

**Minutes  
City of Monona  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Thursday October 15, 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: Mr. Ryan Patton and City Planner Douglas Plowman

**Approval of Minutes:**

A motion by Mr. Conrad, seconded by Ms. Steele, to approve the minutes of September 17, 2020 carried with no corrections.

**Appearances:**

There were no appearances.

**New Business:**

**Public Hearing: Ben Fisher and Claire Pellegrini, 4602 Tonyawatha Trail are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(a) Street Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing a new front porch. (Case No. Z-007-2020)**

Mr. Fisher presented the variance application to the Board. The front of the house is already beyond the street yard setback, and at an angle to the property line. They are requesting a total of 9.7' of encroachment into the street yard setbacks to build a new front porch. The current entryway is not fully functional, as both doors are not able to be open at the same time. Additionally, the roof is leaking, and they would like to repair this at the same time as conducting the work. The applicant presented the hardship as being the front entry obstruction as well as the limited curb appeal of the home. The applicant argued that this was a reasonable expectation to be able to build a front porch addition to enjoy the lake views, and be in keeping with the lake cottage style of the home.

**Consideration of Action: Ben Fisher and Claire Pellegrini, 4602 Tonyawatha Trail are requesting a variance from Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances Sec. 480-24(d)(4)(a) Street Yard Setbacks for the purpose of constructing a new front porch. (Case No. Z-007-2020)**

Planner Plowman shared that the street yard setbacks are the reason for the request. The house is set at an angle as it relates to the street yard property line. It was recommended that the Board discuss the hardship, and run through the decision matrix as they consider the application.

Ms. Steele asked if the applicant has spoken to the neighbors regarding the request. Mr. Fisher responded that they know to some extent. The specific plans have not been shared, as they are not directly impacting their views. Ms. Steele sought clarification regarding how far the porch would extend based upon the photographs submitted to the Board. Chair Thomas discussed the porch, and the open nature of it. The suggestion was made that the Board may wish to consider a possible condition that requires the porch remain open, or come back for another variance. Mr. Conrad evaluated the front door challenges as the unnecessary hardship. It was discussed that it was unsafe, particularly if you were leaving in an emergency. There was also discussion of how the current pandemic increases the use of outdoor seating options versus indoor alternatives.

Zoning Board of Appeals

October 15, 2020

Approved November 19, 2020

Mr. Schweiger asked if the deck wasn't built if they would need a variance. The applicant was also asked to show how the two front doors worked, and the challenges that they pose. Planner Plowman responded that the applicant could rebuild the existing porch with the same dimensions, but it couldn't be expanded as it's already within the setbacks. Uncovered steps are also allowed 3' into the setbacks that are necessary for access. Mr. Schweiger added that he was struggling to identify the hardship, as curb appeal or views are not hardships themselves. There was discussion of the curve of the lot frontage and if it was an unnecessary hardship or unique property limitation. Ms. Steele added that the street yard zoning restriction and angle of the house on the property creates an unnecessary hardship for the applicant to make improvements.

A motion was made by Ms. Steele, seconded by Ms. Piliouras to approve the street yard setback variance request for a new front porch with the condition that if the porch is to become enclosed, a new request will need to come before the ZBA. There is an unnecessary hardship with the zoning restrictions effect on the property due to the physical shape of the lot and the angle of both the lot and the house. There is no harm to the public interest, and there is no impact to adjacent neighbors and their views.

The motion carried with three votes in favor and one (Mr. Schweiger) in opposition.

**Upcoming Meetings:**

Planner Plowman shared that there have not yet been any applications received for the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Adjournment:**

A motion by Mr. Schweiger, seconded by Mr. Conrad, to adjourn carried. (6:12 pm.)

Respectfully submitted by:

Douglas Plowman, City Planner / Zoning Administrator