about how easy the zoning regulations were to understand, the largest number of residents (45%) had not needed to look up the zoning regulations. Of the 55% that had looked up the zoning regulations, a larger number (32%) found the zoning regulations “difficult” to understand, while a remaining 23% found them “easy” to understand.



If you have ever needed to look up Glen Ellyn's zoning regulations, how easy was it for you to find and understand them?

2.2.2 Perceived Balance of Land Uses

Nearly half of respondents say they have no opinion on how well the zoning code balances residential, commercial, and other land uses (45%), reflecting limited familiarity or comfort assessing this question. Among those with an opinion, more people see the code as “Somewhat unbalanced” (24%) than “Balanced” (22%), with smaller groups at the extremes (“Not at all balanced” 7%, “Very balanced” 2%), indicating a modest tilt toward seeing room for improvement rather than clear satisfaction.



How well does the current Zoning Code balance residential, commercial, and other land uses?


An additional open-ended question was asked as a follow-up, asking “If you responded that the Zoning Code is somewhat unbalanced or not at all balanced, please describe where the balance of land uses could be improved.” Responses split in competing directions. Many want more commercial activity, particularly restaurants and retail downtown and along Roosevelt Road, to broaden the tax base. A significant group opposes large apartment buildings and increased density, while an opposing group wants more diverse and affordable housing (ADUs, duplexes, townhomes, missing middle). Common themes include oversized homes on small lots, insufficient tree protection, burdensome permitting for homeowners, inconsistent variance

practices favoring developers, and concerns that South Glen Ellyn bears a disproportionate share of affordable and multi-family housing.

Respondents were asked an open-ended question regarding what land uses, if any, they would like to see more of in Glen Ellyn. The most frequently mentioned desires were more green space/parks, ADUs, restaurants and small retail, and affordable housing options. Respondents wanted to see fewer large apartment/condo buildings, McMansions on small lots, low-income housing (a vocal minority), gas stations, car washes, and chain uses. A notable contingent wants no change at all. Backyard henkeeping appears repeatedly as a specific request.


2.2.3 Housing Type Permissions

Opinions on allowing more diverse types of housing are almost evenly split, with a slight edge toward support. Just over two-fifths say the zoning code should allow more diverse housing such as ADUs, townhomes, and duplexes (Yes 45%), a similar share say it should not (No 43%), and a smaller group are unsure (12%), underscoring a community divided on expanding housing options.




2.2.4 Business Friendliness

Most respondents rate the business climate created by the zoning code as middling to difficult rather than easy. A majority choose the middle option (3) when asked whether the code makes it easy or difficult for local businesses to operate and grow (57%), while another fifth lean toward difficulty (2 at 20%), and 14% see it as “Very difficult,” compared with only 4% at 4 and 3% at “Very easy.”




2.2.5 Environmental and Green Space Protection


Residents generally see the code as providing moderate environmental protection, with many wanting stronger measures. About 39% rate environmental protection in the middle (3), 23% say the code does “pretty well” (4), and 12% say it protects the environment “very well” (5), while 15% rate it at 2 and 10% at “1 (Not well at all),” indicating that roughly one quarter think environmental protections are weak.



2.2.6 Neighborhood Character, Height, and Density


A plurality of respondents feel the zoning code adequately protects neighborhood character, but a sizable minority disagree or are unsure. About 43% say the code does protect their neighborhood’s character, while 30% say it does not and 27% are unsure, suggesting mixed confidence in how consistently character is preserved. On height and density regulations specifically, just over half believe current rules are appropriate for their neighborhood (Yes 53%), nearly a third say they are not (No 29%), and 18% are unsure, indicating that concerns about building scale are present but not universal.





2.2.7 Overall Satisfaction with Zoning Code and Decisions

Overall, residents are more neutral or dissatisfied than satisfied with how zoning decisions are made. About two in five respondents choose "Neutral" (40%), while roughly one third say they are "Dissatisfied" (36%) and 9% are "Very dissatisfied," compared with only 13% "Satisfied" and 3% "Very satisfied," highlighting a broad desire for improved process, communication, or outcomes.



When asked about what they liked most about the current zoning code, the most common positive response is that the code preserves Glen Ellyn's residential character, small-town feel, tree-lined streets, and neighborhood identity. Respondents also appreciate separation of residential and commercial uses, setback and lot coverage rules (when enforced), protection of green space, and the variance/hearing process as a check on development. A large share of respondents answered "unsure," "N/A," or "nothing," reflecting limited familiarity with the code.

Respondents were asked a final open-ended question asking if there is anything else they would like to share about zoning in Glen Ellyn. The dominant themes are frustration with inconsistent and inequitable enforcement — particularly the perception that developers receive variances easily while homeowners face excessive red tape — and Glen Ellyn's reputation as difficult to work with, driving away contractors and businesses. Many call for greater transparency and meaningful resident input in decisions. Tree loss during teardowns and new construction is a

recurring concern. A vocal group wants the downtown character protected from further large-scale development (citing specific buildings as a cautionary example). A smaller but consistent group urges more density and flexibility to keep the village economically competitive with Wheaton, Elmhurst, and Naperville.

3. Assessment of Residential Zoning Standards

3.1 Overview: Review of Residential Zoning Standards

This diagnostic evaluates the residential zoning district structure and related residential regulations that govern how residential properties may be used, maintained, improved, and redeveloped over time. The report focuses on clarity, policy fit, administrative usability, and the extent to which current standards support or constrain practical residential reinvestment and housing choice.

The review covers the RE, R0, R1, R2, R2B, R3, R4, and R5 residential districts, together with related provisions in the definitions, supplementary regulations, compliance, and nonconformities. It also draws on the residential variation record from 2019 through 2025, zoning district area data, adopted planning materials, and information regarding conforming and nonconforming residential lots.

The findings are organized by topic rather than by code section. That structure is intended to make the report easier to use during policy discussion and future ordinance drafting. Each topic includes the same three sections: an overview of current standards or language, analysis of how those standards function, and recommendations for zoning reform.

3.2 Reform Framework

The residential regulations generally reflect a traditional Euclidean district structure, with larger-lot lower-density districts at one end and more flexible or higher-density districts at the other. The main reform need is not simply to change individual numbers; it is to make the residential code easier to read, easier to administer, and better aligned with the Village's stated needs for housing preservation, reinvestment, housing variety, and sustainable site design.

- Consolidate broadly applicable residential standards so they are stated once and cross-referenced only when necessary.
- Recalibrate the standards that most often generate relief requests, especially in the R2 district.
- Create clearer pathways for maintenance, modest expansion, and reinvestment on smaller or nonconforming residential lots or buildings.
- Reduce reliance on historic eligibility tests, repeated exceptions, and technical cross-references that are difficult for homeowners and design professionals to identify at the start of a project.
- Use simpler tables, graphics, and measurement rules so the Code explains what is allowed before it explains exceptions.
- Make sure to communicate to the community that broader housing variety is targeted to plan-identified areas and not intended to up-zone all single-family blocks.

3.3 Residential District Structure and Housing Choice

Reform takeaway: Most residential land is governed by districts that allow detached single-family dwellings by right and provide few by-right options for missing-middle or multifamily housing.

3.3.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The residential districts cover approximately 3,019 acres, or 67.3 percent of Village land. The R2 district is by far the largest residential district, covering approximately 51.6 percent of Village land.

The lower-density districts generally permit detached single-family dwellings by right. The R3 and R4 districts provide the primary conventional zoning path for two-family, attached single-family, and multiple-family housing. The R5 district operates through planned development rather than fixed residential bulk standards.

District	Share of Village Land	Primary Role
RE	1.7%	Estate-scale detached residential development
R0	1.1%	Large-lot detached residential development
R1	4.6%	Lower-density detached residential development
R2	51.6%	Predominant detached residential district
R2B	1.8%	Detached residential district with larger lot requirements than R2
R3	2.0%	Primary district for two-family and small attached residential forms
R4	4.4%	Primary conventional district for multifamily development
R5	0.07%	Planned development district for senior housing/mixed residential forms

The table above provides an understanding of the scale of land within the zoning districts and what is permitted in each one, while the table below presents it differently, building an understanding of which housing types are permitted in which zoning districts.

Housing Type	Current Zoning Path
Detached single-family	Permitted by right in RE, R0, R1, R2, R2B, and R3; special use in R4; planned development path in R5.
Two-family	Permitted by right in R3; special use in R4; planned development path in R5.
Attached single-family	Up to 4 units by right in R3; up to 6 units by special use in R3; up to 6 units by right in R4; planned development path in R5.
Multiple-family	Permitted by right in R4; not listed as a conventional permitted use in R5 despite related parking references.
Group homes and congregate elderly housing	Allowed through varying permitted or special use pathways depending on district and resident count.

3.3.2 Analysis

Because the R2 district covers just over half of the Village, its standards have an outsized practical effect on residential reinvestment. Any issue embedded in R2, including lot coverage, side-yard standards, height cross-references, and nonconforming-lot rules, affects more properties than a similar issue in any other residential district.

The district structure preserves established neighborhood form, but it also concentrates housing choice in a small number of districts. Detached single-family development is widely available by right, while two-family, attached, multifamily, senior, and group living options depend on R3, R4, R5 (collectively, only 7% of the Village), special use review, or planned development. This structure limits the ability of the base zoning map to support a broader range of household needs.

3.3.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Treat R2 as the primary implementation district for residential reform because changes to R2 standards will have the broadest practical effect.
- Evaluate whether additional modest housing types should be permitted by right or through a streamlined process in selected locations now limited to detached single-family development.
- Clarify the intended role of each residential district so the district lineup reads as a coherent housing policy, not only as a sequence of lot-size categories.
- Consider whether R0, R1, R2, and R2B should remain separate districts if their main policy distinction is minimum lot size rather than distinct neighborhood or housing objectives.
- Use R3 and R4 as the basis for a clearer missing-middle and multifamily framework, including standards that are organized by dwelling type.

3.4 Code Organization and Administrative Usability

Reform takeaway: The substance of many standards can be preserved while making the Code shorter, easier to navigate, and less dependent on repeated district-by-district text.

3.4.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The residential district sections repeat common language related to applicability, lot coverage, height, accessory structures, porches, detached garages, projections, and measurement rules. Related standards are also split among district regulations, definitions, supplementary regulations, and nonconformity provisions.

Several recurring provisions are not inherently district-specific. Instead, they operate as general residential standards that apply across multiple districts but are repeated or cross-referenced in separate district sections.

3.4.2 Analysis

The current organization makes routine zoning review more difficult than necessary. A homeowner, architect, contractor, or staff reviewer may need to move between definitions, district text, supplementary tables, notes, exceptions, and nonconformity provisions before determining whether a common improvement is allowed.

Repetition also increases maintenance risk. If the same rule appears in several places, future amendments must be made consistently in each location. If one provision is missed, the Code can develop internal conflicts or unintended distinctions.

Current Pattern	Practical Effect	Reform Direction
Repeated district text	Adds length without adding policy distinction.	State common rules once in a general residential standards section.
Cross-referenced height standards	Requires users to leave their district section to find a core bulk standard.	Either restate the rule in each district or create a single general height section.
Supplementary tables for common improvements	Important rules for porches, decks, patios, driveways, and accessory structures are hard to find.	Organize common residential improvements in one user-facing subsection.
Historic eligibility tests (narrow residential development exceptions that rely on existing neighborhood character, plat history, and surrounding development patterns)	Requires ownership and lot history information that may not be readily available.	Use objective current-lot standards where feasible.

3.4.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Create a general residential standards article or division for provisions that apply across multiple residential districts.
- Limit district sections to standards that materially differ by district, such as permitted uses, lot dimensions, yard requirements, height, and lot coverage.
- Move generally applicable measurement, interpretation, projection, accessory structure, driveway, parking, and nonconforming-lot rules into a generally applicable development standard section.
- Use cross-references sparingly and only after the operative standard is easy to locate from the district page.
- Replace long narrative exceptions with concise tables where the table can state the regulated item, allowed location, dimensional limit, and applicable notes.

3.5 Common Residential Improvements and Accessory Structures

Reform takeaway: The Code regulates routine improvements, such as porches, decks, dormers, detached garages, and accessory structures, through too many scattered rules and qualifying conditions.

3.5.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

Common residential improvements are addressed in several locations. The Code includes district-specific lot coverage exclusions for detached garages and front porches, supplementary

rules for accessory buildings and structures, yard projection tables, and separate height or measurement standards for certain features.

Accessory building standards include a limit of three accessory buildings on a zoning lot and no more than one of each type unless authorized by special use permit. The Code does not clearly explain what counts as a separate accessory building type.

3.5.2 Analysis

The current approach is overly technical for improvements that homeowners commonly seek. For example, a front porch may be subject to a definition, a yard projection rule, a lot coverage exclusion, openness requirements, and minimum depth requirements. A detached garage may require review of accessory structure standards, lot coverage exceptions, garage-door orientation rules, and height measurement standards.

The standards also use indirect incentives, such as excluding certain porch or garage areas from lot coverage, to encourage design outcomes. Those incentives may support good urban design, but they also add calculations and may conflict with stormwater-management goals if they encourage additional covered or paved area without a coordinated site-design framework.

Improvement Type	Current Issue	Simpler Code Treatment
Front porches	Defined separately and linked to coverage exclusions, openness rules, and yard projection standards.	State allowed encroachment, minimum depth, optional coverage treatment, and enclosure limit in one table row.
Detached garages	Coverage exclusion, orientation rules, accessory standards, and garage height rules are spread across sections.	Use a direct detached garage standard with size, placement, height, and coverage treatment stated together.
Dormers and roof features	Height exceptions are embedded in district notes and cross-references.	Create a residential height exception table organized by feature type.
Small accessory structures	Rules depend on definitions, accessory structure provisions, and coverage thresholds.	State number, size, setback, and coverage treatment in one accessory structure subsection.

