



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Thursday, August 27, 2015

5:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Corigliano, chair, called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm and explained the appeals process.

Staff Present: Matt Tucker and Chrissy Thiele

Present: 5 - John W. Schlaefer; Savion J. Castro; Dina M. Corigliano; Winn S. Collins and Peter A. Ostlind

Excused: 2 - Susan M. Bulgrin and Frederick E. Zimmermann

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schlaefer to approve the August 13, 2015, minutes, seconded by Ostlind. The motion passed by voice vote/other, with Castro abstaining.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

PETITION FOR VARIANCE OR APPEALS

1. [39691](#) Michael and Lindy Anderson, owners of property located at 617 Sheldon Street, request a side yard variance to add a second story addition onto their single-story single family home.
Ald. District #13 Eskrich

Attachments: [617 Sheldon St.pdf](#)
[617 Sheldon St Staff Report.pdf](#)

Tucker introduced the project as having a zoning code requirement of 4' side yard setback, while construction of the second story addition would provide a 3' setback. Therefore, the owners are requesting a 1' side yard variance. Property is zoned TR-C2.

Lindy and Michael Anderson, owners of the property, explained to board members that their house was originally constructed in 1914 and the foundation sits three feet away from the side property line. They would like to add their second story addition onto a load bearing wall, which requires a variance. If they were to try to comply with the code, the addition would need to be set back, which would be odd looking and inconsistent with the look of the neighborhood. The floor plan would stay relatively the same, except the bedrooms would be moved upstairs. The roof overhang would remain the

same distance from the side lot line. They also pointed out that almost all the homes in their neighborhood were two stories.

Collins motioned to approve the variance request, seconded by Schlaefer.

Board members agreed that being one of the remaining single family homes in the area was unique, and the location of the house creates the hardship. The second floor addition wouldn't hinder access to the rear yard and the neighboring property's driveway creates a buffer between the two buildings. The footprint of the building wouldn't change, just a slight increase of bulk, but seems like the only practical way to add on to the house. Board members also agreed that the addition wouldn't detrimentally affect the adjacent property and fits in with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

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

2. [39548](#)

Brian Fick and Kristina Stadler, owners of property located at 4016 Hiawatha Drive, request a right side yard variance for a second level deck, as well as left side yard variances for side wall and roof enhancements and chimney reconstruction, on their two-story single family home.
Ald. District #10 Cheeks

Attachments: [4016 Hiawatha Dr.pdf](#)

Tucker introduced the project as having a zoning code requirement of 7' side yard setback, while construction of the second level deck and "fin" in the right side yard would provide a 3' 4" setback. The project also entails side wall and roof enhancement, as well as a front basement addition, in the left yard that would provide a 4' 7" setback. The owners also wish to reconstruct the chimney located in the left side yard, which has a requirement of 5', but would only provide 3' 5". Therefore, the owners are requesting a 1' 8" right side yard variance for the second floor deck, a 2' 5" left side yard variance for the roof, wall, and basement addition, and a 1' 7" left side yard variance for the chimney. Property is zoned TR-C1.

Todd Barnett, the architect, pointed out to board members that the owners no longer wish to request variances for the basement addition and the reconstruction of the chimney, as they plan to alter the plans so they will comply with the zoning code. They also no longer plan on constructing the "fin" in the right side yard, so that request is also being withdrawn. As for the remaining variance requests, the roof and side wall are related to upgrading the weatherproofing and energy efficiency of the house. The intent of the roof design is to push rain to the south side of the property where a runnel, instead of gutters, will catch the water and distribute it to the front yard. In order to protect the side wall where the water will run off, they plan on turning it into a rain screen wall, which is why there is added bulk on the wall.

Barnett also explained to board members that there is an existing second level deck the owners use, but would like utilize the last two feet over the garage as part of the deck. They plan to have the railing flush with the side wall, and without the variance there will be a four inch height difference from where the deck ends and the rubber membrane of the roof starts. The owners are concerned about safety and the possibility of tripping.

Tucker explained to board members that homes with roof decks are required

to have a railing, and regardless of the variance being approved the owners will have to install a railing in order to comply with the building code. Historically, homes usually place the railing as an extension of the first floor walls and even though part of this deck is located in the side yard setback, they would still be allowed to place a guard railing on the edge.

Collins motioned to defer the variance requests, seconded by Schlaefer, to a meeting no later than November 5th.

Board members expressed their concerns of the railing design for the second level deck and they didn't see any hardship for the variance request, nor the applicant trying to meet the intent of the zoning code. They would like to see a proposal that had less of an impact than the current proposal. As for the variance requests for the roof and wall, the board members pointed out that they seemed more of a design feature than a hardship and thought there were other systems of water management than this specific proposal that would have less of an impact.

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. [08598](#) Communications and Announcements

Board members expressed concern over incomplete information submitted with applications and Tucker explained the variance application submittal process.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 pm.

Matt Tucker
City of Madison
Zoning Board of Appeals, (608) 266-4569
Wisconsin State Journal, August 20, 2015