

**Minutes  
City of Monona  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Thursday September 17, 2020**

Chair Thomas called the meeting of the Monona Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 5:46 pm.

Present: Alder Thomas (Chair), Ms. Steele, Mr. Conrad, Ms. Piliouras & Mr. Schweiger

Excused: Mr. Davies (1<sup>st</sup> Alternate)

Also Present: City Planner Douglas Plowman

**Approval of Minutes:**

A motion by Mr. Conrad, seconded by Ms. Steele, to approve the minutes of August 20, 2020 carried with no corrections.

**Appearances:**

Mr. Tom Thompson – 5705 Winnequah Road (Spoke in favor of Z-006-2020)

**New Business:**

**Public Hearing: Scott and Kacey Kronenfeld, 5707 Winnequah Road are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(a) Street Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing an addition to the primary residence. (Case No. Z-006-2020)**

Ms. Kronenfeld presented their variance request. The property is 100 years old, with 3 bedrooms and 2,200 square feet above ground. They hope to make the home more functional to support a growing family with members also working from home. The existing garage is sized for 1.5 cars; 2 vehicles can not fit at the same time. Ms. Kronenfeld works as an emergency physician, for which she has a response vehicle at home. The vehicle should be in a garage, especially in the winter to allow for a faster response. They hope to add another 1 car stall to the garage to allow for 2 cars to be parked inside. It is their intent to maintain the aesthetics and materials of the current building.

The other elements of the request are for additions to the main home. There have been issues with leaking in the roof, and there are more space limitations on the upper level. The proposed addition would allow for a true third bedroom with separate laundry area. The applicant also wishes to add more living space to the main level, utilizing the existing footprint of the deck and enclosing it as a 3-season porch. This will allow for much more functional space without a significant addition being needed outside of the existing footprint.

The applicant would also like to fix their storage shed in the shore yard which was damaged during the high water 2 years ago. They hope to rebuild the shed and enlarge it to accommodate yard equipment and kayaks. Chair Thomas asked if the shed can be moved to remove the need for side yard setback relief. The applicant does not foresee an issue with accommodating this request.

Mr. Tom Thompson of 5705 Winnequah Road shared his support for the proposed improvements. He and his wife have seen the clear need to accommodate the growing family. He added that the proposals are the minimum of what is needed to make the home livable for their needs. Planner Plowman shared an email from the residents of 5711 Winnequah Road who voiced their support, adding that they have no concerns with the plans.

Zoning Board of Appeals  
September 17, 2020  
Approved October 15, 2020

Planner Plowman provided an overview of the application and what exactly is being considered. There are two main elements, the additions to the primary residence, and the second is the storage shed. The shed as proposed is requesting side yard relief, and is also in need of shore yard relief. Lakefront properties are only allowed boathouses and boat piers to locate in the shore yard. Any storage shed would require a variance. The second element is the addition to the primary residence. The variance request is for the street yard setbacks which need to be 30'. This property along with a couple of others on Winnequah Road were built to the property line. There is an extensive City right of way which encompasses the driveway. There is about 45' of depth from the curb to the property line. Any part of the addition within the 30' setback line needs a variance.

Jenny and Ron Binzley of 713 Moygara Road and Sharon Walsh of 712 Moygara Road joined the meeting and were interested in the project, as well as its possible impact on the Winnequah Road sidewalk project. Chair Thomas clarified that the request is not directly related to other Winnequah Road reconstruction. There were no other appearances and the public hearing was declared closed.

**Consideration of Action: Public Hearing: Scott and Kacey Kronenfeld, 5707 Winnequah Road are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(a) Street Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing an addition to the primary residence. (Case No. Z-006-2020)**

Chair Thomas asked the applicants contractor, Mr. Jeremy Ironside, for clarification on the distances from the lot line. The deck is at 27' and therefore 3' within the street yard setbacks. Mr. Schweiger asked for the property limitations present, as a growing family alone doesn't warrant a variance. Ms. Kronenfeld shared that the extensive right of way means there are no other options for garage and deck modifications without significant reconstruction. The current challenges and need for a new garage stems from the applicant's job and the need to store two vehicles inside. Chair Thomas raised the question of hardship to the applicant. It was clarified that the porch addition is approximately 1' within the street yard setback, and that the eastern most edge of that part of the addition would fall within the setback area. The applicant reiterated that they hope to maintain as much of the existing property as possible. Ms. Piliouras sought clarification for the additions being made and the request. The addition is being considered as one request, regardless of the elements being modified. Mr. Schweiger discussed the long term cumulative effects for the continued use of the structure and if an existing hardship is remedied by the 3 season porch and if it enhances the usability of the home and if it is in the public interest. Chair Thomas discussed the challenges of the small rooms in this historic home for any future owner. Mr. Schweiger agreed that the long-term cumulative effect is positive with more usable, modern living space.

A motion was made by Mr. Schweiger, seconded by Ms. Piliouras to approve the street yard setback variance request for an addition to the primary residence. There is an unnecessary hardship that would render burdensome for the existing use. The long term cumulative effect is improved with the variance. There are unique property limitations based upon the excessively large right of way. The request does not harm the public interest and only improves it by increasing the marketability of the home in the future, and the request is in the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Public Hearing: Scott and Kacey Kronenfeld, 5707 Winnequah Road are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(c)(2) Accessory Building Side Yard Setbacks and 480-24(d)(7)(c)(4) Accessory Building Shore Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing a new storage shed in the shore yard. (Case No. Z-006-2020)**

Ms. Kronenfeld shared that the existing shed was damaged due to high water. As they need to rebuild, they would like to slightly enlarge and declutter the yard. They also have need for kayak

Zoning Board of Appeals  
September 17, 2020  
Approved October 15, 2020

storage due to the lack of boathouse on the property. Chair Thomas asked Mr. Ironside if he thought the 3' side yard setback could be accommodated, he agreed. There were no other appearances and the public hearing was declared closed.

**Consideration of Action: Scott and Kacey Kronenfeld, 5707 Winnequah Road are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(c)(2) Accessory Building Side Yard Setbacks and 480-24(d)(7)(c)(4) Accessory Building Shore Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing a new storage shed in the shore yard. (Case No. Z-006-2020)**

Ms. Steele asked Planner Plowman why this needs a variance when a boathouse or boat pier is allowed. He responded that this is a storage shed, given both its location 60' off the shore line and the intent to store yard equipment within it as well as kayaks. This use is not allowed in the shore yard per City Ordinance. It was clarified that this request is in place of a boathouse and not in addition to.

There was discussion from members as to the definition of boathouse and if this could be clarified as one or a boat shelter. The applicant further clarified that they have an alcove already created for the shed and would rather keep it in its existing location than pursue a lakefront boathouse. Mr. Conrad clarified that there isn't a boathouse on the property, and so it needs a boathouse or boat shelter to store boats. Mr. Schweiger shared his opinion of the unnecessary hardship as being that a boathouse or boat shelter could be built, but that it would be significantly more expensive than the proposal. The applicant would also need to alter the shoreline that they are looking to preserve. It was shared that there are few alternative locations to place the shed on the property with limited street yard and side yard availability. Ms. Piliouras clarified if calling it a boat shelter precludes the applicant from building a boathouse at a later date. Planner Plowman responded that as long as it meets the maximum accessory structure square footage it is permitted. Ms. Steele clarified that storage in the garage is already limited. Storage of lawn equipment and bikes is needed elsewhere, and it was asked if this falls under unique property limitations given the age of the home. Mr. Schweiger added that the unique property limitations are met through there being limited alternative locations on the site. He added that the hardship is that there are no other practical storage spaces on the property given the importance of the garage for protecting the vehicles.

A motion was made by Mr. Schweiger, seconded by Mr. Conrad to approve the shore yard setback variance request for the purpose of constructing a new storage shed in the shore yard (side yard setback request withdrawn). The purpose of the zoning restriction is met with the proposal. The intent is not to disallow owner's adequate storage as they can build a boathouse. The long term effect on the property is met by avoiding the boathouse to preserve the shoreline. The long term cumulative effect on the neighborhood is enhanced. Unique property limitations are present with the limited options for shed location elsewhere. Nobody spoke against the proposal and there is no harm to the public interest.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Upcoming Meetings:**

Planner Plowman shared that there may be one application ready for the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Adjournment:**

A motion by Ms. Steele, seconded by Mr. Conrad, to adjourn carried. (6:49 pm.)

Respectfully submitted by:  
Douglas Plowman, City Planner / Zoning Administrator