3.5.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Create one residential improvements table that identifies common improvements, where they may be located, applicable setbacks, height or size limits, lot coverage treatment, and any design conditions.
- Clarify the accessory building type limitation or replace it with a simpler maximum number and/or maximum cumulative area standard.
- Move detached garage and front porch lot coverage exceptions into a single lot coverage or residential improvements section.
- Replace complex bonus-based rules with direct dimensional standards where feasible, such as a maximum square footage, maximum height, or minimum setback.

- Retain incentives for front porches and rear-lot garages only if the standards are easy to administer and coordinated with stormwater, impervious surface, and site design requirements.

3.6 Driveways, Parking Placement, and Impervious Surface

Reform takeaway: The standards for paving, parking, and impervious surface should be consolidated and updated to support clearer review and more sustainable site design.

3.6.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

Driveways, paved parking areas, impervious surface coverage, and impervious surface setbacks are regulated through multiple provisions, including yard coverage limits, parking placement standards, driveway width and material rules, and setback formulas based on lot width.

The Code limits impervious surface within required yards. In R0, R1, R2, and R3, up to 50 percent of each required front, corner side, and rear yard may be impervious surface. In R4, up to 35 percent of the front yard may be impervious surface. In the RE district, up to 25 percent of each required front, corner side, and rear yard may be impervious surface.

Driveways are required to be surfaced with asphalt, concrete, brick, paver stone, or a similar hard surface material. Enlarged or expanded driveways and properties with principal structure or garage expansions must be brought into compliance with this standard.

3.6.2 Analysis

The standards are trying to manage overpaving, parking location, driveway design, and stormwater impacts, but they do so through a fragmented structure. A user must determine yard area coverage, required parking location, driveway width, surface material, and impervious-surface setbacks from separate provisions.

The variation record shows that impervious surface setback relief is a recurring issue. From 2019 through 2025, eight approved variations involved impervious surface setbacks, including driveways, walkways, and patios. Half of those lots had nonconforming lot widths, and nearly 40 percent had lot widths under 50 feet. This suggests that the standards are especially difficult to apply on smaller or constrained lots.

The hard-surface driveway requirement may discourage lower-impact driveway designs, such as ribbon driveways or split-track systems, even where those designs could reduce impervious coverage and better align with stormwater and green-space objectives.

Variation Type	Approved Requests	Typical Improvement	Reform Signal
Impervious surface setbacks	8	Driveways, walkways, patios	A recurring relief category tied to constrained lots and nonconforming widths.
Driveways	5	Driveway location or setback relief	Driveway standards should be clearer and more flexible where site constraints exist.

Walkways	3	Walkway placement/ setback relief	Pedestrian access improvements should be regulated with proportionate standards.
Patios	2	Patio placement/ setback relief	Rear-yard and side-yard paved areas should be handled in the same site-design framework.

3.6.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Consolidate driveway, parking placement, paved area, and impervious surface standards into one residential site design subsection.
- Clarify how front-yard paving limits, required parking spaces, driveway width, and impervious surface setbacks interact.
- Review whether the current mix of yard-area percentages and lot-width setback formulas can be replaced with a simpler and more predictable standard.
- Revise the driveway material standard to allow sustainable low-impact driveway designs, including ribbon driveways, split-track systems, permeable pavers, or other approved designs.
- Consider eliminating the separate impervious surface setback table and using a more consistent accessory-use setback standard for paved surfaces, with a specific exception for driveways where appropriate.
- Use the variation data for lots under 50 feet wide to test any revised paving or setback standard before adoption.

3.7 Definitions, Terminology, and Measurement Rules

Reform takeaway: The Code should distinguish definitions from operative standards and move commonly used measurement rules into one central location.

3.7.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The Code uses overlapping terminology for accessory buildings, accessory structures, buildings, projections, lot measurements, grade, average existing grade, eave height, fence height, detached garage height, and impervious surface setbacks.

Several measurement rules are embedded in district standards, definitions, notes, figures, or supplementary regulations. Examples include front yard measurement, lot width and frontage measurement, grade and average existing grade, garage orientation on curved lots, eave height, detached garage height, fence height, and impervious surface setback measurement.

3.7.2 Analysis

The current structure makes definitions perform too much work. Definitions should explain terms, while operative standards should tell users what is permitted, prohibited, measured, or required. When substantive standards are embedded in definitions or dispersed notes, users may miss key requirements.

Measurement rules are essential to consistent administration, but they are currently too dispersed. Staff and applicants must first identify the applicable standard and then determine

where the Code explains how the standard is measured. This increases the risk of inconsistent interpretation and repeated plan revisions.

3.7.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Create a consolidated “Measurements and Rules of Interpretation” section for residential zoning review.
- Move generally applicable measurement rules out of district notes and supplementary tables where feasible.
- Use definitions only to define terms; place substantive permissions, prohibitions, and dimensional standards in operative code sections.
- Clarify and consolidate accessory building, accessory structure, and accessory use terminology.
- Add diagrams for the measurements most likely to cause interpretation issues, including front yard measurement, corner lots, lot width, average grade, height, and impervious surface setback.

3.8 Lot Size Standards

Reform takeaway: Lot size standards generally follow a logical density progression, but the R2 variation record shows that smaller and nonconforming lots need a clearer reinvestment path.

3.8.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The residential districts generally progress from larger-lot lower-density standards in RE, R0, and R1 to smaller-lot and more compact standards in R2, R3, and R4. R2B is an exception because it has larger minimum lot width and area requirements than R2, R3, and R4.

For detached single-family dwellings, required minimum lot area ranges from 50,000 square feet in RE to 8,712 square feet in R2, R3, and R4. Minimum lot width ranges from 150 feet in RE to 66 feet for interior lots in R2, R3, and R4. Corner lots typically require additional width.

District	Interior Lot Width	Corner Lot Width	Lot Depth	Lot Area
RE	150 ft.	150 ft.	160 ft.	50,000 sq. ft.
R0	100 ft.	100 ft.	150 ft.	18,000 sq. ft.
R1	90 ft.	108 ft.	130 ft.	14,500 sq. ft.
R2	66 ft.	80 ft.	110 ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
R2B	75 ft.	90 ft.	110 ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
R3	66 ft.	80 ft.	110 ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
R4	66 ft.	80 ft.	100 ft.	8,712 sq. ft.

3.8.2 Analysis

Minimum lot size standards provide a basic intensity control and help maintain established development patterns. However, they also determine whether existing smaller lots can be used, improved, or reinvested in without relief.

The variation record strongly points to the R2 district. Of 82 residential lots with approved variations from 2019 through 2025, 76 were in R2. Forty-one of the 82 lots were nonconforming, and 40 of those nonconforming lots were in R2. Twenty lots were nonconforming as to both width and area.

This pattern does not necessarily mean that all R2 dimensional standards are inappropriate. It does show that R2 contains many older or constrained lots where current dimensional standards and related nonconformity rules regularly interact with routine residential improvements.

Variation Finding	Count / Share	Meaning for Reform
Residential lots with approved variations in R2	76 of 82; 92.7%	R2 should be the main test district for residential bulk reform.
Lots with approved variations that were nonconforming	41 of 82; 50.0%	Relief is strongly connected to existing lot constraints.
Nonconforming variation lots located in R2	40 of 41	The interaction between R2 standards and nonconforming-lot rules should be simplified.
Lots nonconforming as to both width and area	20 of 82; 24.4%	Code amendments should account for lots that cannot realistically meet both current dimensions.

3.8.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Use the variation record as a calibration tool when revising R2 lot standards and related bulk requirements.
- Evaluate whether minimum lot area and width standards should be adjusted for existing lots, infill lots, or lots that were lawfully created under prior standards.
- Review corner-lot width premiums to determine whether they are necessary in each district or whether they create avoidable nonconformities.
- Reevaluate the R2B district's larger lot requirements and clarify whether the district serves a distinct planning purpose.
- Create a clearer by-right path for modest reinvestment on smaller or nonconforming lots where the improvement is compatible with neighborhood character.

3.9 Yard Standards

Reform takeaway: Yard standards are central to neighborhood form, but the current side-yard and front-yard rules create recurring pressure points on constrained lots.

3.9.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

Required yards generally decrease as districts move from estate-scale to more compact residential development. Front yard requirements range from 60 feet in RE to 30 feet in R2, R2B, R3, and R4. Rear yard requirements range from 60 feet in RE and R0 to 30 feet in R2B, R3, and R4.

Interior side yards combine fixed minimums and percentage-based standards in most districts. RE requires a 30-foot interior side yard. R0, R1, R2, R2B, R3, and R4 use a base side-yard requirement or a percentage of lot width.

District	Front Yard	Interior Side Yard	Rear Yard
RE	60 ft.	30 ft.	60 ft.
R0	50 ft.	15 ft. or 15% of lot width	60 ft.
R1	40 ft.	9 ft. or 10% of lot width	50 ft.
R2	30 ft.	6.5 ft. or 10% of lot width	40 ft.
R2B	40 ft.	7.5 ft. or 10% of lot width	30 ft.
R3	40 ft.	6.6 ft. or 10% of lot width	30 ft.
R4	30 ft.	6.6 ft. or 10% of lot width	30 ft.

3.9.2 Analysis

Yard standards help maintain spacing, light, air, and neighborhood rhythm. However, they can become difficult to apply on narrow or nonconforming lots, particularly when side-yard formulas are combined with lot coverage, height, porch, garage, or nonconformity rules.

The R2 variation record shows recurring pressure around interior side yards and front yards. Interior side yard relief appeared in 18 R2 variation lots, and front yard relief appeared in seven. Several interior side yard requests involved additions, enclosed rooms, porches, decks, dormers, or similar reinvestment projects, suggesting that the issue is tied to ordinary home improvement rather than only unusual development proposals.

R2 Yard Variation Type	Approved Lots	Common Context
Interior side yard	17	Additions, enclosed rooms, porches, decks, dormers, and other common improvements.
Front yard	7	Projects affected by base front yard requirements or adjacent-structure alignment.
Rear yard	7	Additions, rooftop decks, site improvements, and garage-related improvements.

3.9.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Review R2 interior side yard standards against actual lot widths, nonconforming-lot patterns, and typical home improvement projects.
- Consider whether side-yard formulas should be simplified or whether a separate standard should apply to legally existing narrow lots.
- Clarify front-yard averaging or adjacent-structure alignment rules so they are easier to apply and less likely to trigger relief for compatible additions.
- Review corner side yard requirements and nonconforming-lot adjustments to determine whether current standards create avoidable relief requests.
- Coordinate yard revisions with lot coverage and height standards so one-dimensional fix does not simply shift the same problem to another relief category.

3.10 Lot Coverage and Height

Reform takeaway: Lot coverage and height controls should be retained, but their current organization and bonus structure should be simplified.

3.10.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

For R0, R1, R2, R2B, and R3, the Code repeats lot coverage standards for single-family dwellings and accessory buildings. The standards distinguish between one-story dwellings and dwellings of more than one story, with recurring 35 percent and 20 percent thresholds.

The Code also includes repeated lot coverage exclusions or bonuses for detached garages and front porches. Height standards are cross-referenced in several districts, with the R2 height section functioning as the operative single-family height rule for multiple other districts.

3.10.2 Analysis

Lot coverage and height standards are appropriate tools for managing building bulk and neighborhood scale. The issue is not the existence of these controls, but their complexity. Repeating the same thresholds in multiple districts, splitting exceptions into separate provisions, and relying on bonuses creates avoidable review steps.

The R2 variation record shows lot coverage as the most frequent R2 relief category. Twenty-three R2 lots were approved for lot coverage relief. Interior side yard relief followed with 18 lots. Height relief appeared less often but remains difficult to navigate because the applicable height standards are cross-referenced and include detailed bonus provisions.

Bonus-based approaches can support design objectives, such as encouraging front porches or detached garages. However, when the bonus is the main way to achieve a policy goal, users must calculate exceptions rather than apply a direct standard. That is especially burdensome on constrained lots.

R2 Relief Category	Approved Lots	Reform Signal
Lot coverage	23	Most frequent R2 relief category; recalibrate or simplify coverage standards and exceptions.
Interior side yard	17	Side-yard requirements should be tested against common additions and narrow lots.
Front yard	7	Clarify base front-yard and alignment rules.
Rear yard	7	Coordinate rear-yard requirements with accessory structures, additions, and site improvements.
Height	5	Height rules should be easier to locate and apply, even if numerical limits remain.

3.10.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Move shared lot coverage standards and exceptions into one general residential lot coverage section.
- Review whether the distinction between one-story and more-than-one-story dwellings remains necessary or whether a simpler coverage structure would be easier to administer.

- Reevaluate R2 lot coverage thresholds using the recent variation record, especially for lots that are nonconforming as to width, area, or both.
- Replace detached garage and front porch bonus rules with direct standards where feasible.
- If height standards apply across multiple districts, either state them directly in each district or relocate them to a general residential height section.
- Reformat height exceptions for dormers, porches, turrets, and similar architectural features into a concise table organized by feature.

3.11 Nonconformities and Existing Residential Development

Reform takeaway: Rules for smaller lots, existing homes, and nonconformities should be easier to find and less dependent on historic facts that are difficult to verify.

3.11.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

Section 10-4-1 and Chapter 10-8 both regulate how existing residential lots and structures may continue, be improved, be rebuilt, or be expanded. Several provisions apply specifically to R2 or to single-family development even though they are located in sections that otherwise apply generally across the Village.

The provisions use recurring thresholds, including 50 feet of lot width and 6,534 square feet of lot area, to determine whether certain single-family lots and dwellings may be used, improved, altered, reconstructed, or enlarged.

3.11.2 Analysis

The nonconformity framework is one of the most important areas for reform because it affects older homes and smaller lots that are central to housing preservation and neighborhood reinvestment. The current structure is difficult to use because relevant rules are split among general compliance provisions, nonconformity rules, definitions, and R2 district standards.

The standards rely on technical classifications and fact-specific eligibility tests, including ownership history, prior lot status, prior variations, and existing nonconforming coverage or setbacks. Those facts may not be known to property owners, designers, or staff at the beginning of a project.

