

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
DECISION UPON APPEAL

Nancy Swanson having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement to provide a six foot side yard setback

at a property known as 1552 Loomis St., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

SPIER & CANTERBURY 1ST LOT 1 BLOCK 12 LOT SZ: 50.45 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 20th of September, 2017

Date Filed: September 21, 2017

ATTEST

Mikki Eisen
MIKKI EISEN, Deputy Clerk

Concurring:

De Kinnear
Carol Haas
Phil Nohr

Phil Nohr
Phil Nohr, Chairman

Stasia Gentry
Douglas 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

Farmer: For File 2591, at 1552 Loomis St, the house is demonstratively unusually close to the sidewalk and the testimony indicated that it is five feet and all appearances are that it is even closer than that. So the house has a unique property limitation that is not going to be solved any other way. The benefit or no harm to public interest is that given the work that is being done on the house and the fact that this staircase was there before, in much the same fashion, there is no harm to the public interest. There is an overall improvement to the neighborhood because this is a corner property and has a higher visibility. The unnecessary hardship here is rather extraordinary in that there would be no access. This is the only access to the second floor apartment and it is basically three to four feet up and it is going to be the only way that you can accommodate it; if we would deny this variance there would need to be extensive reconstruction inside moving the staircase farther into the house without taking it all out and reconstructing it. It would be a great hardship. That being the case, we would move for approval of a variance of five feet to the six foot side yard setback and that would be the only variance required.

Haefs 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