

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
DECISION UPON APPEAL

Daniel & Tammy La Fleur having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement for a yard shed to be a maximum of 120 square feet

at a property known as 1815 Prospect St., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

LOSEY ADDITION LOT 5 EX N 30 FT & ALL LOT 6 BLOCK 18 LOT SZ: 50 X 140

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 15th of March, 2017

Date Filed: 3/16/2017

ATTEST

Teri Lehrke
Teri Lehrke, Secretary

Douglas R Farmer
Phil Nohr, Chairman
Doug Farmer, Vice Chair

Concurring:

Tom K...
Charles Clement

Douglas R Farmer

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

DECISION UPON APPEAL

File 2575 – Daniel & Tammy LaFleur - An appeal regarding the requirement for a yard shed to be a maximum of 120 square feet at 1815 Prospect St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Knothe: with regard to File 2575 regarding the property located at 1815 Prospect Street, I hereby move that we grant the request for variance for this yard shed to remain as it is, with granting a variance of 24 square feet to the 120 square foot maximum allowed area for a yard shed. The unique condition that exists in that the property is already being used and they don't have a garage. There is no undue hardship to the public interest given that the ordinance was created to allow for access to the property and it is not an issue in this case. Lastly, the undue hardship would be the removal of this shed given the fact that it is already in place.

Farmer adds that if they did move it, there would be no place to store the lawn mower.

Konradt seconded.

Motion carried.

CONCURRING: Joe Konradt
 Doug Farmer
 Charles Clemence
 Tom Knothe

DISSENTING: None

Date Filed: March 16, 2017

ATTEST: Teri Lehrke, City Clerk