The result is a less predictable process for maintaining or modestly expanding older homes. The rules may preserve some opportunity for continued use, but the path is narrow, conditional, and difficult to understand.

Current Issue	Practical Effect	Reform Objective
R2 and single-family-specific provisions are located in general sections.	Users may not know to look outside the district section.	Place these rules where R2 and existing-home users can find them.
50-foot / 6,534-square-foot thresholds recur in multiple sections.	Creates a repeated but not clearly explained policy threshold.	Organize thresholds as one coherent rule and test whether the numbers remain appropriate.

Eligibility may depend on ownership history or prior lot status.	Difficult to verify early in the design process.	Use current objective standards where feasible.
Nonconforming coverage or setbacks further limit improvements.	Compatible reinvestment may still require relief.	Permit modest improvements when impacts are controlled.

3.11.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Reorganize smaller-lot, nonconforming-lot, and existing single-family dwelling provisions into one clearly labeled section.
- Clarify how Class I, II, and III alteration and addition categories apply without requiring users to rely on definitions alone – assess the use and utility of the alteration categories.
- Reevaluate the 50-foot width and 6,534-square-foot area thresholds to determine whether they continue to support housing preservation, reinvestment, and attainable housing goals.
- Reduce or eliminate reliance on historical ownership, prior lot configuration, and prior variation history where a current objective standard can be used instead.
- Create a clearer by-right path for maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and modest expansion of existing homes on smaller or nonconforming lots, subject to compatibility standards.

3.12 District-Specific Findings and Reform Direction

Reform takeaway: Most district-specific reforms should clarify purpose, simplify presentation, and focus substantive recalibration where the standards generate recurring friction.

3.12.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The residential districts contain a mix of common standards and unique provisions. Some district-specific text reflects legacy conditions, such as annexation agreements or former zoning classifications. Other district differences reflect intended changes in density, housing type, or development review process.

The most significant district-specific issue is R2 because it covers the largest share of Village land and accounts for the overwhelming majority of approved residential variations. R5 is also notable because it operates almost entirely through planned development rather than conventional district standards.

3.12.2 Analysis

RE, R0, and R1 generally function as larger-lot detached residential districts. Their reform needs are primarily organizational unless the Village chooses to revisit the policy role of large-lot zoning. R2B appears to function similarly to a detached single-family district with larger lot requirements than R2, R3, and R4, so its distinct purpose should be clarified.

R3 and R4 carry most of the zoning code's conventional housing-choice function. R3 permits two-family dwellings and smaller attached residential forms; R4 is the primary conventional multifamily district. Because these districts cover relatively limited land area, their ability to meet

broader housing needs depends on whether the Village is comfortable expanding similar standards, adding transition districts, or allowing more housing types in additional locations.

R5 is very limited in geographic application and does not contain fixed lot, yard, height, or coverage standards. That structure provides flexibility but little predictability. The district should either be repurposed with clearer standards or removed/replaced in a way that preserves existing approvals.

District	Primary Finding	Recommended Direction
RE	Limited estate district with legacy yard, lot, and height provisions.	Group legacy provisions and clarify their applicability; simplify height presentation.
R0	Large-lot detached district with few unique provisions.	Review lot and yard standards with adjacent districts; otherwise rely on common reform topics.
R1	Lower-density detached district with limited unique issues.	Evaluate whether standards remain calibrated to existing lots and desired reinvestment.
R2	Largest district and primary source of approved residential variations.	Make R2 the main recalibration district for coverage, yards, height, and nonconformities.
R2B	Detached district with larger lot requirements than R2/R3/R4.	Clarify purpose; consider recalibration or consolidation.
R3	Primary district for two-family and smaller attached residential forms.	Retain housing-choice role and present standards by dwelling type.
R4	Primary conventional multifamily district.	Maintain higher-density role; clarify standards and review detached/two-family special use treatment.
R5	Planned development district with minimal fixed standards and very limited application.	Retain with clearer purpose and standards, or remove/replace while preserving existing approvals.

3.12.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Clarify the policy purpose of each residential district in a short intent statement.
- For RE, consolidate date-based legacy provisions and annexation-related exceptions so they are easier to locate and administer.
- For R0 and R1, focus on common residential standards and review whether their lot and yard requirements remain appropriate relative to adjacent districts.
- For R2, prioritize recalibration of lot coverage, interior side yards, front-yard rules, nonconforming-lot provisions, and height organization.
- For R2B, determine whether the district should remain distinct, be recalibrated, or be consolidated with another detached residential district.
- For R3 and R4, present dimensional standards by housing type and confirm that use permissions align with the Village's desired missing-middle and multifamily strategy.
- For R5, decide whether to retain the district as a planned development tool, add predictable base standards, or remove the district while preserving existing planned development approvals.

3.13 Implementation Priorities

Reform takeaway: The most effective reform sequence is to simplify the residential code structure first, then recalibrate the standards most connected to recurring variation requests.

3.13.1 Overview of Existing Standards/Language

The zoning reform recommendations can be implemented in phases. Some reforms are primarily organizational and can be advanced without making major policy changes. Others require policy direction because they may affect housing choice, dimensional flexibility, or development review thresholds.

3.13.2 Analysis

A phased approach will help separate readability improvements from substantive policy decisions. The first phase should focus on code architecture: common residential standards, measurement rules, terminology, tables, and district formatting. The second phase should focus on recalibration of the standards that generate recurring relief, especially in R2. The third phase should address broader housing choice, district consolidation, and potential map or use changes.

3.13.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

- Phase 1: Reorganize residential code architecture, including common standards, measurement rules, accessory structures, projections, driveways, parking, and impervious surface.
- Phase 2: Recalibrate high-friction R2 standards, including lot coverage, interior side yards, front yards, height organization, and nonconforming-lot rules.
- Phase 3: Evaluate district purpose and housing choice, including the role of R2B, R3, R4, and R5 and potential missing-middle housing reforms.
- Phase 4: Prepare user-facing tables and diagrams for homeowners, staff, and design professionals.
- Phase 5: Test draft standards against recent variation examples before adoption to confirm whether the amendments would reduce unnecessary relief requests while preserving neighborhood compatibility.

Priority	Action	Expected Benefit
1	Create a general residential standards section.	Shorter district sections and easier administration.
2	Centralize measurements and definitions.	Fewer interpretation disputes and clearer plan review.
3	Rework R2 lot coverage and side-yard standards.	Reduced need for routine relief on constrained residential lots.
4	Simplify nonconformity and smaller-lot rules.	Clearer reinvestment path for older homes and existing lots.
5	Clarify housing-choice districts and R5.	More predictable implementation of long-range housing policy.

3.14 Recommended Code Reorganization

The following outline shows one way to reorganize the residential zoning regulations so common rules are easier to find and district sections remain concise. This is not intended as ordinance language; it is a drafting framework for the next phase of zoning reform.

Proposed Section	Purpose
Residential Districts and Intent Statements	State the purpose, permitted uses, and district-specific dimensional standards for each residential district.
Common Residential Standards	Collect generally applicable standards for accessory structures, projections, porches, decks, garages, and similar improvements.
Residential Site Design	Consolidate driveway, parking placement, paved area, impervious surface, and low-impact design standards.
Measurements and Rules of Interpretation	Centralize lot, yard, height, grade, frontage, and impervious surface measurement rules.
Existing Lots, Existing Homes, and Nonconformities	Provide one coherent framework for maintenance, expansion, reconstruction, and reinvestment on smaller and nonconforming lots.
Residential Use and Housing Type Tables	Present housing types and review procedures clearly by district, including missing-middle and multifamily options.
District-Specific Exceptions	Retain only those exceptions that are unique, necessary, and easy to administer.

This structure would allow the Village to preserve the policy choices that remain important while removing much of the repetition and cross-referencing that currently exist.

4. Review of Commercial Zoning Districts

4.1 Analysis of Commercial Zoning Districts

The Village's commercial zoning districts carry much of the responsibility for implementing the 2023 Comprehensive Plan's direction on reinvestment, placemaking, housing choice, multimodal access, tax-base diversification, and compatibility with established neighborhoods. The existing district structure contains several useful building blocks, especially the distinction between neighborhood-scale commercial areas, auto-oriented commercial corridors, the downtown core, and institutional/light industrial settings. However, the code also reflects an older regulatory model that relies on long lists of highly specific uses, high parking ratios, planned development requirements for many routine changes, and limited form-based direction.

The following analysis reviews each commercial or commercial-adjacent district in terms of its current regulatory role, its alignment with Comprehensive Plan goals, and recommended zoning reforms. The recommendations are intended to make the code clearer, more predictable, and more closely calibrated to the different physical contexts of Glen Ellyn's commercial areas.

4.2 C1 Community College

4.2.1 Intent and Overview

The C1 District is currently reserved and has no active regulatory framework or mapped application. It functions as an unused placeholder in the zoning code. Because the district has no established purpose, use permissions, dimensional standards, or design expectations, it does not currently help implement the Comprehensive Plan's goals for neighborhood commercial areas, corridor reinvestment, mixed-use development, or transition areas.

4.2.2 Analysis

Maintaining a reserved district in the middle of the commercial district sequence adds unnecessary complexity for code users. It also creates a missed opportunity. The Comprehensive Plan identifies Downtown and Stacy's Corners as neighborhood commercial centers and calls for commercial areas that provide everyday goods and services, attractive streetscapes, pedestrian-oriented environments, and appropriate buffering near residential neighborhoods. A reserved C1 district does not advance those goals.

The Village could either eliminate the district or repurpose it to fill a gap in the current district structure. If repurposed, C1 could become a small-scale neighborhood commercial district intended for Stacy's Corners and similar local-serving nodes where commercial activity should be compatible with surrounding residential character. This would allow the code to distinguish between traditional neighborhood commercial areas, corridor commercial areas, downtown mixed-use areas, and more service-oriented commercial environments.

4.2.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

The C1 District should either be removed from the code or converted into a purposeful district that implements an identified planning objective.

- Eliminate C1 if the Village does not need an additional commercial district category.
- If retained, repurpose C1 as a "Neighborhood Commercial" or "Legacy Neighborhood Commercial" district for Stacy's Corners and similar small-scale commercial nodes.
- Calibrate the district around small-format retail, restaurant, service, office, civic, and limited mixed-use buildings that can fit comfortably near residential neighborhoods.
- Include frontage, entrance, transparency, pedestrian connection, landscape, lighting, and residential-edge transition standards rather than relying only on use permissions.
- Avoid importing auto-oriented uses or large-format corridor uses into a future C1 district unless those uses are carefully limited or treated as conditional/special uses.

4.3 C2 Community Commercial District

4.3.1 Intent and Overview

The C2 Community Commercial District is intended to provide basic services and convenience shopping for adjacent neighborhoods and the community as a whole. It permits a broad mix of

retail, personal service, restaurant, office, and similar neighborhood-serving uses. The district has relatively modest dimensional standards, including no required front yard, a 10-foot rear yard, no side yard except where adjacent to or across an alley from residential zoning, a 35-foot base height limit, and a general parking ratio of one space per 250 square feet for many uses.

4.3.2 Analysis

C2 is generally aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's concept of neighborhood commercial development, but the current standards do not fully express the form or compatibility expectations that the Plan emphasizes. The use list is broad and includes many older, highly specific use descriptions. Several auto-oriented uses are allowed as special uses, including car washes, automobile repair, automotive sales and service, drive-in commercial facilities, and service stations. These may be appropriate in some locations, but they are not necessarily compatible with all neighborhood commercial settings.

The district also lacks a strong set of pedestrian, frontage, and site-design standards. The Comprehensive Plan calls for neighborhood commercial areas that provide day-to-day goods and services while functioning as activity centers, gathering places, and walkable destinations. It also emphasizes buffering, attractive screening, landscaping, and pedestrian infrastructure where commercial areas are embedded in residential contexts. C2's dimensional standards address basic setbacks and residential-edge yards but do not create a full framework for building orientation, storefront design, internal pedestrian connections, parking placement, or lighting.

Parking requirements are another point of tension. A one-space-per-250-square-foot baseline may be higher than needed for smaller mixed-use or neighborhood-serving commercial uses, particularly where shared parking or walkable access is available. Overly rigid parking requirements can make reinvestment harder on constrained sites and can reinforce auto-oriented site layouts.

4.3.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C2 should be refined into a clear neighborhood- or community-commercial district that supports local services, walkability, and compatibility with adjacent residential areas.

- Reframe C2 with a concise purpose statement tied to Stacy's Corners and similar nodes.
- Consolidate the long use list into broader modern use categories such as retail sales, personal services, eating and drinking establishments, office, medical office, indoor recreation, and civic/institutional.
- Treat auto-oriented uses, drive-throughs, outdoor storage, and intensive service uses as conditional/special uses subject to location, access, screening, and site-design standards.
- Add frontage standards that require buildings to address the street, provide visible entrances, maintain pedestrian connections, and avoid parking-dominated frontages where walkable character is desired.

- Right-size parking minimums and allow shared parking, cross-access, bicycle parking, and EV charging to satisfy modern access needs without overbuilding surface parking.
- Strengthen residential-edge standards for landscape buffers, lighting, service-area screening, refuse enclosure placement, noise control, and loading location.

4.4 C3 Service Commercial District

4.4.1 Intent and Overview

The C3 Service Commercial District is designed to allow a wide range of retail and service uses, including motorist-oriented and auto-intensive activities that may be incompatible with uses encouraged in other business districts. It accommodates many of the use types typically associated with the Roosevelt Road corridor, including auto sales and service, building material sales, restaurants, offices, clinics, hotels, theaters, animal hospitals, and other retail and service uses. The district requires a 40-foot front yard, a 30-foot rear yard, 10-foot side yards, increased yards near residential districts, a 45-foot base height limit, and a general parking ratio of one space per 250 square feet for many uses.

