



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Consider: Who benefits? Who is burdened?

Who does not have a voice at the table?

How can policymakers mitigate unintended consequences?

Thursday, November 20, 2025

5:00 PM

Virtual

The City of Madison is holding the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting in virtual format.

Written Comments: You can send comments on agenda items to
zoning@cityofmadison.com

Register for Public Comment:

- Register to speak at the meeting
- Register to answer questions
- Register in support or opposition of an agenda item (without speaking)

If you want to speak at this meeting you must register. You can register at <https://www.cityofmadison.com/MeetingRegistration>. When you register to speak, you will be sent an email with the information you will need to join the virtual meeting.

Watch the Meeting: If you would like to join the meeting as an observer, please visit <https://www.cityofmadison.com/watchmeetings>.

Listen by Phone: (877) 853-5257 (Toll Free) **Webinar ID:** 895 2251 9520

Call to Order/Roll Call

Ostlind called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

Staff Present: Katie Bannon, Gabriela Arteaga, and Cary Olson

Present: 4 - Peter A. Ostlind; Angela Jenkins; David P. Waugh and Cliff Goodhart

Absent: 1 - Agnes (Allie) B. Berenyi

Excused: 1 - Samuel V. B. Fritz

Approval of Minutes

Waugh moved to approve the minutes from the meeting of November 20, 2025. Jenkins seconded the motion. The board made edits to the minutes. The motion to approve the minutes with revisions passed 3-0 by unanimous vote.

Public Comment

1. [90747](#) Public Comment: 11/20/2025

There were no public comments.

Disclosures and Recusals

There were no disclosures or recusals.

Petition for Variance, Area Exceptions or Appeals

2. [90746](#) Terence Gregory Blake & Yuyang Zhong, owners of the property at 18 Powers Ave, request a side yard setback variance for a second story addition to a single-family house. Alder district #15

Attachments: [18 Powers Ave - Sanborn.jpg](#)
[18 Powers Ave - Aerial.pdf](#)
[18 Powers Ave - Application .pdf](#)

Zoning Administrator Bannon provided an overview of the request. Bannon explained that the Board approved a variance for a second-story addition at this location, 18 Powers Ave, in December 2024. At that time the project included an attached ADU as a second-story addition. It would have added a unit to the top of the single-story house and had a height of 26'. A new variance is required because the project has changed. What the petitioners propose today is to build a 27' high, second-story addition to the single-family house. The addition would not be an ADU.

Otherwise, it is a similar request to the previous request. The existing house has a side setback of 3'. The code requires a 4' side yard setback, and the petitioners propose a 3' side yard setback on the footprint of the existing house. The petitioners request a variance of one foot. Bannon presented elevations, floor plans, and photographs to show the scope of the project and the existing conditions of the property.

Petitioners Yuyang Zhong and Terence Gregory Blake confirmed that Bannon's description of the request was accurate. The petitioners explained that an addition would serve their needs since the house is small. The petitioners considered building to the back of the property, but it would be difficult since there are 100-year-old trees with well-established roots. Blake stated that the house is already at the 3' setback and, since the roof is steep, the house will only gain 5' in height.

The Board asked questions.

Ostlind closed the public hearing.

Jenkins moved to approve the requested variance. Waugh seconded the motion.

Review of Standards:

Standard 1: There are conditions unique to the property of the applicant that do not apply generally to other properties in the district

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The existing house is already in the setback.

Standard 2: The variance is not contrary to the spirit, purpose, and intent of the regulations in the zoning district and is not contrary to the public interest.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The side yard setback's purpose is to create buffering between properties. In this case, the project is adding only a minimal amount of bulk.

Standard 3: For an area variance, compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent use of the property for a permitted purpose or would render compliance with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. When adding a second floor, it is burdensome to set the addition back from the footprint of the original house.

Standard 4: The alleged difficulty or hardship is created by the terms of the ordinance rather than by a person who has a present interest in the property. The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The difficulty is due to the existing house's placement, which creates structural and design challenges.

Standard 5: The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. While the proposal does add bulk, it does not create substantial detriment.

Standard 6: The proposed variance shall be compatible with the character of the immediate neighborhood.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The addition is in line with other homes undergoing renovations in the area, and it fits into the changing landscape of the neighborhood.

The Board voted to approve the requested variance. The motion passed 3-0 by unanimous vote.

3. [90748](#)

James Westring, representative of the owner of the property at 2654 Union St, requests a front yard setback variance for an addition to a single-family house. Alder district #15

Attachments: [2654 Union St - Sanborn.jpg](#)
[2654 Union St - Aerial.pdf](#)
[2654 Union St - Application .pdf](#)

Bannon explained that the petitioners request a front yard setback variance for an addition to a single-family house. The existing, enclosed porch is within the front yard setback. A portion of the existing one-story house and unfinished attic is also within the setback. The petitioners propose to remove the existing front porch and replace it with an enclosed porch with the same footprint. They also propose to remove the existing attic and add a second-story addition. The enclosed porch addition and part of the second-story addition would be within the front yard setback. Bannon shared elevations, plans, and photographs to describe the current condition of the house as well as the proposed addition. Bannon also presented photographs and aerial photographs to show the architecture and front yard setbacks of other houses on the block face. The

front yard setback is determined based on front yard setback averaging of the other houses on the block face. Bannon explained that the block face was previously two separate blocks until a street was vacated and the blocks were merged. The required front yard setback is 14.1', and the applicants request a front yard setback of 6.8' for a variance of 7.3'.

The petitioner's representative, James Westring, confirmed that Bannon's description of the request was accurate. Westring asserted that the house's non-compliant setback is a result of the city merging two blocks. Westring stated that the proposal supports the established street rhythm, aligns with the neighboring homes' setbacks and rebuilds the front porch as a feature that supports the neighborhood's walkable, community-oriented identity. Westring stated that following the code would make the home an anomaly.

Bannon made a correction for the record regarding the way merging two blocks affected the front yard setback requirements. Even if using the setback average of only the western half of the block, the front yard setback average would still be 9.89', and the code requires a minimum of 10' with front yard setback averaging. The proposal would require a variance even if there were two separate blocks today.

The Board asked questions.

Ostlind closed the public hearing.

Waugh moved to approve the requested variance. Jenkins seconded the motion.

Review of Standards:

Standard 1: There are conditions unique to the property of the applicant that do not apply generally to other properties in the district

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The property is unique because the house, and the porch especially, are already significantly within the setback.

Standard 2: The variance is not contrary to the spirit, purpose, and intent of the regulations in the zoning district and is not contrary to the public interest.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. Given that the purpose of the front yard setback is meant to provide a buffer between the buildings and adjacent streets and sidewalks, the proposal is consistent with the regulations in the zoning district.

Standard 3: For an area variance, compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent use of the property for a permitted purpose or would render compliance with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The porch and house are already in the setback. Therefore, building a front porch without a variance would require significant alteration of the existing building.

Standard 4: The alleged difficulty or hardship is created by the terms of the ordinance rather than by a person who has a present interest in the property.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The difficulty is due to the placement of the house. It is common in older neighborhoods with houses built under different code requirements.

Standard 5: The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. Replacing the front porch would not add bulk between the house and adjacent buildings. The second story addition is minimally within the setback and would not cause substantial detriment.

Standard 6: The proposed variance shall be compatible with the character of the immediate neighborhood.

The Board found that the variance meets the standard. The second story matches the style of the surrounding houses and fits in the neighborhood.

The Board voted to approve the requested variance. The motion passed 3-0 by unanimous vote.

Discussion and Action Items

4. [90749](#) Review Elected and Appointed Official Code of Conduct

Chair Ostlind reviewed the Elected and Appointed Official Code of Conduct with the Board.

5. [08598](#) Communications and Announcements

Communications: Gaby noted that the Board has one case for the December 18, 2025 meeting

Adjournment

Waugh moved to adjourn the meeting. Jenkins seconded the motion. The Board adjourned at 6:28 pm.