

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: 2562 Hoard St Name of Owner: Andrew Voxman
Andrew Voxman
Name of Owner:
Address of Owner (if different than above): 509 W Arlington Place, Apt #3, Chicago, II 60614
Ab+ #3 Chicago II 60614
Daytime Phone: (608) 8 43 9 643 Evening Phone:
Email Address:
Name of Applicant (Owner's Representative): Jim Vox man Address of Applicant: 3449 Freedom Lane, Madison, WI 53716
Name of Applicant (Owner's Representative):
Address of Applicant: 3449 Freedom Lane, Vad Son, W153/18
, ida i coo o i i i primari i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
Daytime Phone: (608) 4446084 Evening Phone: (608) 444 6084
Email Address:
Email Address.
Description of Requested Variance: It is requested that a lodging room on the Second Floor of 2562 Hoard St be converted into an efficiency apartment
room so the second floor of 2562 Hoard
(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
St be converted into an etticiency apariment
(See reverse side for more instructions)
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
Amount Paid: \$300 Hearing Date: 12-14-2017 Receipt: 037 917-0004 Published Date: 12-07-2017
Receipt: 037817-0004 Published Date: 12-07-2017 Filing Date: 11-22-2017 Appeal Number: LNDVAR-2017-00022
Received By: MWT GQ:
Parcel Number: 07 1006109162 Code Section(s): 28.045 (2)
Zoning District: TR-C4
Alder District: 12- Palm
事数 医大克克氏 网络红色 在一点 数据数据数据数据 医骶线 医内内 医复数二氏病 医二氯甲基酚 医皮肤 医二二氏病 "这一大,这一一大,这一一一样,一样一一一

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):

X	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.	
	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"): Lot lines 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) 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 $11" \times 17"$)	
	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 $11'' \times 17''$)	
	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.	
図	CHECK HERE. I acknowledge any statements implied as fact require supporting evidence.	
X	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: - Andrew Voxman Date: 11-20-17		
(Do not write below this line/For Office Use Only)		
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:		

This is to verify that my father,

Jim Voxman has my permission to

Jim Voxman has my permission to

appear before the City of Madisa,

appear before the City of Madisa,

Zoning Board of Appeals and argor

Zoning Board of Appeals and argor

my appeal concerning the lodging

my appeal concerning the lodging

my appeal concerning the lodging

room (efficiency apartment) Sitation

room (efficiency apartment) Sitation

At the property - 2562 Hoard that

I own.

And New Voxman)

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.

No properties in the area have any stand alone lodging rooms. There is a normal size lot. The property had an existing living area, the dimensions of which will not require change.

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 intensity of the relationship between the lot area and the intensity of use would not change.

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.

Changing the unit to an efficiency apartment from a lodging room would make this a better living space. There are no nearby grocery stores and a more permanant resident would be better for the neighborhood.

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 terms of the ordinance require this to be a lodging room. Lodging houses/rooms are outdated in Madison residential neighborhoods. An efficiency apartment would be better for whoever rents the unit and the intensity wouldn't change.

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

There is no detriment it would increase stability in the neighborhood.

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

The proposed variance would be compatible with the neighborhood. It would enhance it.