



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved 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, April 17, 2025

5:00 PM

Virtual

The City of Madison is holding the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting virtually to help protect our community from the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

1. Written Comments: You can send comments on agenda items to zoning@cityofmadison.com
2. 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.

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

4. Listen by Phone:
(877) 853-5257 (Toll Free)
Webinar ID: 842 6821 9940

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Ostlind called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm.

Staff Present: Katie Bannon, Cary Olson, Gabriela Arteaga

Present: 5 - Peter A. Ostlind; Agnes (Allie) B. Berenyi; Angela Jenkins; David P. Waugh and Samuel V. B. Fritz

Excused: 1 - Cliff Goodhart

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jenkins made a motion to approve the 2/20/2025 minutes; Fritz seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

1. [87494](#) Public Comment (3/20/2025)

There were no disclosures or recusals.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

NEW BUSINESS

2. [87495](#) Ian Lowe and Soumya Palreddy, owners of the property at 229 Van Deusen St, request a rear yard setback variance for an addition to a single-family house. Alder district #13

Attachments: [229 Van Deusen - Photos.pdf](#)
[229 Van Deusen - Sanborn.pdf](#)
[229 Van Deusen - Staff Report.pdf](#)
[229 Van Deusen St - Application.pdf](#)
[229 Van Deusen St - Notices.pdf](#)
[Public-notice-letter.pdf](#)
[229 Van Deusen - Aerial.pdf](#)

Bannon explained that application is for a rear setback variance for an addition at 229 Van Deusen St. The property is a single-family house. Bannon stated that there's a 9ft x 13ft two-story deck/open porch on the rear of the house that the petitioners want to remove and replace with a 13ft x 13ft addition. The required setback is 27.7ft, and 15ft is provided. The variance request is 11.7ft. Bannon explained that the petitioners propose an open porch as part of the first floor of the addition. For the second floor, they propose a bedroom and bathroom addition.

Petitioners Soumya Palreddy and Ian Lowe confirmed that Bannon's description of the request was accurate. Petitioners explained that they want an additional bathroom upstairs to accommodate a grandparent. Petitioners explained that their kids use their side yard as a backyard because their backyard abuts Olin, a busy street. Also, they stated that the side of the house has a sports court that would be costly to remove. Therefore, the applicants request a variance to replace the existing structure with a two-story addition.

The Board asked questions of the petitioners, contractor, and Bannon.

Chair Ostlind closed the public hearing.

Fritz moved to approve the variance. Waugh seconded the motion.

Review of Standards

Standard 1: The Board had differing viewpoints about whether the property met the standard. On one hand, high-traffic roads surround the lot, the rear portion is constrained by the garage and shallower depth than neighboring lots, and the lot has improvements on the side of the house. On the other hand, while the lot is shallower in depth, it is also wider than neighboring lots.

Standard 2: The Board disagreed on whether the variance met this standard. The purpose of the ordinance is to provide buffering between buildings. The house is longer than houses on neighboring lots, and the variance would add additional bulk to the rear. However, since the property is a corner lot, the variance is not contrary to that purpose and would not change the envelope of the house. The rear setback also intends to provide a similar envelope to nearby buildings. In this case, the addition would not change the envelope of the house.

Standard 3: The Board disagreed on whether the variance met this standard. Part of the Board argued that strict adherence to the code would mean removing the improvements in the side yard, the only area where petitioners could build an addition without a variance. Additionally, it seems that neighboring properties would be able to make changes to the back of their lots without a variance. The ordinance, rather than a strict application of the ordinance, creates the burden. However, others on the Board argued that the petitioners did not provide enough evidence of undue burden. Instead of the code creating the hardship, it seems the desired location of the bathroom creates the difficulty. Part of the Board believed there are other options that would meet the code that did not seem to have been fully explored. The Board discussed the size of the addition and potential alternatives.

Standard 4: The Board disagreed on this standard. Part of the Board found that the proposal is driven by the applicant rather than the code. Another part of the board agreed that the size of the variance is larger than it needs to be, but that the ordinance and conditions of the property are causing the issue.

Standard 5: The Board referenced that the applicants shared that the current neighbor emailed that they are fine with the variance. However, the Board also pointed out they need to consider future neighbors, not only current ones.

Standard 6: The Board disagreed on whether the request met this standard. Those in favor argued that the addition matches the house well enough, and the neighborhood has a variety of types of housing. However, the Board also had concerns about adding a large amount of bulk into the rear setback and creating asymmetry.

Fritz made a motion to re-open the public discussion to ask applicants about their preferred course of action. Berenyi seconded the motion.

After discussion, the petitioners decided to defer their application to a future meeting.

Chair Ostlind closed the public hearing.

Fritz made a motion to withdraw the previous motion to approve the variance. David seconded the motion.

Berenyi made a motion to defer the application to a meeting on or before the July 17 meeting of the ZBA. FRitz seconded the motion.

The motion passed 4-0 by unanimous vote.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. [87496](#) Brief discussion about Board meeting packets

The Board discussed the Board meeting packets with staff.

4. [08598](#) Communications and Announcements

Arteaga noted that the ZBA will not have a case for May.

ADJOURNMENT

Fritz moved to adjourn the meeting; Waugh seconded. The Board adjourned at 7:11 pm.