

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
VARIANCE APPLICATION
621 North St

Zoning: TR-C4

Owner: Jesse & Kathleen Cooper

Technical Information:

Applicant Lot Size: 60' (North St) x 49.13' (Moland St) **Minimum Lot Width: 40'**

Applicant Lot Area: 2,900 sq. ft. **Minimum Lot Area: 4000 sq ft**

Madison General Ordinance Section Requiring Variance: 28.045(2)

Project Description: Remove existing partial second story and construct full-height second story addition with elevated deck.

	<u>Front Yard</u>	<u>Reverse-corner side yard</u>
Zoning Ordinance Requirement:	18'-2"	12'-0"
Provided Setback:	13'-6"	6'-4"
Requested Variance:	4'-8"	5'-8"

Comments Relative to Standards:

1. The lot exceeds lot width minimums but has less lot area than required. This is because this lot and the adjacent home to the south were split from an originally platted lot at the time the houses were originally constructed. As a result, the lot is square-ish, with placement of the home generally shifted toward Moland Street and into the required front yard setback. The lot is a reverse-corner lot due to the yards for the lot on the home to the south (the other lot that was split to create two home sites, resulting in a reverse-corner side yard setback requirement from North Street).
2. Zoning district's purpose and intent: The regulation being requested to be varied is the *front yard setback* and reverse-corner *side yard setback*. In consideration of this request, the *front yard setback* is intended to provide buffering between developments and the adjacent streets/sidewalks, resulting in a generally common front setback for developed lots. The *reverse-corner side yard setback* is intended to provide buffering between developments and the adjacent streets/sidewalks but paying particular sensitivity to the home to the rear, as to not negatively impact the home on that lot.

The existing building placement and relationship between the existing home and the homes adjacent to where the variances are being requested appears to be a long-standing condition, likely original to the development of these lots. There is adequate side yard setback on the side of the home opposite the variance (east side) and to the rear (south side). In regard to

the front yard setback request, the home is placed forward of other homes fronting on Moland Street, but that is because of the small lot size for this property, which cannot be changed. A front yard exists; it just happens to be smaller than the front yards provided for the larger lots on Moland Street. This condition is common for corner lots. In regard to the reverse-corner side yard setback request, the adjacent home to the south that establishes the greater side yard setback has a setback to North Street that generally matches the proposal. The addition of the deck in the setback will have no impact on the home to the south relative to the intent and purpose of the setback. The project appears to result in development consistent with the purpose and intent of the TR-C4 district.

3. Aspects of the request making compliance with the zoning code burdensome: The existing building placement drives this request; the proposal matches and extends the existing wall and foundation locations of the existing building. Designing the addition to meet the setback would introduce an unusual look and a complicated/expensive design to transfer the load of the structure to the foundation. The addition will result in a home that appears common and similar to other homes found in the immediate area, and results in useable, functional and otherwise reasonable and common living spaces within the building.
4. Difficulty/hardship: The home was constructed in 1925 and purchased by the current owner in March 2015. See comment #1 and #3 above.
5. The proposed variance shall not create substantial detriment to adjacent property: The project is designed to add the functional space while also being sensitive to bulk, by utilizing a hip-roof design and an open deck at the second level on the North Street side. This approach minimizes the bulk change in the setback area. The placement and structure height appear necessary to accommodate the space while maintaining an attractive, complimentary look for the home.
6. Characteristics of the neighborhood: The general area is comprised of mostly two-story homes, reflecting similar house-size-to-lot relationships. The proposed addition results in a full second story, which is found at homes in the general area. There are also houses without partial second stories in the general neighborhood. This project appears common for the area.

Other Comments: The application requests a lot coverage variance, however, no variance is required because no increase to lot coverage is requested with this application.

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.