



**DUPAGE
COUNTY**

BUILDING & ZONING DEPARTMENT

630-407-6700
fax: 630-407-6702

www.dupagecounty.gov/building

MEMORANDUM

TO: DuPage County Development Committee

FROM: DuPage County Zoning Board of Appeals

DATE: May 7, 2026

RE: **ZONING-26-000007 NGHC, Inc. (Lisle / District 5)**

DuPage County Development Committee: May 19, 2026:

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting: May 7, 2026: The Zoning Board of Appeals recommended to deny the following zoning relief:

1. Conditional Use for a Planned Development for three (3) uses on the subject property: a Group Home, a greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and an Accessory Dwelling Unit.
2. Variation to increase the total area of permitted detached accessory buildings from 1,241 sq. ft to approximately 6,989 sq. ft. (3,850 sq. ft. ADU, 2,880 sq. ft. greenhouse, and 259 sq. ft. existing shed).
3. Variation to exceed the maximum permissible area for detached accessory buildings in the R-3 Single Family Residential District from 2,600 sq. ft. to approximately 6,989 sq. ft.
4. Variation to allow the total area of detached accessory buildings (proposed accessory dwelling unit, proposed greenhouse, and existing shed) to be larger than the principal building (existing house is 4,745 sq. ft.).
5. Variation to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be more than 1,000 sq. ft. in size (approximately 3,850 sq. ft.).
6. Variation to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be located in a new detached accessory building.
7. Variation to increase the maximum number of permitted occupants on the property—from five (5) occupants to 12 occupants total—allocated as eight (8) occupants in the existing principal single-family /proposed group home and 4 occupants in the accessory dwelling unit.
8. Variation to allow neither the legal or beneficial owner to be an occupant on the property with an ADU.

9. Variation to allow the exterior of the converted dwelling to not retain the appearance of an existing accessory building containing the accessory dwelling unit.
10. Variation to increase the height of a detached accessory building from permitted 24 feet to approximately 28 for the proposed greenhouse and 36 for the proposed accessory dwelling unit.

ZBA VOTE (to Deny): 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Absent

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That petitioner testified that the subject zoning relief is for a Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”), with required Variations.
2. That petitioner testified that there is a large community of individuals that are intellectually disabled and looking for a group home in DuPage County.
 - a. That petitioner testified that he started the group home search for his daughter and that the proposed group home would be for his daughter and other group home occupants.
3. That petitioner testified that Little Friends will operate the group home within the existing residence located on the subject property.
4. That petitioner testified that a proposed 3,850 square-foot ADU would be constructed at the rear of the subject property for occupancy by himself and other family members of the group home residents in order to remain in close proximity to their family members.
5. That petitioner testified that individuals with intellectual disabilities often face challenges obtaining employment and that the proposed greenhouse on the subject property would provide residents of the group home with opportunities to grow food for personal consumption and for sale as a form of employment and vocational activity.
6. That petitioner testified that the proposed Planned Development, consisting of the group home, greenhouse, and ADU, would generate earned revenue for the group home residents and additional rental income to support the operation of the group home.
 - a. That petitioner testified that a charitable organization, NGHC, Inc., was established and that the existing residence, along with additional funds, would be donated to the organization for the development and operation of the group home, ADU, and greenhouse.
 - b. That petitioner testified that residents of the proposed ADU would pay rent to the charitable organization in order to help support the individuals residing within the group home located in the principal residence.
7. That the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence for the Standards for Conditional Use or Variation and has not presented a particular hardship or practical difficulty for a Variation.

STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USES:

1. That the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that petitioner has not demonstrated that the granting of the Conditional Use is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, detrimental to the public welfare, or in conflict with the County's comprehensive plan for development; and specifically that the granting of the Conditional Use will not:
 - a. Impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property.
 - b. Increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property.
 - c. Diminish the value of land and buildings throughout the County as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not diminish the value of land and buildings throughout the County.
 - d. Unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways.
 - e. Increase the potential for flood damages to adjacent property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase the potential for flood damages to adjacent property.
 - f. Incur additional public expense for flood protection, rescue or relief as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not incur additional public expense for flood protection, rescue, or relief.
 - g. Otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of DuPage County as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of DuPage County.

STANDARDS FOR VARIATIONS:

1. That the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that petitioner has not demonstrated that the granting of the Variation is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, detrimental to the public welfare, or in conflict with the County's comprehensive plan for development.

2. That the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that petitioner has not demonstrated the granting of the Variation will not:
 - a. Impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property.
 - b. Increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to said property.
 - c. Diminish the value of land and buildings throughout the County as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not diminish the value of land and buildings throughout the County.
 - d. Unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways.
 - e. Increase the potential for flood damages to adjacent property as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not increase the potential for flood damages to adjacent property.
 - f. Incur additional public expense for flood protection, rescue or relief as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit will not incur additional public expense for flood protection, rescue, or relief.
 - g. Otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of DuPage County as petitioner has not demonstrated or provided sufficient evidence that the proposed Planned Development for a group home, greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and accessory dwelling unit proposed accessory dwelling unit will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of DuPage County.

GENERAL ZONING CASE INFORMATION

CASE #/PETITIONER: ZONING-26-000007 NGHC, Inc.

ZONING REQUEST:

1. Conditional Use for a Planned Development for three (3) uses on the subject property: a Group Home, a greenhouse with accessory retail/wholesale crop sales on the subject property, and an Accessory Dwelling Unit.
2. Variation to increase the total area of permitted detached accessory buildings from 1,241 sq. ft to approximately 6,989 sq. ft. (3,850 sq. ft. ADU, 2,880 sq. ft. greenhouse, and 259 sq. ft. existing shed).
3. Variation to exceed the maximum permissible area for detached accessory buildings in the R-3 Single Family Residential District from 2,600 sq. ft. to approximately 6,989 sq. ft.
4. Variation to allow the total area of detached accessory buildings (proposed accessory dwelling unit, proposed greenhouse, and existing shed) to be larger than the principal building (existing house is 4,745 sq. ft.).
5. Variation to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be more than 1,000 sq. ft. in size (approximately 3,850 sq. ft.).
6. Variation to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be located in a new detached accessory building.
7. Variation to increase the maximum number of permitted occupants on the property—from five (5) occupants to 12 occupants total—allocated as eight (8) occupants in the existing principal single-family /proposed group home and 4 occupants in the accessory dwelling unit.
8. Variation to allow neither the legal or beneficial owner to be an occupant on the property with an ADU.
9. Variation to allow the exterior of the converted dwelling to not retain the appearance of an existing accessory building containing the accessory dwelling unit.
10. Variation to increase the height of a detached accessory building from permitted 24 feet to approximately 28 for the proposed greenhouse and 36 for the proposed accessory dwelling unit.

OWNER: NGHC, INC., 25W351 PLANK ROAD, NAPERVILLE, IL 60563 / **AGENT:** DAVID J. NELSON, 25W351 PLANK ROAD, NAPERVILLE, IL 60563

ADDRESS/LOCATION: 25W351 PLANK ROAD, NAPERVILLE, IL 60563

PIN: 08-08-401-005 / 08-08-401-102

TWSP./CTY. BD. DIST.: LISLE / DISTRICT 5

ZONING/LUP: R-3 SF RES / 0-5 DU AC

AREA: 1.14 ACRES (49,658 SQ. FT.)

UTILITIES: WELL / SEPTIC

PUBLICATION DATE: DAILY HERALD: APRIL 15, 2026

PUBLIC HEARING: THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Building: No objection or concerns with the petition.

DUDOT: Our office has no jurisdiction in this matter.

Health: *No Comments Received.*

Stormwater: No objection/concerns with the concept of the petition. Additional information may be required at time of permit application.

- “The Stormwater Department has no objection to the petition as conceptually presented. However, the petitioner is notified that any increase in net new impervious area beyond Stormwater Ordinance thresholds will trigger requirements for detention and Post-Construction Best Management Areas.”

Public Works: “DPC Public Works doesn’t own any sewer or water mains in this area.”

EXTERNAL:

City of Naperville: *No Comments Received.*

Village of Lisle: Our office has no jurisdiction in this matter.

Lisle Township: *No Comments Received.*

Township Highway: No objection or concerns with the petition.

Lisle-Woodridge Fire Dist.: *No Comments Received.*

Sch. Dist. 203: *No Comments Received.*

Forest Preserve: “Forest Preserve District of DuPage County staff have reviewed the information provided by the County for Public Notice Cases: ZONING-26-000007 NGHC, Inc.; PLAT-26-000005 Coco Estates; PLAT-26-000004 BLASK NFP (Shine); ZONING-26-000010 CHAVEZ; ZONING-26-000011 Elliott; ZONING-26-000012 Starodub; and ZONING-26-000014 Ansari and we do not have any comments. Please consider this the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County’s formal response to these Public Notices.”

LAND USE

Subject Property:

- **Zoning:** R-3 SF RES / **Existing Use:** HOUSE / **Land Use Plan (LUP):** 0-5 DU AC

North of Subject Property:

- **Zoning:** PLANK ROAD AND BEYOND R-3 SF RES / **Existing Use:** HOUSE / **Land Use Plan (LUP):** 0-5 DU AC

South of Subject Property:

- **Zoning:** R-3 SF RES / **Existing Use:** HOUSE / **Land Use Plan (LUP):** 0-5 DU AC

East of Subject Property:

- **Zoning:** R-3 SF RES / **Existing Use:** VACANT / **Land Use Plan (LUP):** 0-5 DU AC

West of Subject Property:

- **Zoning:** R-3 SF RES / **Existing Use:** HOUSE / **Land Use Plan (LUP):** 0-5 DU AC