



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
[www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

## Meeting Minutes - Approved ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

---

Thursday, June 27, 2013

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Basford, chair, called the meeting to order at 5:06 pm and explained the appeals process.

**Staff Present:** Matt Tucker and Chrissy Thiele

**Present:** 5 -

John W. Schlaefter; Diane L. Milligan; Susan M. Bulgrin; Dina M. Corigliano and Michael A. Basford

**Excused:** 1 -

Frederick E. Zimmermann

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Schlaefter motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Bulgrin, with the correction of a few errors and clarification for the Board's approval for item five. The motion passed by voice vote/other with Milligan abstaining.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

### PETITION FOR VARIANCE OR APPEALS

1. [30417](#) Harold & Charlette DeVoss, owners of property located at 1029 Troy Drive, request a side yard variance to expand and enclose the existing carport on their two story single family home.  
Ald. District #18 Weier

**Attachments:** [1029 Troy Dr Amended.pdf](#)

Tucker introduced the project as having a zoning code requirement of 10' 4" side yard setback, along with a 40" side wall offset, while expanding and enclosing the existing carport would provide a 7' setback. Therefore, the owners are requesting a 3' 4" side yard variance. Property is zoned SR-C1.

Louis Cheramy, the owner's representative, informed board members that almost every house in the neighborhood has a garage and many of them are attached, so it would fit well with the surrounding area. However, in order to convert the applicant's carport into a garage, they need to add an additional 5' to the carport. They are lowering the roofline in order to fit in an overhanging door for the garage and the slope of the roof goes toward the street. Cheramy believes the design fits well with the house. He also explained that it would be

financially difficult to move the garage to the other side of the house, as they would have to move the driveway as well as build a new structure, whereas with the proposed design they are utilizing the existing driveway and carport.

Donald Szukis, a neighbor of the applicants, thought the addition would fit well with the neighborhood and supported the applicants with their project.

Milligan motioned to approve the variance, seconded by Schlaefer, with the condition that the optional side window noted in the plans be included.

Board members determined the house is already oriented toward the property line, with the carport being the closest and the driveway also being on that side, and the general orientation of the house directs the placement of the garage. The side wall already has variation with the back section jogged in and the noted optional window will also help with the side wall offset. They also saw moving the garage to a different location as burdensome and thought the addition would fit in with the neighborhood.

The motion to approve the variance passed (5-0) by voice vote/other, with the condition that the optional side window noted in the plans be included.

2. [30618](#)

Dennis and Vicki Hill, owners of property located at 5316 Shaw Court, request a rear yard variance to construct a single story screen porch addition onto their single story single family home.

Ald. District #11 Schmidt

Attachments: [5316 Shaw Ct.pdf](#)

Tucker introduced the project as having a zoning code requirement of 21' rear yard setback, while the construction of the screen porch addition would provide a 9.6' setback. Therefore, the owners are requesting an 11.4' rear yard variance. Property is zoned SR-C2.

Dennis Hill informed board members that the lot behind his property is mostly undeveloped, the main residency being far away, which makes an ideal placement for the screen porch as it would be secluded from the neighboring homes. He said he talked to his surrounding neighbors and they have no problem with the addition. Hill also explained to board members that the proposed placement of the screen porch fits best with the house, with the access coming from the kitchen. The current deck can be accessed from both the kitchen and the dining room. He didn't think they could place the screen porch on the west side of the house as that is where the bedrooms are located.

Schlaefer motioned to approve the variance, seconded by Milligan, with the condition that the porch remains screened and any modifications to it will require the owner to apply for an additional variance.

Board members determined the lot is shallow, making the building envelope very small and narrow. They indicated that the proposed addition would not detrimentally affect the surrounding neighbors and placing the screen porch on the west side of the home would be burdensome. They also stated that this type of addition is common in the surrounding area and fits well with the neighborhood.

The motion to approve the variance passed (5-0) by voice vote/other, with the

condition that the porch remains screened.

3. [30619](#)

Audrey Gasch and Eric Kelley, owners of property located at 2703 Oakridge Avenue, request a reverse corner side yard variance to construct a first story roof canopy addition onto their two story single family home.  
Ald. District #6 Rummel

Attachments: [2703 Oakridge Ave.pdf](#)

Tucker introduced the project as having a zoning code requirement of 8' reverse-corner side yard setback, while the construction of the first story canopy addition would provide a 2' setback. Therefore, the owners are requesting a 4' reverse-corner side yard variance. Property is zoned TR-C3.

Eric Kelly wishes to make an aesthetic improvement to the house and feels the proposed canopy provides an accent to the opening of their house. They also get a lot of snow and ice buildup on the front stoop during the winter, which he believes the canopy will help prevent that.

Tucker informed board members that the ordinance has an allowance for eaves and gutters to be in the setbacks, however, this project doesn't qualify for either. This project also couldn't qualify as an open porch as it is not located in the front yard setback.

Corigliano motioned to approve the variance, seconded by Bulgrin.

Board members found the lot to be very irregular and the way the house is oriented makes the side yard act as a front yard. They didn't think the addition would provide any significant bulk to the home and wouldn't detrimentally affect any of the surrounding properties. They also agreed that the addition would fit in with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

The motion to approve the variance passed (5-0) by voice vote/other.

#### DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. [08598](#)

Communications and Announcements

There were no communications or announcements.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:42 pm.

Matt Tucker  
City of Madison  
Zoning Board of Appeals, (608) 266-4569  
Wisconsin State Journal, June 20, 2013