4.4.2 Analysis

C3 is the Village's main tool for auto-oriented commercial areas, but its standards reinforce the very strip-commercial conditions the Comprehensive Plan seeks to improve over time. The Plan recognizes Roosevelt Road as a major economic engine and regional corridor, but it also calls for reinvestment in aging properties, more efficient use of land, better multimodal access, improved corridor image, consolidated access drives, shared parking, stronger landscaping, and selective multi-family or mixed-use development near commercial amenities.

The existing C3 standards still assume deep setbacks, front-loaded parking, and separated single-use development. The 40-foot front yard and parking expectations can make it difficult to bring buildings closer to the street, add liner buildings, create pedestrian-scaled frontages, or redevelop shallow corridor parcels. The district also includes a wide range of auto, storage, contractor, light manufacturing, and other intensive uses, some by right and some by special use. While those uses may be necessary in select locations, a single C3 district may not be refined enough to distinguish between high-visibility redevelopment areas, stable service-commercial areas, and locations where transition to residential or mixed-use development is appropriate.

The Comprehensive Plan's corridor recommendations suggest that C3 should evolve from a permissive service-commercial district into a more context-sensitive corridor framework. Different segments of Roosevelt Road may need different standards for access management, building placement, parking location, landscaping, cross-access, and residential transitions.

4.4.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C3 should be recalibrated to support corridor reinvestment while still accommodating necessary auto-oriented and service uses in appropriate locations.

- Consider splitting C3 into context-specific districts or overlays, such as "Corridor Commercial," "Corridor Mixed-Use," and "Auto/Service Commercial."

- Reduce or make flexible the required front setback where redevelopment can provide improved streetscape, pedestrian access, landscape buffering, and building orientation.
- Require or incentivize parking to the side or rear of buildings where feasible, with strong perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping where front parking remains necessary.
- Add access-management standards requiring cross-access, shared driveways, consolidated curb cuts, rear access drives where feasible, and recorded easements for multi-parcel redevelopment.
- Establish corridor design standards for façade articulation, primary entrances, pedestrian routes through parking lots, screening of loading/service areas, and landscaped street edges.
- Limit the most intensive uses, including outdoor storage, vehicle storage, contractor yards, light manufacturing, and payday/check-cashing/currency exchange uses, to locations where they will not undermine reinvestment, corridor image, or adjacent residential compatibility. Explore inclusion of low-impact production, cottage industry production, or maker/flex space.
- Allow mixed-use or multi-family development in targeted locations where the Comprehensive Plan identifies transition areas or redevelopment opportunities, while preserving active commercial frontage along Roosevelt Road where appropriate.
- Add low-impact development and green infrastructure requirements for major redevelopment, including bioswales, rain gardens, permeable pavement, landscaped medians, and stormwater-integrated parking lot islands.

4.5 C4 Office District

4.5.1 Intent and Overview

The C4 Office District is intended primarily to accommodate office buildings, civic and governmental structures, clinics, research laboratories, private schools, studios, broadcasting studios, and limited sales, personal service, or eating establishments within office buildings. The district permits office and related uses by right, while allowing certain residential care, daycare, restaurant, automotive, warehouse, and public uses by special use. The district requires a 40-foot front yard, a 20-foot rear yard, 10-foot side yards, increased yards near residential districts, a 45-foot base height limit, and parking ratios similar to the other commercial districts.

4.5.2 Analysis

C4 reflects a conventional single-use office district model. That model is less consistent with current market conditions and the Comprehensive Plan's direction to consolidate and comprehensively redevelop out-of-date office properties, particularly within Downtown and the Roosevelt Road corridor. The Plan recognizes office uses as part of the Village's commercial base, but it does not suggest that office-only zoning should be the primary implementation tool. Instead, it encourages reinvestment, mixed-use development, adaptive reuse, and compatibility with nearby neighborhoods.

The limited permitted-use mix may reduce the ability of older office properties to adapt. Where office demand is weak or existing buildings are functionally obsolete, a district that primarily permits office uses may prolong vacancy or underinvestment. The allowance for sales, services, and eating establishments only within office buildings and only up to a portion of the ground floor may also be too restrictive for properties that could support a more flexible mixed-use or neighborhood-serving pattern.

The district's dimensional standards also resemble C3's suburban commercial model, with a 40-foot front setback and parking-oriented site design. This may be appropriate for some campus-like office properties, but it is less effective for infill, adaptive reuse, or corridor redevelopment where the Village wants better streetscape character, more efficient land use, and improved pedestrian connectivity.

4.5.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C4 should be reconsidered as part of a broader strategy for obsolete office properties and mixed-use redevelopment.

- Evaluate whether the Village still needs a standalone office district or whether existing C4 areas should be folded into corridor, mixed-use, institutional, or neighborhood commercial districts.
- If C4 is retained, expand permitted uses to include complementary retail, service, restaurant, medical, flex, co-working, civic, residential, and mixed-use options where context supports them. Explore inclusion of low-impact production, cottage industry production, or maker/flex space.
- Allow adaptive reuse and conversion of office buildings to residential, mixed-use, civic, educational, or medical uses through clear standards rather than relying primarily on discretionary relief.
- Replace suburban office setback standards with context-sensitive building placement standards that can accommodate both campus-style sites and more urban infill conditions.
- Add transition standards for C4 sites near residential neighborhoods, including height setbacks, landscape buffering, lighting controls, and loading/service placement.
- Revisit parking ratios for office and medical office uses, and allow shared parking, demand-based parking studies, transit proximity reductions, and bicycle/EV infrastructure.
- Use redevelopment incentives or flexible approval procedures to encourage reinvestment in aging office properties that otherwise may remain vacant or underutilized.

4.6 C5 Central Business District

4.6.1 Intent and Overview

The C5 Central Business District is the zoning framework for Glen Ellyn's historic downtown. It is divided into two subdistricts: C5A Central Retail Core and C5B Central Service. The C5A subdistrict is intended to maintain and protect the primary retail core of Downtown, generally within the compact area bounded by Pennsylvania, Forest, Hillside, and Glenwood. The C5B subdistrict is intended to accommodate service uses, consolidated parking, residential uses in some circumstances, and the gradual expansion of the retail core.

The district is explicitly pedestrian-oriented and recognizes Downtown's historic role as the Village's central retail, service, entertainment, civic, residential, and transit-oriented focal point. At the same time, many new buildings, unimproved land development, and larger additions in the C5 district must proceed as planned unit developments.

4.6.2 Analysis

C5 is conceptually well aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan calls for Downtown to remain the Village's historic, pedestrian-oriented retail, commercial, service, and entertainment focal point. It also supports mixed-use development with ground-floor commercial and upper-story residential or office uses, adaptive reuse, additional housing near transit, public parking management, public/private partnerships, improved streetscapes, and preservation of the "retail wall" at street level.

The district's primary challenge is not its purpose, but the way the code implements that purpose. The current C5 structure relies heavily on lengthy use lists, use-specific restrictions, and PUD triggers. These tools can protect downtown character, but they can also make routine reinvestment slow, uncertain, and difficult to explain. In a built-out downtown with small parcels, older buildings, changing retail markets, and constrained parking, the code should provide clear standards that distinguish between active street-fronting uses, upper-floor/back-of-building uses, service uses, residential uses, and auto-oriented or low-activity uses.

Downtown also faces a practical tension between wanting active storefronts and needing flexibility as retail patterns change. Uses such as offices, health/personal services, clinics, and studios can contribute to occupancy and customer traffic but may weaken storefront vitality if they occupy key display-window frontages without active public-facing design. The code should address this through frontage standards, transparency requirements, storefront activation rules, and location-based use permissions rather than relying only on special use review.

4.6.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C5 should be retained as the Downtown zoning framework, but rewritten to be more predictable, form-oriented, and supportive of adaptive reuse.

- Maintain the distinction between a retail-core area and a surrounding service/mixed-use downtown area, but simplify the district structure and clarify how C5A and C5B relate to one another.

- Replace highly specific use lists with broader modern use categories organized by ground-floor active uses, upper-floor uses, service/support uses, residential uses, civic uses, and restricted auto-oriented uses.
- Establish storefront activation standards for key pedestrian streets, including minimum transparency, public entrance spacing, display windows, limits on blank walls, and restrictions on non-active ground-floor frontage.
- Allow service and office uses in appropriate locations while requiring an active storefront treatment where they occupy visible ground-floor spaces. Explore inclusion of low-impact production, cottage industry production, or maker/flex space.
- Reevaluate PUD triggers so that routine adaptive reuse, small additions, interior conversions, and context-compliant infill can proceed through an administrative or site plan process.
- Continue to support upper-story residential and office uses, adaptive reuse, and context-sensitive additions that preserve the historic scale and rhythm of Downtown.
- Modernize downtown parking regulations for new construction to reflect transit access, shared public parking, employee parking management, and realistic residential parking demand.

4.7 C5A Central Retail Core Subdistrict

4.7.1 Intent and Overview

The C5A Central Retail Core Subdistrict is intended to protect the most pedestrian-oriented retail portion of Downtown. It permits a wide range of traditional retail, restaurant, entertainment, and service uses, allows dwelling units above the ground floor where commercial uses are located on the ground floor, and limits certain office and service uses to upper floors, lower floors, or ground-floor areas set back at least 40 feet from street-facing façades without storefront windows. The district generally requires no front or corner side yard, caps any provided front or corner side setback at five feet, limits height to 45 feet or four stories, and does not require accessory off-street parking within the core retail area.

4.7.2 Analysis

C5A is the district most directly aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's downtown vision. Its zero-setback framework, upper-story residential allowance, and parking exemption all support a compact pedestrian environment. These elements should be preserved and strengthened. The district recognizes that Downtown's value comes from the continuity of storefronts, pedestrian activity, and historic scale rather than from suburban parking and setback standards.

However, the use regulations are detailed and somewhat difficult to administer. They distinguish between many individual retail and service types, some of which are outdated or overly specific. The code's treatment of non-retail uses reflects a valid concern: the most visible storefronts should remain active and appealing. But the current mechanism can be rigid and may not always match contemporary downtown business models. A modern code should regulate the

storefront outcome more directly: active windows, publicly accessible customer areas, pedestrian entries, hours of activity, and interior layouts that avoid dead frontage.

The PUD requirement for unimproved land and larger additions may also be too blunt for the retail core. It can be valuable for major redevelopment, but context-compliant infill should have a clearer path if it meets dimensional, frontage, preservation, parking, and design standards.

4.7.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C5A should remain the Village's strongest pedestrian retail district, with more direct form and storefront standards.

- Preserve the zero-to-five-foot front setback framework and the exemption from accessory off-street parking in the core retail area.
- Convert the detailed use list into a modern table that distinguishes active ground-floor uses from limited-activity uses, upper-floor uses, and conditional/special uses.
- Require visible, active storefront design for ground-floor spaces on key streets, including transparency, display area, public entries, and limits on window coverings or opaque interior treatments.
- Allow certain office, educational, wellness, studio, and service uses at the ground floor only when they maintain an active customer-facing storefront and do not create long inactive frontages.
- Continue to allow upper-story residential and office uses, while ensuring that ground-floor commercial frontage is preserved.
- Create an administrative path for small additions, façade changes, tenant changes, and adaptive reuse projects that meet clear downtown standards.
- Retain special review for auto-oriented uses, drive-throughs, large-format uses, outdoor storage, and other uses that could disrupt pedestrian character.

4.8 C5B Central Service Subdistrict

4.8.1 Intent and Overview

The C5B Central Service Subdistrict surrounds and supports the retail core. It permits a broad range of uses within existing buildings, including retail, restaurants, services, offices, entertainment, and similar downtown uses. It also allows residential uses, including single-family attached, single-family detached, two-family, and multi-family dwellings, as special uses. The district uses different dimensional standards for commercial, mixed-use, multi-family, single-family attached, and single-family detached development. Existing uses receive parking credit, and new parking obligations are generally triggered by changes to different parking-demand categories, major reconstruction, or additions.

4.8.2 Analysis

C5B plays an important transition and support role for Downtown. It provides space for services, parking, residential uses, and mixed-use development outside the tight retail core. This aligns with the Comprehensive Plan's direction to accommodate Downtown housing, manage parking, support public/private parking partnerships, preserve street-level commercial activity, and use single-family attached and multi-family housing as transitions between Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

The district is also complicated. Its use permissions differ for existing buildings, new construction, residential uses, and special uses. Many permitted uses in existing buildings require planned unit development for new construction or significant additions. Residential forms are allowed, but often through special use or PUD pathways. These layers can make it hard for property owners to understand what is expected and can slow redevelopment of aging or underutilized downtown-edge sites.

The C5B parking-credit approach is a useful recognition of existing downtown conditions, but the underlying parking ratios remain high for some uses and may not reflect actual demand in a transit-oriented setting. The Comprehensive Plan specifically recommends reevaluating residential parking requirements in the C5 districts and considering more contemporary ratios for multi-family housing near the Metra station.

4.8.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C5B should be simplified into a flexible downtown mixed-use and transition district that supports reinvestment while protecting neighborhood edges.

- Retain C5B as the district for downtown service, mixed-use, parking, and transition areas, but simplify the use structure so that new development and existing-building reuse are easier to understand.
- Permit multi-family, upper-story residential, and mixed-use development by right when projects meet clear form, frontage, parking, and residential-transition standards.
- Use special use review for single-purpose residential projects only where the Village wants to ensure that important commercial frontages are not lost.
- Modernize the parking-credit system and reduce residential parking requirements near transit based on local demand, shared parking, and public parking availability.
- Add clear edge standards where C5B abuts lower-density neighborhoods, including height stepbacks, landscaped buffers, lighting controls, service-area screening, and access management.
- Allow adaptive reuse and context-sensitive additions without requiring a PUD when the project meets district standards.
- Encourage public/private parking partnerships, shared parking agreements, and structured parking where such facilities support downtown vitality and reduce pressure for surface parking.
- Explore adding low-impact production, cottage industry production, or maker/flex space.

4.9 C6 Commercial/Multiuse Planned Development District

4.9.1 Intent and Overview

The C6 Commercial/Multiuse Planned Development District is intended to ensure planned and orderly development of mixed-use areas identified in the Comprehensive Plan. All development in the district must occur by planned development and be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The district allows a broad range of retail, service, office, auto-oriented, institutional, residential, and outdoor activity uses subject to review and approval of a development plan. Bulk standards, including height and floor area ratio, are determined through the development plan, with standards expected to be consistent with adjacent districts and the Comprehensive Plan.

4.9.2 Analysis

C6 appears to have been designed as a flexible planned development tool rather than a conventional zoning district. That flexibility can be useful for large or complex sites, but it also creates uncertainty because basic entitlements, dimensional standards, and design expectations are deferred to the PUD process. In practice, that can make development harder rather than more predictable, particularly for partially built-out sites, shopping centers, or redevelopment areas where property owners need early clarity before investing in detailed plans.

The Comprehensive Plan calls for mixed-use development, redevelopment of obsolete commercial properties, larger-scale corridor reinvestment, and creative site and building design solutions. Those goals should not require every project to start from a blank-slate planned development process. A district that has no clear by-right development path may discourage exactly the reinvestment the Village wants to attract.

C6 also overlaps conceptually with the potential future role of a corridor mixed-use district. If the Village creates modern form-based or hybrid districts for Roosevelt Road, Downtown-edge areas, and other mixed-use nodes, C6 may become unnecessary. Alternatively, it could be retained only as a large-site planned development overlay for exceptional projects that need negotiated standards.

4.9.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

C6 should either be eliminated or substantially rewritten so it provides predictable standards rather than relying entirely on the PUD process.

- Consider eliminating C6 if its mapped areas can be more effectively regulated through updated corridor, mixed-use, downtown, or neighborhood commercial districts.
- If retained, convert C6 into a “Mixed-Use Planned Development Overlay” rather than a base district.
- Establish baseline permitted uses, conditional/special uses, height ranges, frontage types, parking locations, open space expectations, access standards, and residential-transition standards.
- Reserve full PUD review for large, multi-phase, multi-building, or uniquely constrained sites, rather than requiring it for all development.

- Create an optional concept-plan review step that allows developers and decision-makers to discuss feasibility, community priorities, access, parking, and design expectations before significant resources are spent.
- Clarify how amendments to approved planned developments will be handled, including a streamlined process for minor changes, tenant changes, façade updates, parking adjustments, and site-plan refinements.
- Ensure any retained C6 framework includes clear public-benefit expectations, such as improved streetscape, shared parking, cross-access, affordable or attainable housing, open space, stormwater improvements, or structured parking.

4.10 I1 Light Industrial District

4.10.1 Intent and Overview

The I1 Light Industrial District is intended to provide an environment for industrial activities that do not create appreciable nuisance or hazards and that can be located harmoniously with office uses and in relatively close proximity to residential areas. Permitted uses include light manufacturing, contractor offices, building material sales, automobile repair and service, commercial laundry, research laboratories, indoor self-storage, sheet metal shops, medical cannabis dispensaries, and accessory retail associated with another permitted use. Special uses include outdoor storage, contractor yards, cartage and delivery uses, recycling collection centers, warehouses, vehicle storage yards, and similar more intensive uses. The district requires a 30-foot front or corner side yard, 20-foot side and rear yards, a 20,000-square-foot minimum lot area, a 45-foot height limit, and screening where required.

4.10.2 Analysis

The Comprehensive Plan identifies light industrial uses as a small but important part of the Village's land use pattern. It notes that there are relatively few light industrial uses in Glen Ellyn and that the category should be maintained to support the Village's industrial base while enhancing sites through proper screening from adjacent residential uses.

I1 is generally consistent with this policy direction, but the permitted use list is broad and includes several uses with different impact profiles. Some listed uses are low-impact, employment-generating, or compatible with office/flex development. Others, such as automobile repair, commercial laundry, sheet metal shops, contractor yards, vehicle storage, outdoor storage, and warehousing, may generate noise, truck traffic, outdoor activity, or visual impacts. The current district relies on special use review and general screening requirements, but it would benefit from more precise performance standards.

The Comprehensive Plan also encourages compatible light industry and high-tech uses in select commercial areas. This suggests that the I1 district should be modernized to accommodate small-scale production, maker spaces, research and development, food and beverage production, and flex industrial uses while better controlling outdoor storage, loading, truck access, and residential-edge impacts.

4.10.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

I1 should be retained but modernized as a low-impact light industrial, maker, and flex employment district.

- Update the purpose statement to emphasize low-impact production, maker/flex space, research and development, contractor services, and employment-generating uses compatible with nearby neighborhoods.
- Consolidate industrial uses into modern categories and distinguish between indoor low-impact uses, outdoor storage/service uses, vehicle-related uses, and heavy-impact uses that should remain prohibited or conditional.
- Establish performance standards for noise, vibration, odor, dust, outdoor activity, hours of operation, truck circulation, loading, and refuse/service areas.
- Strengthen buffering and screening requirements for I1 sites near residential, park, or public/semi-public uses.
- Require loading areas, outdoor storage, and vehicle storage to be located and screened to minimize visibility from streets and adjacent residential properties.
- Consider allowing limited accessory retail, tasting rooms, showrooms, or customer-facing components for maker, food/beverage, and production uses where parking and access can be managed.
- Reevaluate parking requirements for industrial/flex uses based on employees, visitors, vehicle fleet needs, and shared parking rather than applying a one-size-fits-all commercial ratio.

4.11 CC Community College District

4.11.1 Intent and Overview

The CC Community College District applies to College of DuPage and is intended to recognize the unique role of a public community college as an educational, cultural, economic, and civic asset. The district allows community college uses with a Village Board-reviewed master plan, indoor and outdoor special events with adequate traffic control and on-site parking, open space, public parks, playgrounds, gardens, and parking lots consistent with the master plan or code requirements. Special uses include parking garages not shown on an approved master plan, private daycare or private schools not associated with the college's educational program, and public utility or public service uses. Development is tied to an approved master plan, with substantial setbacks, parking determined by the master plan, and screening of loading areas from public roads and residential uses.

4.11.2 Analysis

The CC district is not a conventional commercial district, but it has a significant relationship to the Village's commercial, transportation, housing, and economic development goals. The Comprehensive Plan identifies College of DuPage as a major community amenity and economic

development asset. It encourages continued coordination between the Village and COD, stronger town-and-gown relationships, transit connections between COD, Downtown, and the Metra station, student and faculty housing opportunities near campus, campus-edge placemaking, and mutually beneficial amendments to the planned development or master planning framework that guides the campus.

The current CC district provides broad flexibility for the college and appropriately relies on a master plan. However, the code could more clearly articulate the Village's expectations for campus-edge transitions, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, transit integration, event management, signage/wayfinding, lighting, parking demand management, and coordination with nearby commercial areas. The Comprehensive Plan's emphasis on COD as an economic and cultural partner suggests that the CC district should not only regulate impacts, but also facilitate mutually beneficial campus-community integration.

4.11.3 Recommendations for Zoning Reform

The CC district should remain a flexible institutional district, with clearer standards and procedures for campus evolution and Village coordination.

- Retain the master plan approach, but clarify the required contents of future master plan updates, including land use, building envelopes, circulation, parking, stormwater, open space, lighting, signage, and campus-edge transitions.
- Establish standards for pedestrian and bicycle connections along Lambert Road, Park Boulevard, Fawell Boulevard, and other campus edges.
- Coordinate district standards with transit goals, including shuttle or Pace connections between COD, Downtown, Roosevelt Road, and the Metra station.
- Clarify when amendments to the COD master plan are major or minor, and create a predictable process for routine campus changes.
- Strengthen edge standards for lighting, loading, service areas, event operations, and landscape buffering near residential areas.
- Support COD-related economic development by allowing appropriate incubator, innovation, training, arts, cultural, and public event uses when impacts are managed.
- Coordinate with nearby zoning districts to support student and faculty housing, mixed-use development, and commercial services near COD without overburdening the campus district itself.

4.12 Use Permissions and Mixing Uses

The commercial districts rely on long enumerated use lists that reflect older retail and service classifications. Many use names are highly specific, such as individual retail store types, while newer business models are either absent or awkwardly categorized. This structure can make the code harder to use, harder to update, and more dependent on interpretation. It also makes it difficult for staff, applicants, boards, and the public to understand why similar uses are treated differently.

The Comprehensive Plan supports a more flexible and adaptive commercial environment. It calls for expanding the variety of commercial, retail, and office establishments; encouraging compatible new commercial development; promoting redevelopment of obsolete properties; supporting mixed-use development Downtown and in appropriate transition areas; and introducing compatible light industry and high-tech uses in select locations. The code should therefore move away from an “everything everywhere” approach in some districts and an overly narrow use-by-use approach in others.

Recommended use-permission reforms include:

- Replace long lists of individual retail and service uses with broader use categories and use-specific standards.
- Organize commercial use tables by district context: neighborhood commercial, corridor commercial, downtown retail core, downtown mixed-use/service, office/flex, light industrial, institutional, and mixed-use overlay.
- Distinguish between use, form, and operational impacts. For example, medical office, boutique fitness studio, or professional office may be acceptable downtown if it maintains an active storefront, but may be inappropriate if it creates inactive window frontage in the retail core.
- Allow mixed-use development by clear standards in appropriate districts rather than relying primarily on PUDs or special uses.
- Identify uses that require additional controls because of access, noise, outdoor storage, vehicle queuing, truck movement, hours, or residential-edge impacts.
- Treat drive-throughs, vehicle sales/service, outdoor storage, contractor yards, heavy service uses, and similar auto- or impact-oriented uses as conditional/special uses with objective approval criteria.
- Clarify the relationship between principal uses, accessory uses, temporary uses, outdoor dining, outdoor display, events, food trucks, and accessory retail.
- Include adaptive reuse provisions that allow older office, commercial, and institutional buildings to convert to compatible new uses without unnecessary discretionary approvals.

4.13 Form-Based Standards

The current commercial districts regulate use and basic dimensional standards more comprehensively than they regulate physical form. In many locations, this is not enough to implement the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan’s commercial goals repeatedly emphasize physical outcomes: pedestrian-oriented Downtown streets, attractive storefronts, improved corridor image, landscaped parking lots, better screening, reduced curb cuts, cross-access, multimodal connections, residential transitions, low-impact development, and compatibility with historic character.

The code should incorporate form-based or hybrid standards that vary by context. These standards do not need to replace conventional zoning entirely, but they should define the physical elements that matter most in each commercial setting.

Recommended form-based reforms include:

- Create frontage standards for key street types, including downtown storefront frontages, neighborhood commercial frontages, corridor commercial frontages, and service/industrial frontages.
- Establish building orientation standards that require principal entrances to face streets, public sidewalks, parking courts, or internal pedestrian routes.
- Require pedestrian routes from public sidewalks to building entrances, transit stops, parking areas, and adjacent sites.
- Add parking placement standards that prefer side or rear parking in walkable areas and require strong screening where front parking remains.
- Require perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping, parking-lot islands, foundation landscaping, and landscaped medians or pedestrian refuges in larger lots. Focus Group interviews relayed a desire for aesthetic standards related to retail - retail signage, lighting, and landscaping requirements should be reviewed to better balance aesthetics, safety, and business visibility.
- Require cross-access and shared access for corridor redevelopment unless infeasible due to site conditions.
- Include residential transition standards addressing height, stepbacks, setbacks, landscape buffers, lighting, service areas, refuse, loading, and mechanical equipment.
- Add downtown storefront standards for transparency, entrance spacing, display windows, façade rhythm, durable materials, and limits on inactive or blank frontage in a manner that achieves desired results without bogging down investments and improvements within the business district.
- Add corridor design standards for façade articulation, pedestrian-scale features, gateway treatments, signage coordination, and streetscape compatibility.
- Add low-impact development standards for major redevelopment, especially along Roosevelt Road and in other highly impervious commercial areas.

4.14 Alignment with Long Range Plans

4.14.1 Comprehensive Plan

The 2023 Comprehensive Plan provides a clear policy basis for commercial zoning reform. It supports preservation of Glen Ellyn's established residential and historic character while also encouraging strategic redevelopment, reinvestment, mixed-use development, and tax-base diversification. The commercial zoning districts should be updated so that the code becomes the primary implementation tool for that policy direction.

(a) Grow and Diversify Key Commercial Districts

The Plan identifies Downtown, Roosevelt Road, Stacy's Corners, and areas near College of DuPage as key activity areas. Each needs a different zoning response. Downtown needs a compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use framework that protects active ground-floor commercial frontage while allowing upper-story housing and adaptive reuse. Roosevelt Road needs a corridor redevelopment framework that supports reinvestment, lot consolidation, cross-access, shared parking, improved landscaping, and more efficient land use. Stacy's Corners needs a neighborhood commercial framework that supports local-serving businesses, historic character, and residential compatibility. Areas near COD need a coordinated institutional, housing, transportation, and commercial strategy.

The existing district structure partially reflects these distinctions, but not clearly enough. C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, I1, and CC should be modernized so that each district has a distinct purpose, use mix, form expectation, and approval pathway.

(b) Enhance Physical Form and Site Design

The Plan emphasizes the image and appearance of commercial areas, including buildings, parking lots, signage, public rights-of-way, streetscape, pedestrian infrastructure, and site landscaping. The code should therefore move beyond basic setbacks and parking ratios. It should require or incentivize the physical improvements that the Plan identifies: landscaped parking lots, screened service areas, consolidated access, safe pedestrian routes, active storefronts, compatible building form, dark-sky compliant lighting, bicycle parking, and low-impact stormwater design.

For Downtown, this means protecting the retail wall, maintaining zero-lot-line building placement, supporting upper-story housing, and providing flexibility for adaptive reuse. For Roosevelt Road, it means reducing the dominance of front-loaded parking, strengthening the street edge, adding cross-access, improving pedestrian circulation through parking lots, and requiring more robust landscape and stormwater design. For neighborhood commercial areas, it means ensuring that small-scale commercial activity contributes to rather than conflicts with surrounding residential character.

