

CITY OF MENASHA
BOARD OF APPEALS
TEL-WEB CONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 12, 2020
MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Chairman Galeazzi at 1:03 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Commissioner Ellis, Rouch, Galeazzi, Maxymek

ALSO PRESENT: PP Stephenson and Clerk Krautkramer

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Request of Request of Cindy Pietrich, 801 London Street, Menasha – the applicant is requesting a front home addition

Chairman Galeazzi opened the public hearing and provided an opportunity for both the applicant and City Staff to make any opening comments.

Cindy Pietrich, 801 London Street, Menasha. She explained that depth of the roof is used for shading purposes.

Joe Stephenson, Principal Planner. He provided an overview of the applicants' appeal.

Chairman Galeazzi closed the public hearing.

D. MINUTES TO APPROVE

1. Board of Appeals, 5/29/19

Moved by Comm. Rouch seconded by Comm. Ellis to approve the minutes.

Motion carried on voice vote.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Request of Cindy Pietrich, 801 London Street, Menasha – the applicant is requesting a front home addition.

Cindy Pietrich, 801 London Street, Menasha. She explained the roof needs to be replaced that due to leakage in the structure.

PP Stephenson reported that Ms. Pietrich is requesting allowance to place an addition, also known as a covered porch, in the front yard setback. The front home addition is not permitted in an R-1 Single Family Residence District. He reviewed the regulations for granting a variance and explained that Ms. Pietrich's residence does not meet those regulations.

Chairman Galeazzi explained the role of the Board of Appeals.

PP Stephenson explained Ms. Petrich does not meet the requirements to grant a variance. He stated staff's analysis for requirement of a variance:

- The applicant has not demonstrated a hardship since the proposed addition could be modified to accommodate the setback requirement.
- There are no unique characteristics to the property. The home and yard layout are not exclusive to this property. The site presents no uniqueness and no site elements that diminish the property rights of the owner.
- The proposed addition will increase the value of the property, however the applicant has stated the main reason for the addition is to provide shade for her child while outdoors.
- Allowing variances to these established standards undermines the objective of the zoning code in place.

General discussion ensued on roof pitch requirements, alternative shade options, lot size, uniqueness of the property, state variance guidelines, and retractable awning set-back requirements.

PP Stephenson stated staff would like to see action by the Board to deny the request for a variance from the applicant.

Moved by Comm. Galeazzi seconded by Comm. Rouch to deny the variance for a front home addition due in part that the applicant did not satisfy the core variance factors; Hardship to the Property Owner due to Physiographical Considerations, Unique Property Conditions, Not an Exclusive Desire to Increase Property Value or Income, Will Not be Detrimental to the Neighborhood, Will not Undermine the Spirit of the Zoning Code.

Motion carried on roll call 4-0.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Comm. Rouch seconded by Comm. Maxymek to adjourn at 1:46 p.m.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Haley Krautkramer
City Clerk