

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
 DECISION UPON APPEAL

LAUTZ LASSIG CUSTOM BUILDERS having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement to provide a 25 foot front yard setback at

at a parcel known as 2126 Winnebago St., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

SW ANDERSONS THIRD ADDN LOT 9 BLOCK 3 LOT SZ: 40 X 142.7

and due notice having been given by mail to all City of La Crosse property owners and lessees within 100 feet of the property which is the subject of this appeal, and similar notice having been published in the La Crosse Tribune more than five (5) days prior to the time of the hearing hereon, and testimony having been received and heard by said Board in respect thereto, and having been duly considered, and being fully advised in the premises,

WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED: That the decision of the Building Inspector be: Affirmed ☐ Reversed ☒

(See attached)

Dated this August 17, 2016

Date Filed: August 19, 2016

ATTEST

Teri Lehrke, deputy
 Teri Lehrke, Secretary

Concurring:

Carol Hepp
Philip Nohr

Philip Nohr
 Phil Nohr, Chairman

Nastasia Senty
Douglas L. Tannen

Dissenting:

The decision of the Board may be appealed to circuit court within 30 days of the decision being filed pursuant to Wisconsin Statute sec. 62.23(7)(e)10.

NOTE: WORK SHALL BEGIN WITHIN 180 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THIS DETERMINATION

DECISION UPON APPEAL

File 2566 – Steve Bamber/Lautz Custom Builders - An appeal regarding the requirement to provide a 25 foot front yard setback at 2126 Winnebago St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Mover/motion: Farmer: on File 2566, the board finds the unique property limitation is in a sense the Code which allows the same structure in concrete, but doesn't allow it in wood, which in many respects is counter to the public interest because the entire structure would be there forever and a permanent addition where a deck out of wood would have a much shorter life if someone wanted to make a change to the look. While it is not the normal unique property limitation that we look for, it is the limitation. There is no harm to the public interest given by the fact that no one spoke during the public hearing opposed to the project. We also have seen these requests many times before. It is just what people come to expect, so there is no harm to the public interest. The unnecessary hardship is that that he never used the word spalling, but that is what I thought was the case, and that is a no-win battle. To try and maintain the current steps would be an unnecessary hardship. For that I move for approval.

Seconder: Haefs

Motion carried.

CONCURRING: Carol Haefs
Douglas Farmer
Phil Nohr
Anastasia Gentry

DISSENTING: none

Date Filed: August 19, 2016

ATTEST: Nikki Elsen, Deputy Clerk