(c) Ensure Transition Areas to Residential

The Plan repeatedly identifies transition areas as important around Downtown, Roosevelt Road, and Stacy's Corners. The existing code addresses some residential-edge conditions through setbacks and screening, but these tools are not comprehensive enough. A modern code should use a broader transition toolkit: height stepbacks, building massing limits, landscaped buffers, lighting controls, loading and refuse placement, mechanical screening, fencing, tree preservation, pedestrian connections, and compatible residential or mixed-use building types.

Single-family attached and multi-family housing can also serve as transitions between intense commercial areas and lower-density residential neighborhoods. The zoning code should allow those housing types in appropriate locations through clear standards rather than treating them as exceptions to the commercial framework.

(d) *Other Plans*

The commercial zoning update should also be coordinated with other Village planning initiatives, including the Downtown Strategic Plan, Downtown Streetscape Plan and Parking Study, Wayfinding Signage Plan, Move Glen Ellyn Active Transportation Plan, Housing Assessment, environmental and sustainability initiatives, and COD facilities planning. These plans reinforce several common themes: clearer standards, more predictable review, better parking management, stronger pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, preservation of community character, improved commercial image, and reinvestment in aging or underutilized properties.

Together, these plans support a zoning framework that is easier to administer, more responsive to market conditions, and more effective at producing the physical outcomes the Village wants. The code update should therefore prioritize clarity, flexibility where appropriate, objective form standards, streamlined approval pathways for compliant projects, and stronger standards for uses or site designs that create identifiable impacts.

5. Assessment of Organization, Clarity, and Style

5.1 Document Organization

There is ample opportunity to reorganize code sections and information to provide more clarity to information and make it more accessible.

- **Table of Contents.** Utilize a comprehensive hyperlinked table of contents so that code users can quickly skip to the information/section that is relevant to them.
- **Hyperlinks.** In addition to including hyperlinks in the table of contents, references throughout the code should be hyperlinked for ease of accessing relevant information.
- **Comprehensive Use Table.** Comprehensive use table laying out use permissions for all districts, and consolidate use standards for specific uses in its own section (referenced in the comprehensive use table)
- **Development Standard Tables.** Put numeric development standards in tables accompanied by illustratory graphics to assist with comprehension.
- **Supplementary Regulations.** Parse out supplementary regulations from use standards – uses should have a dedicated chapter including use permissions and use standards. Supplementary regulations should consist of development standards that supplement the district standards across all zones.
- **Headers and Footers.** Add running headers/footers with chapter and current section (e.g., “Title 10 – Zoning | 10-4-17 C5B Central Service Subdistrict”) plus page numbers on every page; this helps when working from printed packets.
- **“How to use this code”.** Create an introductory section that provides novice code users with a visual overview of how to find information within the document.
- **Glossary.** Streamline the document by putting the definitions at the end of the document as a glossary.

5.2 Consistency

Within a full comprehensive zoning code update, like this project, there is ample opportunity to utilize consistent language across the zoning code document. Although the list below of inconsistent terms is not exhaustive, it provides an overview of the way terms can be used inconsistently across a document. The zoning code update will employ a style guide that will lay out the standardization of terms, acronyms, and stylistic preferences across the document.

Term	Terms Used	Inconsistency	Recommendation
Zoning administrator	“Building and Zoning Administrator”; “Building Official”; “Village’s Building Official”; “Director, Department of Community Development”; “Community Development Director”	Same or closely related administrative functions assigned to differently named officials in various sections (interpretation, plan review, approvals, enforcement).	Define one role (e.g., “Community Development Director”) as the zoning administrator and state that references to Building and Zoning Administrator/Building Official mean that role. Normalize throughout.
Community development director	“Director, Department of Community Development”; “Community Development Director”	Two forms used interchangeably without a definition tying them together.	Pick one style (e.g., “Community Development Director”) and use it consistently. In definitions, clarify that it is the head of the Community Development Department.
Municipal code reference	“Village Code”; “Village code”; “this code”; “this Code”; “This Zoning Code”	Capitalization and label vary when referring to the municipal code vs. the zoning title.	Define “Village Code” for the full municipal code and “this title” or “Zoning Code” for Title 10. Use “Village Code” and “this title” consistently.
Planned unit development as a use	“planned development”; “planned unit development”; “large scale planned residential development, in accordance with the provisions of the planned unit development regulations”; “commercial planned development in accordance with the provisions of the planned unit development regulations”	Districts (R5, C5, C6, C2, C3) describe required or allowed projects as “planned development” or “commercial planned development” while the dedicated chapter and definitions consistently use “planned unit development.”	Planned unit development (PUD) – with sub-labels “residential PUD” and “commercial PUD” only where needed, but always built on the same defined PUD term.

Term	Terms Used	Inconsistency	Recommendation
School / education	“public school, elementary and high, or private school having a curriculum equivalent...”; “nursery, prekindergarten, stand-alone kindergarten, play, special and other private school”; “private school”; “school, commercial or trade”; “college or university”	Similar primary/secondary school uses are described in different strings by district, sometimes bundling nurseries and special schools, while separate commercial/ trade/college uses are also labeled differently.	Public or private school (elementary/secondary); nursery/early childhood school; commercial or trade school; college or university – each defined once and referenced consistently.
Discretionary use approvals	“special use”; “special use permit”; “special use for planned unit development”; “special use permit for a planned unit development”	The object (the use) and the instrument (the permit/ordinance) are sometimes blurred, and PUDs get their own variant phrase.	Use “special use” for the use and “special use permit” for the approving ordinance. For PUDs, standardize on “special use permit for a planned unit development” or “PUD special use permit” and use it uniformly.
Planned development concept	“planned unit development”; “planned development”; “preliminary planned unit development”; “final development plan”; “planned unit development documents”	Multiple names for the same conceptual tool and its submittals, not always used in parallel or defined distinctly.	Use “planned unit development (PUD)” consistently. Standardize submittals as “preliminary PUD plan” and “final PUD plan,” and define “PUD documents” once if needed.
Legislative body	“Village Board”; “Village Board of Trustees”; “corporate authorities of the Village”	Different labels used for the same body in intent, procedures, and adoption clauses.	Pick “Village Board of Trustees” as the defined term and state that it is the corporate authorities. Elsewhere, just use “Village Board of Trustees.”
Reference to zoning regulations	“this title”; “this Zoning Code”; “zoning ordinances of the Village”	Three terms used where one defined label could suffice.	Define “this title” as the “Glen Ellyn Zoning Code” and then primarily use “this title” in operative provisions. Reserve “zoning ordinances” for historical references if needed.

Term	Terms Used	Inconsistency	Recommendation
Religious assembly	“church”; “church or temple”; “churches and temples”; “club or lodge, private, fraternal or religious”	The definition of CHURCH already includes multiple faith traditions and typical incidental activities, but use tables vary between “church,” “church or temple,” and separate “religious club or lodge.”	Place of worship (church, temple, synagogue, mosque, etc.) – defined once; treat clubs/lodges separately only when they are genuinely distinct from houses of worship.
Principal use vs. principal building	“principal use”; “main or principal use”; “principal building”; “structure or building, principal”; “principal use of the lot”	Overlapping definitions and usage for principal use and principal structure, with slightly different phrasing in different sections.	Define “principal building” once and “principal use” once, and remove the duplicate “structure or building, principal” definition or collapse it into the principal building definition. Use “principal use of the zoning lot” consistently.
Lot concepts	“lot”; “zoning lot”; “lot of record”; “parcel”; “property”	The text sometimes uses generic “lot,” “parcel,” or “property” where “zoning lot” is the more precise defined term, especially in standards and conditions.	Use “zoning lot” whenever applying dimensional, intensity, or use regulations. Use “lot of record” only where platted status is legally relevant, and avoid “parcel/property” in operative standards.
Yards and setbacks	“yard”; “front yard setback”; “required front yard”; “setback”; “setback line”	Definitions distinguish yard vs. setback line, but narrative provisions sometimes treat “yard” and “setback” as interchangeable.	Clarify in definitions that “setback” means the required yard depth between a lot line and the setback line. Then use “front yard” and “minimum front yard depth” (or similar) consistently rather than alternating with “setback.”

Term	Terms Used	Inconsistency	Recommendation
"Person"	General definition of PERSON in interpretation section; separate PERSON definition within the cannabis definitions block	Two similar but not identical definitions of the same term in the same title, without a rule establishing priority.	Keep a single global definition of "person" in Chapter 2 and, in the cannabis article, reference that definition rather than redefining. If extra detail is needed (owners, employees, agents), define a separate term like "responsible party."
Parties to applications	"owner"; "applicant"; "petitioner"; "developer"; "owner and applicant"; "owner of the property or his authorized representative"	Different terms describe essentially the same procedural actor, with no hierarchy or cross-definition, and are mixed within the same sections.	Define "applicant" broadly (including owner, contract purchaser, lessee, or authorized agent) and then consistently use "applicant" in procedures. Use "owner" only where fee title status is uniquely relevant (e.g., consent to conditions).
Medical and health facilities	"clinic, medical or dental"; "medical clinic"; "medical or dental clinic"; "hospital"; "hospital, nursing home and educational, philanthropic or religious institution"	The same basic clinic use is restated with slightly different labels in definitions and use lists; hospital and nursing home are sometimes grouped with other institutional uses.	Medical or dental clinic; hospital; nursing home – referenced verbatim throughout all use lists and parking standards.
Restaurant and drive-through / carry-out	"restaurant and eating place except drive-in and carryout establishments..."; "restaurant and eating place, including outdoor seating..."; "eating or restaurant establishment" (parking table); "drive-in commercial facility"; "drive-through facility" (stacking standards)	Core restaurant use is described with two or three different phrases depending on district and context; drive-in and drive-through are mixed with carry-out terminology in some places and treated generically in others.	Restaurant (sit-down); restaurant, drive-through; restaurant, carry-out – with those labels tied to shared supplemental standards for stacking, access, and outdoor seating.

Term	Terms Used	Inconsistency	Recommendation
Internal cross-references	"this chapter"; "this section"; "this title"	Some provisions refer to "this chapter" when they clearly intend standards that appear elsewhere in Title 10, while others correctly use "this title."	Review and standardize cross-references so that references to substantive zoning standards use "this title," and "this chapter/section" is reserved for truly local procedural rules
Indoor entertainment / recreation	"indoor amusement" (defined); "indoor recreational facility"; "indoor theater"; "game room, billiard hall, video arcade" (examples in definition)	The defined use "indoor amusement" is sometimes complemented or effectively duplicated by "indoor recreational facility" and "indoor theater" in district use tables, which can all apply to similar entertainment businesses.	Indoor amusement facility (covering arcades, billiards, game rooms, etc.); indoor recreational facility (if broader, defined distinctly); indoor theater – with clear distinctions in definitions and consistent naming in all districts.

5.3 Graphics

Incorporating additional illustrative graphics into the zoning code would significantly improve both readability and usability for applicants, staff, and decision-makers. While Chapter 11 already provides helpful figures for concepts like lot types, required yards, building height, FAR, screening, and dormers, these graphics sit at the back of a very text-dense document and are not integrated within the document text, which can limit how actively users rely on them during everyday code navigation. Integrating more diagrams and section-specific visuals, graphic depictions of yard and setback rules alongside the district bulk tables in Chapter 4, or process flowcharts for special uses and planned unit developments in Chapter 10—would help translate long narrative provisions and multi-part tests into quickly understandable formats. This is especially valuable where the code combines multiple dimensional criteria and cross-references passages, because co-locating visuals with the operative text reduces misinterpretation and shortens the learning curve for infrequent users.

6. Administration and Procedures

Chapter 10 generally covers the appropriate topics and assigns authority to village bodies, but it could be more predictable, transparent, and efficient with restructuring, clearer standards, and better alignment with how staff and applicants use the code in practice.

6.1 Overall Structure and Roles

Chapter 10 does a solid job of identifying the key actors (Department of Community Development, Plan Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, Village Board) and assigning high-level responsibilities.

6.1.1 General Observations

- Authority is explicitly vested in the Department of Community Development, Plan Commission, ZBA, and Village Board, with a clear statement that the Village Board retains final authority over variations, special uses, amendments, and PUD special uses.
- The Department of Community Development's duties are reasonably comprehensive: zoning and occupancy certificates, driveway approach permits, inspections, records of nonconformities, special uses, variations and amendments, and forwarding applications.
- Staff roles are defined using multiple titles (Director of Community Development, Director of the Department of Community Development, Building and Zoning Administrator), which complicates process diagrams and delegations.
- Chapter 10 is organized as a long list of procedures (certificates, appeals, variations, amendments, special uses, PUDs, fees, penalties) without a roadmap or visual process summary; stakeholders have explicitly asked for clearer, more concrete directives and removal of ambiguity.

6.2 Procedures: Clarity and Predictability

6.2.1 Zoning/Occupancy Certificates and Driveway Approach Permits

The code delegates zoning certificates, occupancy certificates, and driveway approach permits to staff, with duties listed in 10-10-2.

(a) Strengths

- Clear assignment of routine approvals (certificates and driveway approaches) to staff supports administrative efficiency.

(b) Gaps

- Procedural steps, submittal requirements, and review timelines are not spelled out in Chapter 10; they are implied rather than explicit.
- There is no explicit linkage between bulk/use determinations and nonconformity provisions in Chapter 8, even though staff and stakeholders report nonconformities as a major pain point and a frequent trigger for variation requests.

(c) Recommendations

- Create short, checklist-style sections for each administrative approval (zoning certificate, occupancy certificate, driveway approach permit) with: who may apply, what must be submitted, the review path, and review/decision timelines.

6.2.2 Appeals

The ZBA hears and decides appeals from any final order, requirement, decision or determination by an administrative official enforcing this title.

(a) Strengths

- Having a single appellate body for administrative decisions is consistent with best practice and aligns with state enabling acts.

(b) Gaps

- Chapter 10 does not clearly lay out the appeal timeline (e.g., number of days from decision to filing), what constitutes a “final decision,” or what is required in a notice of appeal.
- It is not explicit whether the standard of review is de novo or deferential, nor whether new evidence is allowed, which can lead to ad hoc practice.

(c) Recommendations

- Add a dedicated “Appeals” section with: filing deadline (e.g., 30 days from written decision), contents of appeal, stay of enforcement rules, standard of review, and whether new evidence is permitted.
- Require the administrative official to issue decisions in writing (even if brief) so applicants know when the appeal clock starts and what is being appealed.

6.2.3 Variations: Standards and Process

Stakeholder comments point directly at the variation system as confusing and burdensome: a two-tier standard, multiple separate standards, and a steady stream of bulk variance approvals that suggest the standards are misaligned with real development patterns.

(a) Overview of Current Procedures

- Assigns jurisdiction: ZBA for single- and two-family variations; Plan Commission for non-residential and complex matters (e.g., PUD-related variations); Village Board has final decision authority.
- Includes procedural provisions for hearings, findings, and recommendations, and general standards for granting variations.

(b) Issues Relative to Best Practice

- Standards appear in multiple places and are described as a “two tiered system” in practice: public officials report having “two standards we have to meet, and then other 8–9 standards unsure how to consider.” This makes outcomes less predictable and invites selective emphasis.
- The code does not distinguish clearly between minor/administrative variations (e.g., inches or a foot of relief) and major legislative relief; yet stakeholders describe many

small, repeated variations (e.g., minor increases in lot coverage, modest rear yard encroachments) that almost always get approved after a four-month process.

- The standards focus heavily on hardship and uniqueness without explicit language about repeated patterns of relief that should be addressed by revising the base standards.

(c) Recommendations

- Collapse the “two-tier” variation standards into a single, clearly enumerated set (e.g., 4–5 criteria) that must be met for all variations, written in plain language and applicable across districts.
- Introduce an “administrative adjustment” or “minor variation” tool for small, quantifiable deviations (for example, up to 10% from a bulk standard) that the Community Development Director can approve with clear criteria, while larger requests go to ZBA/Plan Commission.

6.2.4 Special Uses and PUD Special Uses

Chapter 10 clusters special uses and PUDs under the same administrative umbrella, with Plan Commission hearings and Village Board final action.

(a) Strengths

- The requirement for written findings and standards for special uses and PUD special uses is sound and consistent with best practice.
- Termination provisions (10-10-16) establish time limits for building permit filing, construction commencement, and occupancy, and outline a process to modify, extend, or terminate approvals.

(b) Problems Relative to Your Goals and Stakeholder Feedback

- Staff and stakeholders report that the PUD process doesn’t get better results but makes it harder to develop without benefits and that it is written for blank sites, not infill or partial redevelopments. It is also described as inflexible for amendments and changes to original plans.
- The special use system is being used to manage uses that are really aesthetic or design issues, which leads to perception that the Village “doesn’t like special uses” more than a clear policy on where certain use types belong.
- The code distinguishes “special uses for planned unit developments” but uses inconsistent terms (planned development vs planned unit development), and applies the same heavy process for both minor and major PUD changes.

(c) Recommendations

- PUD usage should be reserved for complex or master-planned situations, not to make ordinary, compliant projects feasible.

- Create a formal tiered amendment system for PUDs and special uses (e.g., “minor amendments” that staff or Plan Commission can approve when they stay within certain quantitative thresholds, and “major amendments” that require full hearings), addressing the concern that the current process lacks flexibility for amendments.
- Tighten the special use standards so they focus on land-use compatibility, traffic, infrastructure, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and move purely aesthetic conditions for downtown frontage into district- or design-specific standards rather than case-by-case conditions.

6.2.5 Termination, Extensions, Fees, and Enforcement

(a) Termination and Extensions

- Special uses, variations, map amendments, and PUD special uses become null and void if a building permit is not applied for within 24 months, with a provision allowing the Community Development Director to grant one 12-month extension and subsequent extensions by the Village Board.
- If construction does not commence or occupancy does not occur within specified timeframes, the recommending body (Plan Commission or ZBA) may initiate a public hearing to consider extension, modification, termination, or rezoning.

(b) Best-Practice Assessment

- The presence of explicit timeframes and an extension tool is positive and creates a baseline of predictability.
- However, tying initiation of revocation/modification hearings solely to the recommending body rather than allowing the Village Board or staff to trigger a review could limit responsiveness to changing conditions or non-performance.

(c) Fees and Deposits

- 10-10-17 delegates the fee schedule to the Village Board and establishes a robust deposit mechanism for PUDs, commercial special uses, commercial variations, subdivisions, and development projects over five acres, including monthly invoicing and the right to halt reviews if deposits are not replenished.
- Meeting notes show the Village already tracks process timing more effectively thanks to new permitting software and wants clearer, more consistent process language.

6.2.6 Enforcement and Penalties

- 10-10-18 sets a petty offense fine structure (up to 500 per week per violation), clarifies that each week or part thereof is a separate offense, and authorizes equitable actions to restrain or abate violations.
- Community interviews emphasize a desire for clearer, more consistent code enforcement and process transparency.

(a) Best-Practice Opportunities

- Revocation of permits is an enforcement tool already listed in the Zoning Code. Consider adding intermediate enforcement tools, such as administrative citations or stop-work orders with clear criteria, to give staff more flexible, graduated responses short of full prosecution.
- Add a cross-reference to Chapter 8 nonconformities and a short policy statement clarifying that enforcement will be proportionate and that lawful nonconformities will not be targeted, to reduce fear around investing in nonconforming properties (a recurring theme in stakeholder comments).

6.2.7 General Recommendations for Chapter

- Consolidate staff titles into one or two defined administrative roles (e.g., Community Development Director as Zoning Administrator, with Building Official by reference) and use those consistently throughout Chapter 10.
- Add a short “Administration overview” section with a process map (e.g., table or graphic) summarizing, for each procedure (variation, special use, PUD, map amendment, appeal), who is the intake body, who makes the recommendation, who makes the final decision, and typical timelines.
- Cross-reference a “How to apply” section or external application guide, to align with the Village’s new electronic permitting platform and the goal of tracking hold-ups.

7. Recommendations Matrix

The following matrix combines all recommendations from the report, organized by applicable chapter.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Add a comprehensive hyperlinked table of contents so users can navigate directly to relevant chapters, sections, tables, and standards.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Add internal hyperlinks throughout the code for cross-references, definitions, district standards, procedures, and supplemental regulations.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Create a “How to Use This Code” introductory section with a visual overview of how applicants, residents, staff, and decision-makers should navigate the code.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Use consistent running headers and footers identifying the title, chapter, current section, and page number.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Reorganize the code, creating a use dedicated chapter, so use permissions and use-specific standards are easier to locate – also include use standards that are currently located in the supplementary regulations chapter.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Put numeric development standards into tables and pair them with diagrams or illustrations where interpretation may be difficult.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Reduce long narrative exceptions and technical cross-references by using concise tables, graphics, and plain-language measurement rules.
Title 10, Code-wide / Overall Organization	Develop and apply a zoning code style guide to standardize terminology, capitalization, defined terms, approval names, cross-references, and drafting conventions throughout the code.
Chapter 1: General Provisions	Strengthen the introductory provisions so the code clearly implements the Comprehensive Plan, housing goals, commercial reinvestment goals, sustainability objectives, and neighborhood character policies.
Chapter 1: General Provisions	Clarify interpretation rules so general provisions, definitions, district standards, supplemental regulations, procedures, and illustrations work together without conflicting cross-references.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Add or clarify definitions for senior housing, age-restricted housing, accessible/visitable housing, and related residential use categories if those uses have additional use-specific standards.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 2: Definitions	Define one primary zoning administrator role, such as “Community Development Director” or “Zoning Administrator,” and normalize references to Building and Zoning Administrator, Building Official, and similar titles.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Define “Village Code,” “this title,” and “Zoning Code” consistently and use those terms uniformly throughout Title 10.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Standardize planned unit development terminology, using “planned unit development” or “PUD” consistently and defining related submittals such as preliminary PUD plan, final PUD plan, and PUD documents.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Standardize discretionary approval terminology by distinguishing “special use” from “special use permit” and using a consistent term for PUD special use approvals.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Standardize education-related use categories, such as public/private school, early childhood school, commercial or trade school, and college or university.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Replace inconsistent religious assembly terminology with a single defined use, such as “place of worship,” and distinguish religious clubs or lodges only where they are materially different.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Clarify principal building, principal structure, principal use, and related terms, and remove duplicative or overlapping definitions.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Clarify lot-related terminology by distinguishing zoning lot, lot of record, parcel, and property, and use “zoning lot”.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Clarify the relationship between yards and setbacks, including front yard, side yard, rear yard, corner side yard, setback line, and minimum yard depth.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Retain one global definition of “person” and avoid duplicative definitions in specialized sections such as cannabis regulations.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Define “applicant” broadly and use it consistently in procedures; reserve “owner” for situations where ownership status is legally relevant.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Review medical and health facility terms, including medical or dental clinic, hospital – there is seemingly overlap between medical offices, clinics, etc.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Standardize restaurant-related terms, including sit-down restaurant, carry-out restaurant, drive-through restaurant, and drive-in or drive-through facility.
Chapter 2: Definitions	Clarify indoor entertainment and recreation use categories (such as indoor amusement facility, indoor recreational facility, and indoor theater).

