

**MINUTES OF MEETING
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 4:00 P.M.**

DOCKET1305

54 PICARDY LANE

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 1, 2020

**DUE TO THE CURRENT RESTRICTIONS ORDERED BY ST. LOUIS COUNTY ON PUBLIC
GATHERINGS DUE TO COVID-19, THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BY VIDEO
CONFERENCE VIA ZOOM**

The following members of the Board were present:

Chairman Liza Forshaw
Ms. Kristen Holton
Ms. Laura Long
Ms. Elizabeth Panke
Mr. Lee Rottmann

Also present were Erin Seele, City Attorney; Anne Lamitola, Director of Public Works; Andrea Sukanek, City Planner; Roger Stewart, Building Commissioner; and Nancy Spewak, Mayor.

Chairman Forshaw called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

Approval and Adoption of the Agenda and Minutes

Mr. Rottmann made a motion to adopt the Agenda. Ms. Panke seconded the motion. All those present were in favor.

Ms. Long made a motion to adopt the Minutes of the August 4, 2020 meeting. Mr. Rottmann seconded the motion. All those present were in favor.

Docket 1305 Petition is submitted by Daniel George for the property located at 54 Picardy Lane. Petitioner is requesting relief from the Building Commissioner denying a garage addition. The construction of the proposed structure would result in an encroachment into a front yard setback of approximately 14 feet. This is prohibited in Ladue Zoning Ordinance 1175, Section V-B (1).

Mr. Stewart stated the applicant requests a variance to allow erect an attached 3 car garage. The proposal includes a 14' encroachment into the required 50-foot front yard setback in the C Zoning District. The lot has 3 front yards. Mr. Stewart shared an email from Andrew Hable, 31 Picardy Lane with numerous photos, stating the property is in disrepair and asking for denial of the variance. He believes the garage would be a visually unattractive to neighbors to the west of the house when open.

Chairman Forshaw introduced the following exhibits to be entered into the record:

Exhibit A – Zoning Ordinance 1175, as amended;

- Exhibit B – Public Notice of the Hearing;
- Exhibit C – Letter of Denial dated July 13, 2020;
- Exhibit D – List of Residents sent notice of meeting;
- Exhibit E – Letter from the resident requesting the variance dated July 14, 2020;
- Exhibit F – Entire file relating to the application
- Exhibit g – Opposing email with photos

Daniel George took the oath and addressed the Board, stating that when he moved into the home in 2018 it was overgrown and neglected. It has been a work in progress. Major improvements are planned. Storm water mitigation has been step one of the process. The house has a small carport that isn't suitable in size for car parking. He has worked with Roger Stewart and the Architectural Review Board to design the garage in keeping with the style of the home and neighborhood. On Picardy Lane, 3 car garages are common. The proposed placement in a front yard is crucial to avoid moving the driveway, to avoid removing mature trees and to keep the garage away from the bedroom area of the house. The proposal has a breezeway between the house and the attached garage, and the carport will remain. The plans as shown do not accurately depict the direction the garage is facing; they were created to give a visual of the façade.


Kathleen Mullins, 44 Picardy Lane took the oath and stated her support for the garage as planned. She said the garage doors would not face the neighborhood. She observed that the Georges have been doing vast improvements to the home and the lot is challenging. Garage placement possibilities are extremely limited.

Elizabeth Hackett, 30 Picardy Lane took the oath and stated that she also added a garage to her home with careful planning and worked with the A.R.B. She believes the 14' encroachment to be excessive. There are other options including reducing the size of the garage and changing its location. She believes it is important to maintain the integrity of the stately homes on Picardy Lane.

Board discussion ensued. The lack of a garage in Ladue is often considered a practical difficulty and the existence of 3 front yards on the lot is quite restrictive. A question was raised as to whether a 3 car garage (as opposed to a 2 car garage) in a front yard is excessive, and whether the carport needs to be retained. The applicant was encouraged to consider alternative size and placement for the garage and to present better visual information about the proposal and the carport. A continuance was granted.

Adjournment

At 6:46 p.m. Mr. Rottmann made a motion to Adjourn the meeting. Ms. Panke seconded the motion. A unanimous vote in favor was taken.


Ms. Liza Forshaw, Chairman