



CITY OF MADISON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VARIANCE APPLICATION

\$300 Filing Fee

Ensure all information is typed or legibly printed using blue or black ink.

Address of Subject Property: 2402 COMMONWEALTH AVE. 53711

Name of Owner: KENDRA KREUTZ

Address of Owner (if different than above): OWNER OCCUPANT

Daytime Phone: 608-345-7590 Evening Phone: 608-345-7590

Email Address: kendrakreutz@gmail.com

Name of Applicant (Owner's Representative): EDWARD KUJARSKI, ARCHITECT

Address of Applicant: 405 SIDNEY STREET
MADISON, WI 530703

Daytime Phone: 608-469-5963 Evening Phone: 608-469-5963

Email Address: ekujarski@aol.com

Description of Requested Variance: - REDUCTION OF MINIMUM PERMANENT OPEN SPACE
& PARTIAL RELIEF FROM REQUIRED MINIMUM REAR & SIDE YARD SETBACKS.

(See reverse side for more instructions)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
Amount Paid: <u>\$300</u>	Hearing Date: <u>3-23-17</u>
Receipt: <u>027122-0006</u>	Published Date: <u>3-16-17</u>
Filing Date: <u>3/2/17</u>	Appeal Number: <u>LNDVAR-2017-00003</u>
Received By: <u>[Signature]</u>	GO: <u>OK</u>
Parcel Number: <u>0709-214-1933-3</u>	Code Section(s): <u>28.044 (2)</u>
Zoning District: <u>TR-C3</u>	
Alder District: <u>B-Eskrich</u>	

Application Requirements

Please provide the following Information (Please note any boxes left unchecked below could result in a processing delay or the Board's denial of your application):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-application meeting with staff: Prior to submittal of this application, the applicant is strongly encouraged to discuss the proposed project and submittal material with Zoning staff. Incomplete applications could result in referral or denial by the Zoning Board of Appeals.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site plan , drawn to scale. A registered survey is recommended, but not required. Show the following on the site plan (Maximum size for all drawings is 11" x 17"): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lot lines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing and proposed structures, with dimensions and setback distances to all property lines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approximate location of structures on neighboring properties adjacent to variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major landscape elements, fencing, retaining walls or other relevant site features <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scale (1" = 20' or 1" = 30' preferred) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> North arrow
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elevations from all relevant directions showing existing and proposed views, with notation showing the existing structure and proposed addition(s). (Maximum size for all drawings is 11" x 17")
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Interior floor plan of existing and proposed structure , when relevant to the variance request and required by Zoning Staff (Most additions and expansions will require floor plans). (Maximum size for all drawings is 11" x 17")
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Front yard variance requests only. Show the building location (front setback) of adjacent properties on each side of the subject property to determine front setback average.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lakefront setback variance requests only. Provide a survey prepared by a registered land surveyor showing existing setbacks of buildings on adjacent lots, per MGO 28.138.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Variance requests specifically involving slope, grade, or trees. Approximate location and amount of slope, direction of drainage, location, species and size of trees.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CHECK HERE. I acknowledge any statements implied as fact require supporting evidence.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CHECK HERE. I have been given a copy of and have reviewed the standards that the Zoning Board of Appeals will use when reviewing applications for variances.

Owner's Signature: _____

Linda Lee

Date: _____

3/1/17

----- (Do not write below this line/For Office Use Only) -----

DECISION

The Board, in accordance with its findings of fact, hereby determines that the requested variance for _____ (is) (is not) in compliance with all of the standards for a variance. Further findings of fact are stated in the minutes of this public hearing.

The Zoning Board of Appeals: Approved Denied Conditionally Approved

Zoning Board of Appeals Chair: _____

Date: _____

GREEN DESIGN STUDIO

EDWARD KUHARSKI, ARCHITECT, AIA, LEED AP

405 SIDNEY STREET | MADISON, WI 53703
608.469.5963 MOBILE | EKUHARSKI@AOL.COM

FEBRUARY 28, 2017

STATEMENTS ON STANDARDS FOR VARIANCE:

ADDITIONS/ALTERATIONS TO PROPERTY AT 2402 COMMONWEALTH AVE.
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53711 - OWNER/OCCUPANT: KENDRA KREUTZ

1.) This lot, if not unique in the city, is at least one with very rare conditions (see Survey & Site Plan). It has in effect 3 street frontages comprising almost 72% of the lot perimeter, and one interior lot line. This makes it difficult to determine how to apply the requirements of the Zoning Code. I spent over an hour with two zoning staff to arrive at a workable way to assign yards & setbacks.

2.) The requested variance(s) are needed at least in part as a result of the above mentioned difficulties posed by the assumptions in the code that presume more conventional lots in more conventional contexts. The modest encroachments into designated yard and open space requirements do not create any adverse conditions, are consistent with adjacent structures, and the overall development pattern in the neighborhood. All three proposed additions address functional deficiencies of the existing home in as concise a manner as possible, and in a form that is natural to the existing design. The vestibule solution is quite similar to that of the fairly recently added vestibule to the adjacent home at 2404 Commonwealth, which is largely the same basic house with similar site constraints.

3.) Due to its unusual shape, while the lot has a good amount of open space, only a small amount of it meets the requirement of 8' least dimension. While the proposed additions contribute to the shortfall, the existing condition is already slightly less than the minimum. As cited in #2, each of the three proposed additions address real deficiencies in the existing house:

- The existing kitchen is less than 80 square feet; the addition of 21 sf more makes a critical difference in designing a minimum functional solution.
- The existing weatherized porch needs reconfiguration and change to windows to make it an adequately functional & habitable office for the owner, a self-employed consulting engineer.
- The main entry lacks a vestibule airlock and the existing porch structure is deteriorated and in need of replacement.

4.) Any owner would face similar difficulties for virtually any kind of improvement to this house. This property is the proverbial round peg being fitted in a square hole.

5.) The proposed project causes no detriment to adjacent properties, it only adds value, which is to the benefit of neighbors and the city as well as to the owner.

6.) The proposed project is entirely compatible with the existing home and the surrounding neighborhood. An observer without prior knowledge will not be able to tell that the house has had any alterations.

REGISTERED ARCHITECT ~ LEED ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL