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 2: Definitions	Use definitions only to define terms; move substantive permissions, prohibitions, dimensional limits, and approval standards into the operative code sections.
Chapter 2 / Chapter 5	Clarify and consolidate accessory building, accessory structure, and accessory use terminology, and align the definitions with operative accessory-use standards.
Chapter 3: Establishment and Purpose of Districts and District Boundaries	Clarify the intended policy role of each zoning district so the district lineup reads as a coherent housing, commercial, and mixed-use framework rather than only a sequence of lot-size or intensity categories.
Chapter 3 / Chapter 4	Consider whether R0, R1, R2, and R2B should remain separate districts if their main policy distinction is minimum lot size rather than distinct neighborhood or housing objectives.
Chapter 3 / Chapter 4	Treat R2 as the primary implementation district for residential reform because revisions to R2 standards will have the broadest practical effect.
Chapter 3 / Chapter 4	Use R3 and R4 as the basis for a clearer missing-middle and multifamily framework.
Chapter 3 / Chapter 4	Evaluate whether additional modest housing types should be permitted by right or through streamlined review in locations now limited to detached single-family development.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Amend residential and mixed-use district purpose statements and use permissions to better reflect Comprehensive Plan goals.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add or expand by-right permissions for duplexes and small multi-unit buildings, including 4- to 6-unit buildings, in appropriate R3 and R4 locations.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Broaden by-right or special-use permissions for townhomes, stacked flats, and small elevator-served multifamily in R3 and R4, particularly near Downtown and transit corridors.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Expand by-right multifamily permissions and increase allowable density in R4 and R5 where additional units can be accommodated.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Clarify and strengthen permissions for upper-story residential and mixed-use residential in C5 and C6 at moderate densities.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Amend commercial district standards, especially C2-C6, to explicitly allow upper-story residential and mixed-use multifamily in appropriate commercial and corridor locations.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow mixed-use residential along key corridors, including Roosevelt Road, where redevelopment can add housing while strengthening the commercial environment.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Provide height and FAR allowances sufficient to produce meaningful mixed-use and multifamily development, including 4- to 6-story buildings where context-appropriate.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Revise minimum lot area, lot width, lot coverage, and FAR standards in R2-R4 to allow alternative small-lot, cottage, and modest infill options.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Calibrate height and yard standards in R3 and R4 to allow 2- to 3-story missing-middle housing while maintaining neighborhood-compatible scale.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Create calibrated FAR or lot coverage controls that discourage oversized replacement homes while allowing reasonable modernization of existing smaller homes.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow modest reductions in minimum lot area or lot width through alternative small-lot standards where existing block patterns support smaller homes.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Evaluate whether minimum lot area and lot width standards should be adjusted for existing lots, infill lots, or lots lawfully created under prior standards.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Use the variation record as a calibration tool when revising R2 lot standards, side-yard formulas, lot coverage limits, and related bulk requirements.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Consider simplifying side-yard formulas or creating separate standards for legally existing narrow lots.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Clarify front-yard averaging and adjacent-structure alignment rules so compatible additions are less likely to require relief.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Permit small group homes and community residences by right wherever single-family dwellings are allowed in R1-R4 and R5, subject to the same bulk and parking standards as comparable dwellings.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add clear form standards for attached and small multifamily housing, including height, massing, façade rhythm, open space, and transitions to lower-density homes.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Permit smaller unit sizes and flexible open space standards where projects meet adopted form, common-area, and livability criteria.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Consider density, height, parking, fee, or flexibility incentives for projects that provide diverse unit types, smaller units, attainable price points, or affordable/mixed-income housing.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow small-lot, attached, and multifamily infill by clear standards in appropriate locations rather than reserving most new housing capacity for large discretionary projects.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Calibrate the C2 district around small-format retail, restaurant, service, office, civic, and limited mixed-use buildings that fit comfortably near residential neighborhoods.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	For C2 and neighborhood commercial areas, treat auto-oriented uses, drive-throughs, outdoor storage, and intensive service uses as conditional or special uses with objective location, access, screening, and design standards.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add frontage standards in neighborhood commercial areas requiring buildings to address the street, provide visible entrances, maintain pedestrian connections, and avoid parking-dominated frontages.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Strengthen residential-edge standards for commercial districts, including landscape buffers, lighting controls, service-area screening, refuse placement, noise control, loading location, and access management.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Consider splitting C3 into context-specific districts or overlays, such as Corridor Commercial, Corridor Mixed-Use, and Auto/Service Commercial.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	In C3 corridor areas, reduce or make flexible required front setbacks where redevelopment improves streetscape design, pedestrian access, landscape buffering, and building orientation.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Require or incentivize side or rear parking in C3 and other corridor areas, with strong perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping where front parking remains necessary.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add access-management standards for corridor redevelopment, including cross-access, shared driveways, consolidated curb cuts, rear access drives where feasible, and recorded easements.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Establish corridor design standards for façade articulation, primary entrances, pedestrian routes through parking lots, screening of loading/service areas, and landscaped street edges.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Limit intensive uses such as outdoor storage, vehicle storage, contractor yards, light manufacturing, and payday/check-cashing/currency exchange uses to locations where they will not undermine reinvestment, corridor image, or residential compatibility.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow mixed-use or multifamily development in targeted commercial locations identified as transition areas or redevelopment opportunities, while preserving active commercial frontage where appropriate.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Evaluate whether the Village still needs a standalone C4 office district or whether existing C4 areas should be folded into corridor, mixed-use, institutional, or neighborhood commercial districts.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow adaptive reuse and conversion of office buildings to residential, mixed-use, civic, educational, or medical uses through clear standards rather than relying primarily on discretionary relief.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Replace suburban office setback standards with context-sensitive building placement standards that accommodate both campus-style sites and more urban infill conditions.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add transition standards for C4 sites near residential neighborhoods, including height stepbacks, buffering, lighting controls, and loading/service placement.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Use redevelopment incentives or flexible approval procedures to encourage reinvestment in aging office properties.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	In C5, replace highly specific use lists with broader modern categories organized by ground-floor active uses, upper-floor uses, service/support uses, residential uses, civic uses, and restricted auto-oriented uses.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Establish downtown storefront activation standards for key pedestrian streets, including transparency, public entrance spacing, display windows, limits on blank walls, and restrictions on inactive ground-floor frontage.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow service and office uses in appropriate downtown locations while requiring active storefront treatment where they occupy visible ground-floor spaces.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Preserve the zero-to-five-foot front setback framework and accessory off-street parking exemption in the core retail area.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow certain office, educational, wellness, studio, and service uses at the ground floor only when they maintain active customer-facing storefronts and do not create long inactive frontages.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 10	Create an administrative path for small additions, façade changes, tenant changes, and adaptive reuse projects that meet clear downtown standards.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Retain special review for auto-oriented uses, drive-throughs, large-format uses, outdoor storage, and other uses that could disrupt downtown pedestrian character.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Retain C5B as the district for downtown service, mixed-use, parking, and transition areas, but simplify the use structure so new development and reuse are easier to understand.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Permit multifamily, upper-story residential, and mixed-use development by right in C5B when projects meet clear form, frontage, parking, and residential-transition standards.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Use special use review for single-purpose residential projects in C5B only where the Village wants to ensure that important commercial frontages are not lost.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Add clear C5B edge standards where the district abuts lower-density neighborhoods, including height stepbacks, landscaped buffers, lighting controls, service-area screening, and access management.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Allow adaptive reuse and context-sensitive additions in C5B without requiring a PUD when the project meets district standards.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Consider eliminating C6 if mapped areas can be more effectively regulated through updated corridor, mixed-use, downtown, or neighborhood commercial districts.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	If C6 is retained, establish baseline permitted uses, special uses, height ranges, frontage types, parking locations, open space expectations, access standards, and residential-transition standards.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 10	For C6 or planned-development areas, create an optional concept-plan review step so feasibility, community priorities, access, parking, and design expectations can be discussed before major investment.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 10	Clarify how amendments to approved planned developments will be handled, including streamlined review for minor changes, tenant changes, façade updates, parking adjustments, and site-plan refinements.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Update the I1 purpose statement to emphasize low-impact production, maker/flex space, research and development, contractor services, and employment-generating uses compatible with nearby neighborhoods.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 5	Establish performance standards for I1 and similar uses addressing noise, vibration, odor, dust, outdoor activity, hours of operation, truck circulation, loading, and refuse/service areas.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 5	Strengthen buffering and screening requirements for I1 sites near residential, park, or public/semi-public uses.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 4 / Chapter 5	Require loading areas, outdoor storage, and vehicle storage to be located and screened to minimize visibility from streets and adjacent residential properties.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Consider allowing limited accessory retail, tasting rooms, showrooms, or customer-facing components for maker, food/beverage, and production uses where parking and access can be managed.
Chapter 4: District Regulations	Retain the CC district master plan approach, but clarify required contents for future master plan updates, including land use, building envelopes, circulation, parking, stormwater, open space, lighting, signage, and campus-edge transitions.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 5	Establish pedestrian and bicycle connection standards along Lambert Road, Park Boulevard, Fawell Boulevard, and other College of DuPage campus edges.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 10	Clarify when amendments to the College of DuPage master plan are major or minor and create a predictable process for routine campus changes.
Chapter 4 / Chapter 5	Strengthen campus edge standards for lighting, loading, service areas, event operations, and landscape buffering near residential areas.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Create a general residential standards article or division for provisions that apply across multiple residential districts.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Create one residential improvements table identifying common improvements, where they may be located, applicable setbacks, height or size limits, lot coverage treatment, and design conditions.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Clarify the accessory building type limitation or replace it with a simpler maximum number and/or maximum cumulative area standard.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Replace complex accessory-structure bonus rules with direct dimensional standards where feasible, such as maximum square footage, maximum height, or minimum setback.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Retain incentives for front porches and rear-lot garages only if they are easy to administer and coordinated with stormwater, impervious surface, and site design requirements.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Replace detached garage and front porch bonus rules with direct standards where feasible.


Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Clarify how front-yard paving limits, required parking spaces, driveway width, and impervious surface setbacks interact.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Revise driveway material standards to allow sustainable low-impact designs, including ribbon driveways, split-track systems, permeable pavers, and other approved designs.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Consider eliminating the separate impervious surface setback table and using a more consistent accessory-use setback standard for paved surfaces, with a driveway exception where appropriate.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Use variation data for lots under 50 feet wide to test revised paving, driveway, and impervious surface setback standards before adoption.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add supplementary regulations encouraging step-free entries, visitable ground-floor units, and accessible common areas in multifamily and townhome projects.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add supplementary standards for larger supportive facilities addressing scale, access, parking, life-safety, compatibility, occupancy, spacing, and design without unnecessary separation requirements.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Replace long lists of individual retail and service uses with broader use categories and use-specific standards.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Clarify the relationship between principal uses, accessory uses, temporary uses, outdoor dining, outdoor display, events, food trucks, and accessory retail.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Create frontage standards for key street types, including downtown storefront, neighborhood commercial, corridor commercial, and service/industrial frontages.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Establish building orientation standards requiring principal entrances to face streets, public sidewalks, parking courts, or internal pedestrian routes.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Require pedestrian routes from public sidewalks to building entrances, transit stops, parking areas, and adjacent sites.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add parking placement standards that prefer side or rear parking in walkable areas and require strong screening where front parking remains.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Require perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping, parking-lot islands, foundation landscaping, landscaped medians, and pedestrian refuges in larger parking lots.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Require cross-access and shared access for corridor redevelopment unless infeasible due to site conditions.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add downtown storefront standards for transparency, entrance spacing, display windows, façade rhythm, durable materials, and limits on inactive or blank frontage.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add corridor design standards for façade articulation, pedestrian-scale features, gateway treatments, signage coordination, and streetscape compatibility.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Add low-impact development and green infrastructure standards for major redevelopment, especially along Roosevelt Road and in highly impervious commercial areas.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Modernize parking regulations for downtown, senior housing, affordable housing, small-unit housing, mixed-use buildings, and transit-proximate development to reflect shared parking, public parking availability, reduced vehicle ownership, and transportation-demand strategies.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Allow shared parking between commercial and residential uses in mixed-use buildings and planned developments.
Chapter 5: Supplementary Regulations	Encourage public/private parking partnerships, shared parking agreements, and structured parking where they support downtown vitality and reduce pressure for surface parking.
Chapter 7: Planned Unit Developments	Update residential PUD standards to encourage mixes of small-lot single-family, townhomes, and small multifamily on larger infill or redevelopment sites.
Chapter 7: Planned Unit Developments	Add cottage court or small-home cluster options to the residential PUD standards with tailored bulk standards and shared open space.
Chapter 7: Planned Unit Developments	Use residential PUD standards to support mixed-income housing and a range of unit sizes on larger infill or redevelopment sites.
Chapter 7: Planned Unit Developments	Revise PUD standards to clarify when residential and mixed-use PUDs are appropriate for assembling, intensifying, or redeveloping key opportunity sites.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 7: Planned Unit Developments	Establish clearer PUD expectations for minimum density, mix of uses, housing affordability, public benefits, site design, open space, connectivity, and transition standards.
Chapter 7 / Chapter 10	Clarify when a PUD special use is required and consider eliminating minimum acreage so PUDs can be used surgically where they add real value.
Chapter 7 / Chapter 10	Create a formal tiered amendment system for PUDs and special uses, distinguishing minor amendments from major amendments requiring full hearings.
Chapter 7 / Chapter 10	Reduce reliance on PUDs and special uses for development that can be regulated through clear district, form, frontage, parking, and transition standards.
Chapter 8: Nonconformities	Amend compliance and nonconformity provisions so small, older homes on nonconforming lots can be modestly expanded or reconfigured without triggering requirements that make teardown more likely.
Chapter 8: Nonconformities	Create clearer pathways for maintenance, modest expansion, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and reinvestment on smaller or nonconforming residential lots.
Chapter 8: Nonconformities	Reduce reliance on historic eligibility tests, prior lot configuration, prior ownership, prior variation history, repeated exceptions, and technical cross-references where current objective standards can be used.
Chapter 8: Nonconformities	Clarify how Class I, II, and III alteration and addition categories apply without requiring users to rely on definitions alone.
Chapter 8 / Chapter 10	Add a cross-reference between enforcement and nonconformities, with a policy statement clarifying that enforcement will be proportionate and lawful nonconformities will not be targeted.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Create short, checklist-style sections for zoning certificates, occupancy certificates, and driveway approach permits, including who may apply, required submittals, review path, and decision timelines.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Require staff to document key interpretations, such as story, height, lot coverage, and measurement issues, as written policies or an administrative interpretations appendix.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Add a dedicated appeals section with filing deadline, appeal contents, stay of enforcement rules, standard of review, and whether new evidence is permitted.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Require administrative officials to issue decisions in writing so applicants know when the appeal clock starts and what decision is being appealed.

Zoning Code Chapter	Consolidated Recommendation
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Collapse the two-tier variation standards into a single, clearly enumerated set of plain-language criteria applicable across districts.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Introduce an administrative adjustment or minor variation tool for small, quantifiable deviations that the Community Development Director can approve under clear criteria.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Add a policy statement that repeated, similar variation approvals should trigger code amendments rather than continued case-by-case relief.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Tighten special use standards so they focus on land-use compatibility, traffic, infrastructure, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Move purely aesthetic or frontage-related special use conditions into district, frontage, or design standards rather than addressing them case by case.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Clarify termination, extension, modification, and revocation procedures for special uses, variations, map amendments, and PUD approvals, including who may initiate review.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Consider adding intermediate enforcement tools, such as administrative citations or stop-work orders, with clear criteria for graduated enforcement.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Consolidate staff titles into one or two defined administrative roles and use those titles consistently throughout Chapter 10.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Add an administration overview section with a process map summarizing, for each procedure, the intake body, recommending body, final decision-maker, and typical timeline.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Add process flowcharts for variations, special uses, PUDs, map amendments, appeals, zoning certificates, and other administrative approvals.
Chapter 10: Administration and Enforcement	Cross-reference a “How to Apply” section or external application guide to align the zoning code with the Village’s electronic permitting platform and process-tracking goals.
Chapter 11: Illustrations	Integrate illustrations into the operative code sections instead of leaving them only in a standalone chapter at the back of the code.

RE Parcel Size Analysis



College Of Dupage



College Rd

Glen Park Rd

ey Rd

Glen Park Rd

S Milton Ave

Elmwood Dr

Canterbury Ct

Mc carron Rd

Southminster Presbyterian Church

Stanton Rd

Arboretum Rd

Pinegrove Ct

Ahlstrand Rd

Ahlstrand Rd

Raider Ln

Park Blvd

Parkview Dr

Parkview Dr

Lakeside Dr

Lakeside Dr

Crimson King Ln

Autumn Blaze Dr

Butterfield Rd

Hackberry Dr

Hackberry Dr

Forest Hill Dr

Cypress Dr

Teakwood Dr

Arboretum Rd

Burr Oak Dr


Sequoia Dr

Parcels in RE Zoning

Area,Width,Depth



Compliant (35)




Area < 50,000 sq ft & Width > 150 ft & Depth > 160 ft (9)



Area < 50,000 sq ft & Width < 150 ft & Depth > 160 ft (7)

Date: 3/26/2026

R0 Parcel Size Analysis



Parcels in R0 Zoning

Area,Width,Depth


	Compliant
	Area is > 18,000 sq ft& interior lot width < 100 ft & lot depth > 150 ft
	Area < 18,000 sq ft & interior lot width < 100 ft & lot depth < 150ft

Date: 3/26/2026

R1 Parcel Size Analysis



GLENDAL
HEIGHTS





Parcels in R1 Zoning

Area,Width,Depth

- Compliant (167)
- Area > 14,500 sq ft & Interior lot width < 90 ft or Corner lot width < 108 ft & Lot Depth > 130 ft (17)
- Area < 14,500 sq ft & Interior lot width > 90 ft or Corner lot width > 108 ft & Lot Depth > 130 ft (84)
- Area < 14,500 sq ft & Interior lot width < 90 ft or Corner lot width < 108 ft & Lot Depth > 130 ft (37)
- Area < 14,500 sq ft & Interior lot width < 90 ft or Corner lot width < 108 ft & Lot Depth < 130 ft (2)

Date: 3/26/2026

R2 Parcel Size Analysis



Date: 3/24/2026



R2B Parcel Size Analysis

