

Landmarks Commission
Meeting of January 10, 2022
Agenda item #2, Legistar #68894

In July, the Commission approved a lot division and the relocation of an existing structure (151 W Wilson, a 3-story flat) to the proposed empty lot. This historic 3-story flat was said to be "right at the threshold of height and gross volume" per the meeting minutes. Relocation of the historic 3-story flat is no longer being discussed. Rather the applicant says: "Lot 3 is partitioned as a separate buildable lot for future sale/development."

The UDC voted to approve the planned development/property subdivision at the December 15th meeting, subject to design review that would require review by the UDC Secretary (with an option for referral to the UDC). Part of that approval is the Zoning Text. The Zoning Text permits:

- A front yard setback of 15' (20' is the minimum under the zoning code);
- Side yard setbacks of 4';
- Rear yard setback of 20' (30' is the minimum under the zoning code); and
- 3 stories in height (2 stories/35 feet is the maximum under the zoning code).

Under zoning, a building 28' in width and 97' in depth could be built on this lot. Height could be 3 full stories (no maximum height per story) plus a peaked roof (since any part of a building that is above the second story and between the eaves and the ridge line of pitched roofs is not deemed a story). A porch would not be required under zoning, so any building could sit about 5' closer to the sidewalk than the body of the existing homes on the block face.

Would the Landmarks Commission approve new construction to the extent potentially allowed under the Zoning Text? (I would hope not – such a building would become the most prominent building on the block.)

Although this issue is not part of the agenda, I urge Landmarks to give the applicant some general guidance as to what might be allowed to be constructed at some future date.

- The applicant is only under contract to purchase. In the past, there has been at least one instance where a Commissioner felt constrained due to lot size. Providing some guidance at this point would allow the applicant to have a better sense of what might be allowed, better informing the purchase decision.
- Issues arose with a lot subdivision in University Heights in 2011 - a lot had been subdivided several years earlier and the proposed house was something many neighbors objected to for various reasons (Legistar 20928). Providing general guidance at this time could help lessen potential future issues.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz