

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
VARIANCE APPLICATION
3522 Dennett Drive

Zoning: TR-C2

Owner: Jeff Skaife

Technical Information:

Applicant Lot Size: 44' w x 120' d

Minimum Lot Width: 40 ft.

Applicant Lot Area: 5,280 sq. ft

Minimum Lot Area: 4,000 sq. ft.

Madison General Ordinance Section Requiring Variance: 28.045(2)

Project Description: Single story single family home. Remove enclosed dilapidated unheated front porch, reconstruct as single-story conditioned (heated) space for the home matching front yard setback, side walls of existing home.

Zoning Ordinance Requirement: 16' 8"

Provided Setback: 11' 7"

Requested Variance: 5' 1"

Comments Relative to Standards:

1. Conditions unique to the property: The lot exceeds ordinance minimums and is a fully-developed lot. The lot is part of a block with some open porches and some enclosed porches. The project matches the existing front setback for the existing enclosed front porch, which is legal-nonconforming. The side yard setback and roof location for the home is an existing condition that cannot be reasonably changed.
2. Zoning district's purpose and intent: The regulation being requested to be varied is the *front yard setback*. In consideration of this request, the front yard setback is intended to establish a general development pattern and setback for structures from the street and a general commonality in regard to the bulk of buildings in the immediate area. In this case, and as found on other homes in the general area, many of the homes in the area include porch-like features. Some porches are designed similar to the existing condition; others match the side walls and roof of the homes. Many of these original porch features have been enclosed, some unheated and others have been converted to interior conditioned living space. The proposal expands the existing bulk characteristics of the home to the sides and appears to result in development consistent with the purpose and intent of the TR-C2 district.
3. Aspects of the request making compliance with the zoning code burdensome: Meeting the required setback would have the effect of a loss of some of the existing space, and would

make the project, a modest conditioned space expansion to a 90 year old home, infeasible. See comment #1 above.

4. Difficulty/hardship: The home was constructed in 1926 and purchased by the current owner in 1990. See comments #1 and #3 above.
5. The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property: The location of the project maintains the existing bulk condition of the home. The expansion of the living space will afford this area to be used more actively than if it was an unheated enclosed porch; but this use does not appear to have discernible adverse impact on the neighboring structures or uses.
6. Characteristics of the neighborhood: The general area is characterized by one and two-story houses of similar size on generally uniform lots. As stated above, enclosed porch features are common, and many appear to have been enclosed and some have been converted into living space. The style and design of the addition is generally in keeping with design of the home, and is typical for the area.

Other Comments: The new front steps and landing are an allowed projection into the front setback and thus do not require a zoning variance.

This case was deferred at the April 28, 2016 meeting, with the ZBA noting concerns regarding the design and style of the addition and the windows proposed for the addition. In response, the petitioner has redesigned the addition to be in keeping with the look of other properties in the area with an enclosed front porch look, and has proposed windows that match the existing home.

Staff Recommendation: It appears standards have been met, therefore staff recommends **approval** of the variance request, subject to further testimony and new information provided during the public hearing.