



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
[www.cityofmadison.com](http://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, February 19, 2026

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](mailto: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: 834 1231 5429

### Interpretation and Accessibility

#### Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Peter Ostlind called the meeting to order at 5:01 pm.

**Staff present:** Zoning Administrator Katie Bannon, Gaby Arteaga, and Cary Olson

**Present:** 4 - Peter A. Ostlind; Agnes (Allie) B. Berenyi; David P. Waugh and Cliff Goodhart

**Absent:** 1 - Angela Jenkins

**Excused:** 1 - Samuel V. B. Fritz

#### Approval of Minutes

Waugh moved to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2026 meeting. Goodhart seconded the motion.

The Board approved the minutes 3-0 by unanimous vote.

### Public Comment

1. [91861](#) Public Comment: 2/19/2026

There were no public comments.

### Disclosures and Recusals

There were no disclosures or recusals.

### Petition for Variance, Area Exceptions or Appeals

2. [91143](#) Kevin Sorg, representative of the owner of 5125 Lake Mendota Drive, requests a height variance for an addition to a detached garage for a single-family house. Alder district #19

**Attachments:** [5125 Lake Mendota Dr - addresses 200ft.pdf](#)  
[Accessory Building Height Measurement.pdf](#)  
[5125 Lake Mendota Dr - aerial.pdf](#)  
[12-18mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota - PowerPoint.pdf](#)  
[12-18mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota Dr - application.pdf](#)  
[12-18mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota Dr - outcome letter.pdf](#)  
[12-18mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota Dr Staff Report.pdf](#)  
[2-19-mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota Dr Staff Report- 2nd Hearing.pdf](#)  
[2-19-mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota - PowerPoint - 2nd Hearing.pdf](#)  
[2-19-mtg\\_ 5125 Lake Mendota Dr - amended application.pdf](#)

Zoning Administrator Bannon provided an overview of the revised application. Bannon shared the proposed floor plan for the second floor. The dimensions are the same as the previous application as far as square footage. Bannon showed the changes that the applicant made from the previous hearing, including changes to the area above the garage door. Applicants added a roof above the garage door, changed the windows, and changed the roof from a gable roof to a shed roof.

At the December meeting, the applicants proposed a height of 23.7'. Since the code allows a max of 15', December's application requested a variance of 8.7'. Today, the variance request increased with the change in roof design. The applicants now propose a height of 26.5', which on a shed roof is measured to the peak, for a variance of 11.5'. The zoning code measures height for a gable roof differently than for a shed roof. However, even if looking at the height at the roof peak of earlier proposal (not how the zoning code measures the height), the height would have been 24.9' to the peak. The new proposal is taller than that.

Bannon showed that applicants added comments to the application to address the Board's concerns about Standard 6. The comments explain how the design changes they propose meet the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Bannon showed photos of the current house and the surrounding properties to provide context for neighborhood character. She also shared examples of area

garages with rooftop decks. In addition, there were a few area garages with a gable roof and space above the first floor.

Petitioner Sandra Larson confirmed that Bannon's description of the request was accurate. Larson explained that the 75-year-old structure needs updates and repair. The owners want to install an overhead garage door for security, fix the leaking garage roof, and add a lift inside the structure. The lift would allow them to access the house without the long flight of stairs. Larson also stated that the current garage has no room to store usual garage items. To accommodate for the door, lift, and additional storage space, they have to build a second story enclosure. Larson stated that they will keep the same footprint and will not disturb large trees or the integrity of hillside. The garage will not shade anyone's property or block any views.

Representative Kevin Sorg said the Board's greatest issues in the December meeting were the view from the street, as in the front façade, and the roof line. To better fit into the neighborhood, they propose adding a roof over the garage and using windows to break up the front façade. Sorg explains they lowered the front leading edge of the eave to be more in line with the rest of the neighborhood. Sorg stated that the new proposal removes almost 36" of elevation so the garage looks more residential rather than commercial. Sorg explained that the new proposal includes wider eaves to match the upper level. The siding and windows will match the existing home.

The Board asked questions.

Steven Crade spoke in support of the variance request. Crade owns and occupies the house across the street. Crade supported the project as it will not block views and it will fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

Ostlind closed the public hearing.

Waugh moved to approve the requested variance. Berenyi 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 request meets the standard. The street is more than 15' lower than the primary building, which causes the conditions that require the variance.

**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 request meets the standard. The intent of the code is to prevent large structures from encroaching on air space and views. That is not a concern here due to the steep slope. Additionally, the highest point of the roof is farthest away from the street.

**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 request meets the standard. Without a variance, the petitioners would have to dig the garage down into the grade to achieve only part of their goals. That approach creates other burdensome complications and would not improve accessibility.

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 request meets the standard. The ordinance drives the difficulty. Like many older homes, this one lack storage space, which is inconvenient in the present day. The way the ordinance measures the height also favors peaked roofs over single-sloped roofs.

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

The Board found that the variance request meets the standard. They referred to the support of the neighbor as evidence that the project would not negatively affect adjacent property. The structure would not impede views or intrude on the streetscape.

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

The Board found that the variance request meets the standard. While the garage building is somewhat unique in its design, the revised proposal keeps it in character with the immediate neighborhood. The changes break up the mass from the original proposal and cut the garage back into the hill. It has a modern look but is still in line with the other houses in the neighborhood and their varied housing styles.

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

### Discussion and Action Items

3. [08598](#) Communications and Announcements

The Board does not have a case for its next meeting on 3/12/2026. The Zoning Board of Appeals will not meet in March.

### Adjournment

Waugh moved to adjourn the meeting. Berenyi seconded the motion. The Board adjourned the meeting at 5:41 pm.