

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
DECISION UPON APPEAL

Carol Dahl / Coulee Region Mobility having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement to provide a 25 foot setback from the front property line and to limit accessory structures to the rear or side yard

at a property known as 1230 Losey Blvd. S., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

CLIFF VIEW ADDITION LOT 1 BLOCK 1 LOT SZ: 50.5 X 126.2 N 125 S

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 20th of September, 2017

Date Filed: September 21, 2017

ATTEST

Nikki Elsen
Nikki Elsen, Deputy Clerk

Concurring:

Phil Nohr
Carol Haas
Philip Nohr

Phil Nohr
Phil Nohr, Chairman

Anastasia Senty
Douglas L. Tarnie

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

Farmer: The unique property limitation here is that this is the only exit that would accommodate the lift. The other exit is a service door with internal stairs, so it is just not feasible. The property has a unique limitation I that this is the only exit. There is no harm to the public interest; the wood structure here is really actually a benefit to the public interest in that it is more likely to be temporary because it is highly unlikely that any future owners would need the lift, although maybe they would, but if they didn't need it they could reduce the structure to a more appropriate size. This is actually beneficial to the public interest. The unnecessary hardship in this case is extremely obvious. The occupant needs to be in and out and this is the only way and it would be unconscionable to deny this given the unnecessary hardship. That being the case, on File 2590, I move two variances: one to allow an accessory structure in the front yard which I believe is the lift, and two, to grant a four foot variance for the front yard setback.

Konradt seconds.

Motion carried.

CONCURRING: Anastasia Gentry
 Doug Farmer
 Phil Nohr
 Carol Haefs
 Joe Konradt

DISSENTING: None

Date Filed: September 21, 2017

ATTEST: Nikki Elsen, Deputy Clerk