

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT  
VARIANCE APPLICATION  
**108 Lake Edge Boulevard**

**Zoning:** SR-C1

**Owner:** Joshua Forehand and Katherine Kraemer

**Technical Information:**

**Applicant Lot Size:** 57' w x 158.2' d (Irregular Corner)     **Minimum Lot Width:** 60'  
**Applicant Lot Area:** 11,296 sq. ft     **Minimum Lot Area:** 8,000 sq. ft.

**Madison General Ordinance Section Requiring Variance:** 28.035(2)

**Project Description:** Single-story single family home. Remove existing 12.2'w x 20.2'd detached garage to accommodate construction of a two-story addition with open porch. Addition includes first-floor laundry, foyer, and two-car garage space. Second story provides three bedrooms and two bathrooms. Existing first story bedrooms and living room are to be remodeled to provide a larger living room, new dining room and new study space. The addition does not include any basement area.

Zoning Ordinance Requirement:     26.25' \*  
Provided Setback:     15'±  
Requested Variance:     **11.25'±**

\* project qualifies for a 25% rear yard setback reduction because existing principal structure and any additions covers less than twenty percent (20%) or less of the lot area.

**Comments Relative to Standards:**

1. Conditions unique to the property: The subject lot is a large corner lot and is highly irregular in lot shape, wider at the rear and narrowing to a point at the front. The home is placed at the rear of the building envelope, near the rear setback requirement. A mature tree is located where an addition could be constructed in the building envelope. The existing building placement and associated front, side and rear yard setbacks are set by existing building placement, and cannot be reasonably changed.
2. Zoning district's purpose and intent: The regulation being requested to be varied is the *rear yard setback*. In consideration of this request, the rear yard setback is intended to provide buffering between developments, generally resulting in a space between bulk placed on lots. Also, the setback is intended to mitigate potential adverse impacts between the subject property and surrounding properties and to establish general commonality in regard to the bulk of buildings in the immediate area. Without complete removal of the existing home

(including basement), it's highly unlikely the improvements in the property would meet this goal.

The proposal results in a home with similar amenities, size and design to other buildings found in the general area, but placed in a different location on the lot. The bulk of the home provides a fair amount of setback from the property lines on all sides, and does not encroach closely to any of the homes on neighboring lots. Characteristics of the home appear to result in development consistent with the purpose and intent of the SR-C1 district.

3. Aspects of the request making compliance with the zoning code burdensome: Placing the addition where allowed (left side) would require modifications including moving the driveway, moving or extending utilities within the home, changing the flow of the spaces within the home, and cutting down the mature tree, which would make the project infeasible. See comment #1 above.
4. Difficulty/hardship: The home was constructed in 1952 and purchased by the current owner in March 2009. See comments #1 and #3 above.
5. The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property: The addition is located in a similar location as the existing detached garage, and will be about 60' from the homes in the lots to the west and south. The home is not placed parallel to the rear setback, so the amount of projection into the setback varies, less to the front of the addition, more to the rear of the addition. The new living space could affect privacy for the neighbors, but the existing house placement similarly affects privacy. It appears as though the addition would minimally change that impact.
6. Characteristics of the neighborhood: The general area is characterized by one and two-story houses of similar size to the proposal. The size of the addition will result in a home keeping in the size of homes found in the general area. The style and design of the addition is generally in keeping with design of the home, and would be considered typical for the area.

**Other Comments:** The home is probably the smallest home in the neighborhood, providing 775 sq. ft. of living area, and has a smaller than average detached garage. With the addition, the home will be about 2000 sq. ft. above-grade (including the attached garage but excluding the existing basement) and a more typical 2-car garage.

The orientation of the interior of the home suggests the appropriate placement of any addition is to the right (west) side of the home, where the existing detached garage sits. Access to existing plumbing, the stairwell to the basement, the existing kitchen, and to the basement, and the entrance to the home is generally to this side. As noted above, to orient an addition with similar features to the left side of the home would significantly affect the flow of the home, placement of common areas and utilities, and render a project inefficient and infeasible.

Aside for demolishing the structure and constructing a new home, (a project staff would not recommend in a case where the home is in good shape such as the case with this home), the best viable alternative is the proposal. The request appears minimal in nature, reasonably

accomplishing the goals of adding a 2-car garage, three bedrooms and two bathrooms to this home.

The front and rear elevation drawings appear to include an attached pergola, but this is not shown on the site plan. For purposes of this request, staff believes the pergola is not part of the request, and shall be excluded for the variance request.

**Staff Recommendation:** It appears standards have been met, therefore staff recommends **approval** of the variance request, subject to further testimony and new information provided during the public hearing.