

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: 144 Langdon St.			
Name of Owner: Wisconsin Association of Theta Delta Chi			
Address of Owner (if different than above):			
Daytime Phone: 312-705-3335 Evening Phone:			
Email Address: DaveH@cdw.com			
Name of Applicant (Owner's Representative): Steve Harms - Tri-North Builders Address of Applicant: 2625 Research Park Drive			
Fitchburg, WI 53711 Daytime Phone: 608271-8717 Evening Phone: 608-575-8262			
Email Address: sharms@tri-north.com			
Description of Requested Variance: The request is for a variance to the rear yard setback of 20' (DDR-2 zone). the existing setback is 8' for the strucure built in 1924. The addition is a dormer on the rear side of the roof that will be set back from the exterior wall below.			
(See reverse side for more instructions)			
Amount Paid: \$\\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \			

Application Requirements

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

	Ø	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.
	M	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"): Description: Existing and proposed structures, with dimensions and setback distances to all property lines approximate location of structures on neighboring properties adjacent to variance Major landscape elements, fencing, retaining walls or other relevant site features Scale (1" = 20' or 1' = 30' preferred)
	Ø	North arrow 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")
	Ø	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")
		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.
		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.
		Variance requests specifically involving slope, grade, or trees. Approximate location and amount of slope, direction of drainage, location, species and size of trees.
L	U .	CHECK HERE. I acknowledge any statements implied as fact require supporting evidence.
	9	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.
(Owne	Date: 12/12/14/ (Do not write below this line/For Office Use Only)
_		DECISION ard, 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. findings of fact are stated in the minutes of this public hearing.
T	he Zo	ning Board of Appeals: Approved Denied Conditionally Approved
Z	onina	Board of Appeals Chair:
	ate:	

Theta Delta Chi – 144 Langdon St. 12-18-14

Standards for Variance

1. There are conditions unique to the property of the applicant that do not apply generally to other properties in the district.

The structure was built in 1924 in compliance at that time. The new zoning code was in force approximately 2 years ago. The building has been vacant for 2 years. There are properties in the area that comply and many that do not regarding setbacks. This is an existing lot with an existing building (90 years old); the building can't be moved to comply.

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 proposed dormer in similar to others in the area and is not contrary to the intent since there will be no appendage to the exterior perimeter, nor will the addition extend above the top most portion of the roof. The existing building has existed for 90 years and lot lines have not changed. The addition does not conflict with the public interest since the addition will not negatively impact any view corridors or pedestrian and vehicle traffic. (Occupancy will remain the same at 34).

The dormer addition and it added beds in the new plan make the remodeling viable. This means the building will add fire suppression and updated fire alarm systems providing a safer environment for its occupants and make the area more safe as well.

There is one existing building at 640 North Henry Street that was allowed to add vertically to the existing building, with 2 levels; one full story and additional half level (see attached photo)

3. For an area (setbacks, etc.) 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 historic designation makes any other configuration infeasible since the added area would be pushed to the front of the building, modifying the roof line visible from the front which is not allowed by the National Parks (through the State Historical Society)

This project is only feasible with the number of beds and the use of historic tax credits for both federal and state. We will be bringing the approval letters to the ZBA meeting.

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 ordinance in force since Jan. 2 2013 presents the hardship vs. the original setback. To allow this to be financially feasible we are utilizing all available space on all floors for beds, leaving common area spaces required by the historic district review in their current state. Also most interior walls must remain in their current location negating any reconfiguration for more efficiency. Without this added SF the dormer adds, the building cannot be brought up to standards required by the state statutes for fire suppression. The fraternity could not use the structure and will remain vacant until another owner can be found to buy the property, remaining vacant for at least another year. Redevelopment is not possible since the building is a contributing structure in a National Historical District and can't be demolished.

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

The addition does not create any detriment to adjacent since the addition will not negatively impact any view corridors or pedestrian and vehicle traffic. The project's fire suppression and fire alarm systems will enhance the adjacent properties providing a safer structure with little chance of fire spreading. Note that the dormer addition is on the north side of the building that faces a parking area, not another structure.

 $6. \ The \ proposed \ variance \ shall \ be \ compatible \ with \ the \ character \ of \ the \ immediate \ neighborhood.$

Since the historical society and the national parks are involved in the approval of the addition, the form and materials must and are compatible with the neighborhood / historic district.







