

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, July 14, 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, Peter Kelly, Christine McKnight, Craig Pavlich, Noureen Lakhani and Chairperson Chip Miller

Absent: Member Matthew Jones

Also in attendance: Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Gabby Brunner, Planning Intern, 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 June 9, 2026, Zoning Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve June 9, 2026, minutes by Member Buckton, Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

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

Sworn in Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Gabby Brunner, Planning Intern for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Lindsay & Johnathan Lantz, Kevin McCarthy, Tim Nelson, Mark Kollias, Chris Scheid.

D. Old Business

1. Public Hearing - 593 Lee St

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the continuation variation request for 593 Lee St.

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 and reduces the total lot coverage proposed by approximately 148 square feet. 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 Petitioner requests approval of a variation from the following section 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.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Applicant Statement
Site Plan
Elevations
Floor Plan

Support Letter- Neill
Opposed Letter- DeDera
Opposed Letter - Wilson & Fraccaro

Member Questions:

Member Lakhani asked for the height of the elevation.

Mr. Frahm stated he did not have the height available to him but stated that the height conforms to the height requirement. (The proposed ridge height of the addition is 25'-3")

Member Pavlich asked what year the home was built and what lot coverage ratios were enforced during that time.

Mr. Harper stated that the home was built in 1925, and the required lot coverage ratio was 30% in the 1923 zoning code.

The homeowner, Kevin McCarthy, presented to Members his backstory on his collaborative effort to seek neighbor feedback since earlier this year (Feb 2026). He took the feedback seriously and made the following 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 by area. During the hearing, a neighboring property owner pointed out that a new front entry could be incorporated without constructing an addition. They 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 being 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 set back to create a more residential appearance and lessen its visual impact on neighboring properties. During the hearing, a neighboring property owner asked for undulations 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. He believes the revised elevations are more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and better address concerns raised during public hearing.

By asking for a lot coverage variance, they are building on the existing footprint of home. The design was selected for privacy and to preserve Lee Street charm. He added that 14 neighbors submitted letters of support. He read a passage from a letter of support from the neighbor directly south of the property, Mr. Assif.

Member Buckton noted that the opposing neighbors were to the north, and both original and revised proposals don't address looking at the large building from their windows. He asked if they looked into this issue.

Tim Nelson, the architect and Petitioner, stated that they didn't want bedroom windows facing other windows but could add them if needed.

Brandy Wilson, Marty Dederer & Tyler Benware are sworn in.

Brandy Wilson, an architect and neighbor, met with the McCarthys and provided sketches. She stated that she gave an honest effort and is concerned about privacy and light. She does not want a two-story home looming over her back yard. She is in favor of problem solving but states that there is no collaboration here with her neighbors. They must respect all codes and zoning codes. She asks to please consider future construction in this neighborhood.

Martin Dederer, a neighboring resident, wanted to comment on the applicant's new design. He stated that he would have loved to sit and discuss concerns about privacy, trees, and light. He included pictures in the letter of opposition of what they would be looking at with the revision. He states that the new design adds no relief to his property and that there is no evidence that he has provided that proves this would add value to the neighborhood. He provided ideas to the Petitioner to expand his home in a manner that would be within code. He is now considering moving due to this.

Tyler Benware listed the 13 addresses of those in favor in which he was representing. They believe the proposal satisfies the character and charm of neighborhood. He stated that the property owners have listened to feedback and worked with Village Staff, and their willingness to collaborate is representative in the changes made to initial proposal. They are utilizing a respected architect who is familiar with older homes, and they are supportive of this proposal.

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

Deliberation

Member Kelly asked what constitutes a hardship. It is an undersized lot, and that is a recognized hardship. The code does not really require the property to accommodate increased house size incurred. He asked if there is a land-based hardship and stated that he doesn't see it meeting the threshold required for a variance.

Member Buckton stated that the Petitioner has gone above and beyond to do what is right to make their home livable. He is going to vote yes because the R2 District is filled with non-conforming lots.

Member McKnight noted that this is a difficult case, but there must be hardships specific to the land. There is evidence that there are many similar in sized lots, and she is inclined to vote no.

Member Pavlich reminded the Board that this lot requires a variance to build anything on it aside from what is already there. There are other variances like this that they have approved. He reminded the public to be sensitive to changes as the neighborhood progresses.

Member Lakhani agreed that the property is land-locked and needs a variation for anything that they decide to do.

Chairperson Miller doesn't see a hardship and will be voting no.

Member Buckton stated that he sees what Member Pavlich is saying, but in this case, they should consider what adjacent neighbors are saying.

Motion to close public hearing by Member Buckton, seconded by Member McKnight.

Member McKnight recommended Approval of the Variation based on the Findings of Facts, Member Pavlich seconded the motion; motion did not pass vote (3) yes and 3 (no).

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

2. Public Hearing - 635 Carolyn Drive

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the continuation variation request for 635 Carolyn Drive.

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 of 34'9" from the rear yard property line in lieu of the required minimum setback of 40'0". The revised plans show a 2-foot reduction in the requested rear yard setback variation from 32'-9" to 34'-9". The modification has reduced the total lot coverage ratio on the property from the originally proposed 2,059 square feet or 19.9% to 2,028 square feet or 19.6%. The applicant has included an updated narrative statement explaining these changes for the member of the board to review and was included in packet.

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

1. Section 10-4-8(D)(2) to allow for a rear yard setback thirty-four feet and nine inches (34'9") from the rear yard property line in lieu of the required setback of forty feet (40'0").

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Narrative Statement

Updated Site & Elevation Plans

Member Questions:

No member questions.

Lindsay and Johnathan Lantz, the Petitioners and homeowners, provided a summary of what was going to be discussed and noted that they had met with Mr. Harper and did neighbor outreach. They reached out to their neighbor at 780 Lenox, who had concerns with stormwater, patio encroachment, and a lack of privacy. They invited him into their home and showed the plans to

him. They told him that they would address the potential stormwater issue, follow Village Engineering recommendations, and plant large trees to provide privacy.

Mr. and Mrs. Lantz stated that their hardship is that the lot is the uniquely wedge-shaped, irregular geometry of the lot. They note that the only code departure is at the back of the lot, which is due to the shape of lot and not their doing. This restricts the buildable area on the lot to 775 square feet. If this were a typical R2 lot, they state that they would not be here. The existing patio footprint will not change, and they are not looking to make any monetary gains from this project. The reduction from 40' to 34'9" represents the variance being requested. They reduced the depth of the addition from 8' to 6'.

Member Pavlich asked if the overall roof line height would not be taller.

Mark Kollias, the project's architect, stated that the height will be lower, not higher.

Sworn in Kevin Wenta, Scott Fisher, Jim Raymond & Paul Botic

Kevin Wenta, the opposing neighbor and resident of 780 Lennox, stated that the Lantz's will get everything they like without a bump out. He thinks there really is no hardship. The trees will not be tall enough, and in the winter, they will see everything. Once they all received the notice, it was shocking that this is what they are doing. The stormwater problem is real, and there is flooding with some of their neighbors.

Member Buckton noted that the Petitioner is correct, and the stormwater is not a zoning concern. Therefore, there is nothing they can consider.

Member Pavlich asked if he currently has drainage issues and is concerned this will create more issues. He noted that the maximum fence height is only 6' with privacy concerns, so maybe a taller fence can be considered as conditions for approval.

Mr. Wenta clarified that his concern is correct.

Member Lakhani asked if additional landscaping would be helpful with the privacy concerns.

Mr. Wenta responded no because they would not be tall enough.

Scott Fisher, the resident of 795 N. Park, expressed his support for the Lantz Family to modify their home. He stated that families and landscape are major components of Glen Ellyn. He asked the Zoning Board of Appeals to approve the request.

Jim Raymond, the next-door neighbor and resident of 631 Carolyn Dr., stated that the Lantz's have given a great presentation and are not building a McMansion, as they have seen before. They are making a minimal improvement, and he is fully in support of it.

Paul Botic, the resident of 636 Carolyn Dr., states that he fully supports the proposal. The Lantz's are the third owners of that property, and they have done a number of projects on that house, which have been done with class and the best materials. They are in favor of it. They have a wall of arborvitae, and it works great for privacy.

Mr. Kollias, architect of the project, stated that the difference in grade is 4', and the neighbors that are opposed have a larger rear yard lot coverage than the Lantz's. They are just trying to get up to speed.

Mr. Harper stated that the Village is charged with enforcing the DuPage Stormwater Ordinance. Any new structure is required to have a stormwater review. As part of building permit process, the Engineering team will review the project.

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

Deliberation

Member Buckton stated that he doesn't see the hardship since there are other opportunities and will be voting no.

Member Kelly noted that he is leaning towards yes and believes that the Zoning Code is set exactly for issues like this and that the issue was not generated by the owners. Their new proposal has decreased footprint and will decrease the view of the shed.

Member McKnight stated that hardship is shown, and she is inclined to vote yes.

Member Lakhani stated that she is inclined to vote yes as well but mentions that the applicants should be able to work together with their neighbor. She made a note to include in the minutes that the stormwater issues are an infrastructure issue, not a Zoning Board of Appeals issue.

Member Pavlich noted that they could consider adding a condition to the approval to have the owners look at stormwater mitigation and consider it as a neighborly request. They could also consider pursuing variations for privacy issues, especially a fence.

Chairperson Miller stated that he is switching to vote yes since the lot is a unique size.

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

Member McKnight recommended Approval of Variation based on the Findings of Fact, under the condition that a landscape plan be included part of the permit application to show privacy concern mitigation. Member Kelly seconded the motion; motion passed with a vote (5) yes and 1 (no).

Member McKnight moved to open the Public Hearing on 877 Crescent Blvd Member Buckton seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

E. New Business

3. Public Hearing - 877 Crescent Blvd

Gabby Brunner, Planning Intern for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the variation request for 877 Crescent Blvd.

Chris Scheid, the Petitioner and 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"). The proposed addition will not increase lot coverage. The east elevation is 22', and the maximum allowed height is 35'.

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.

Following attachments were all presented to the Members:

Aerial Map
Zoning Map
Plat of Survey
Proposed Plans & Elevations

Member Questions:

Member Pavlich asked for clarification on the exemption requirements listed in Section 10-4-1(N).

Chris Scheid, the Petitioner and homeowner, noted that they just moved into the neighborhood. They need more space to make it more conducive for them. The existing conditions of the primary bedroom were shown, and it is stated that the home is located on a corner lot. Only one neighbor on Roger Road had reached out.

Mr. Kollias, the architect, points out the area at the back of the house under the roof. He states that the hardship is that the home is on a corner lot, which limits buildable areas. They meet all points to qualify for the exception to build over the footprint of the existing home in Section 10-4-1(N) except for the 20' corner side yard setback. They are stepping the addition in 16 inches to maintain the gable look of the home.

Member Pavlich asks how the home was able to be built with these setbacks in 1953.

Mr. Harper stated that the new code was not adopted until 1955. In 1923, a 7' setback would have been conforming.

Member Lakhani asked what other options were explored.

Mr. Scheid stated that he wanted to make the east side the same as the west.

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

Deliberation

Member Lakhani stated that she is inclined to be in support of the project.

Member Kelly mentioned that the project is pretty straightforward as a nonconforming corner lot and is a solid yes.

Member Buckton noted that it is pretty clear. Nothing has changed, and there is no increase on lot coverage ratio. He is a yes.

Member McKnight stated that she is a yes.

Chairperson Miller stated that he is a yes as well.

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

Member McKnight recommended Approval of Variation based on Findings of Facts, Member Buckton seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote (6) yes and 0 (no).

4. Zoning Code Discussion

Daniel presented to the Members that 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.

The Members are being asked to review Section 3, Section 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' direction on the following questions:

Administration and Procedures - Not entirely discussed, will complete discussion in future meeting

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 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:
 - a. 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;
 - b. That the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district;
 - c. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property;
 - d. 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

- e. 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;
 - f. 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;
 - g. 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?”**

Member Feedback:

Members asked for specific recommendations from ZoneCo and would like more information.

They state that they have no problem looking at other municipalities to see what they’re doing differently and what their best practices are.

They asked if other communities have adopted form-based code and reverted afterwards, and Mr. Harper said yes.

- 4. “The report recommends that the new code introduces 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?”**

Member Feedback:

They suggest that administrative variations should include an objection trigger. There should be a threshold, like after the ZBA approved 50 homes with setbacks, then Mr. Harper can approve them. Either the code should just change, or it could have a threshold that can be revisited every two years.

They suggest that the Village can move away from the administrative method and move towards improving the code, a mechanism that reduces case load overall, and perhaps create a non-conforming chapter. They could phase out administrative zoning variations, and if the nonconformity conditions are met, then you can do “x”, take data, use recurring items that come up all the time, and set a rule for it.

Nonconforming Structures and Lots

Some recommendations at this point of the process include reorganizing smaller lots and non-conforming lots, re-evaluating the 50’ lot width and 6,534 square foot threshold, and creating a clearer by right path for maintenance and re-configuration.

- 1. “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?”**

Member Feedback:

They note that making these adjustments would clarify situations similar to the corner side lot setback case presented this evening. They recommended a grandfathered clause for these types of cases that they consistently see in ZBA. To preserve an existing setback for a nonconforming lot is okay.

Mr. Harper asked if non-conforming lots and non-conforming buildings should be separated.

Member Pavlich expressed his support for those buildings that were nonconforming. They could have a cutoff date for the last serious code amendment and grandfather these requests from a certain date. Back in the 90's, there were bigger lots with more green space. Now people are interested in supporting a bit more density. The ZBA should all study the Comprehensive Plan and try to create a code that aligns with that plan. He suggested that the Village have more smaller zoning districts that are respective of how they were built originally.

Mr. Harper noted that all numbers and setbacks are determined by political and ideological ideas to create a market condition.

Anne Gould stated that there needs to be thought around how the Village maintains the diversity of homes and maintain stock of starter homes.

2. "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?"**

Mr. Harper stated that this could create confusion for staff and homeowners.

Mr. Kollias noted that they should be considering the IBC fire rating.

Member Pavlich expressed dislike of the idea but suggested that it could be a formula based on lot size and width. He wants staff to strongly consider number of districts and tailor them to lot width perhaps.

Member Kelly supports revising the code but would leave it to ZoneCo to come up with a creative solution. He stated that they need to address side yard setbacks.

E. Other Business

None

F. Chairperson's Statement

None

G. Trustee Liaison Report - Robert Duncan

- Continuing Strategic Plan discussions

H. Staff Report

Mr. Harper stated the following:

1. Dutch Bros recommended unanimously at the Plan Commission meeting
2. Application for an addition to ACE Hardware on Roosevelt Road is being reviewed by staff.
3. Church to east of Village Hall is in process of selling the southern annex of the building and are requesting a Special Use Permit for 12-15 multi-family units
4. Starbucks on Roosevelt will open soon.
5. High School Project is underway.
6. Downtown Park is being worked on. The pavilion will be smaller, and they are adding a playground

I. Adjournment

Member Buckton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member McKnight seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote at 10:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora