

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
VARIANCE APPLICATION

Zoning: TR-C4

Owner: Katharine Stanton and Benjamin Parrell

Technical Information:

Applicant Lot Size: 39'w x 66'd

Minimum Lot Width: 40'

Applicant Lot Area: 2,574 sq. ft.

Minimum Lot Area: 4,000 sq. ft.

Madison General Ordinance Section Requiring Variance: 28.045(2)

Project Description: Two-story single-family home. Remove existing open porch and basement access, and construct 10'-6"d x 26'-8"w two-story dwelling addition. Project creates first-level living addition, including general/family room, half-bath, mud room/entry room, 1st floor laundry and open porch. The second-level provides master bath, closet, and second-level heated "sleeping porch." New basement access also incorporated into the addition.

	<u>Side Yard</u>	<u>Rear Yard</u>
Zoning Ordinance Requirement:	4.2'	19.3'
Provided Setback:	3.1'	17.3'
Requested Variance:	1.1'	2.0'

Comments Relative to Standards:

1. Conditions unique to the property: The lot provides less lot width and lot area than required, and is a developed lot. This lot is part of one originally platted lot (66' x 132') that was subdivided into three parcels for development purposes (including the homes at 302 and 304 S. Few St.). The resulting lots are nonconforming in depth as compared to a typical lot. This factor limits the availability of constructing an addition to the rear, even when using the allowed reduction to the rear yard setback. The existing principal structure generally provides similar setbacks to the neighboring residential lots to the northeast. The principal structure currently complies with rear yard setback requirement but does not meet minimum side yard setback requirement on the left side. The existing structure has a relatively small footprint, about 630 sq. ft.
2. Zoning district's purpose and intent: The regulations requested to be varied are the rear yard setback and side yard setback. In consideration of this request, the rear yard setback is intended to provide minimum buffering between principal buildings on lots and to align buildings within a common building envelope, common back yards, and generally resulting in space in between the building bulk and commonality of bulk constructed on lots. The side yard setback is intended to provide minimum buffering between buildings, generally

resulting in space in between the building bulk constructed on lots, to mitigate potential adverse impact and to afford access to the backyard area around the side of a structure.

The existing building placement and relationship between the existing home and the adjacent homes on lots appears to be a long-standing condition, likely original to the development of these lots. The neighboring property to the west adjacent to the proposed construction project is a zoning district boundary line between the TR-C4 district and TE Traditional Employment district. This property contains a commercial/employment business with no apparent windows or wall openings facing the subject property, and does not appear to provide any setback to the property line. The neighboring property to the south, adjacent to the proposed construction project, is a zoning district boundary line between the TR-C4 district and TR-V2 district. This lot line is also the rear lot line and required rear yard setback area for the home on this lot facing Williamson Street. The homes to the northeast share a common rear yard area with the subject property, with porches and a detached garage existing at 302. S. Few St. The side setback variance matches the setback of the existing building and opposite the variance, there is adequate side yard setback to allow access to the rear yard. The project appears to result in development consistent with the purpose and intent of the TR-C4 district.

3. Aspects of the request making compliance with the zoning code burdensome: The placement of the home on the lot and the associated setback requirements limit the ability for a reasonable addition to be constructed to the rear of the home. Also, the existing first floor plan shows that no place exists to reasonably remodel for a first-floor bathroom, necessitating an addition. A space for an addition does exist on the driveway side in front of the kitchen, but this space is fairly small (8' x 14') and would not be appropriate given the existing floor plan.
4. Difficulty/hardship: The home was constructed in 1880 and purchased by the current owner in August 2017. See comment #1 and #3 above. This request is driven by the desire to provide common amenities and typical housing features for the occupants of the home, including a first floor bathroom for the home, where none currently exists.
5. The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property: The proposal incorporates a reasonably-sized addition and is designed in what appears to be minimal bulk expansion. As noted above, the adjacent property to where the variance is being requested is a rear yard for a residential property (currently providing required Usable Open Space) and a side yard for a zero-lot line commercial/employment property. It does not appear as though the minor increase in bulk in the setbacks will result in on neighboring property above or beyond what would otherwise be allowed.
6. Characteristics of the neighborhood: The general area is characterized by homes of varying sizes and styles, many with additions constructed over time. The design of the addition appears consistent with the existing home. The proposed addition appears common to what can be found in the neighborhood.

Other Comments: Project also involves kitchen remodel, which includes a new door on the street-side of the kitchen wall for a future deck/landing.

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