

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
DECISION UPON APPEAL

Brian Legg having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement that detached residential accessory buildings be placed in the rear or side yard

at a property known as 1524 Prospect St., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

SPIER & CANTERBURY 1ST ADDN LOTS 6 & 7 BLOCK 19 EX PRT FOR RANGER DR IN V1175 P925 LOT SZ: IRR

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 November 21, 2018

Date Filed: November 27, 2018

ATTEST

Teri Lehrke
Teri Lehrke, Secretary

Phil Nohr

Phil Nohr, Chairman

Concurring:

Phil Nohr

Douglas Farmer

Dissenting:

CHGER
Lu Selover

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)(c)10.

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

DECISION UPON APPEAL

2618 – Brian Legg - An appeal regarding the requirement that detached residential accessory buildings be placed in the rear or side yard at 1524 Prospect St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Farmer: the motion for file 2618 at 1524 Prospect St. to allow a shed to be placed into the front yard (and there should be quotation marks around front yard). And then I'll say facetiously if the lot was a more traditional lot this wouldn't be the issue. The unique property limitation – the property has 135 feet of street frontage and is triangular or pie shaped and by testimony this represents the least-used portion of their property both by distance and by shape. The lot is also 6,340 square feet and would not be approved today because it is below the minimum standard. So not only does it have an awkward shape, but it would be too small to be approved today, so it's got two things going against it in terms of unique property limitation. There's no harm to the public interest; the proposed shed is such a distance from the house to mitigate the traditional front yard prohibitions anticipated from a more traditional sized lot. Visually when you look at it even by the drawings here, your first reaction isn't front yard. Their first reaction is - way down the street. The unnecessary hardship if placement of the vinyl shed where it is will allow better parking and better use of the remainder of the lot. And so it doesn't seem unreasonable. I would move for approval.

Seconder: Selover

CONCURRING: Douglas Farmer
Phil Nohr
James Cherf
Lu Selover

DISSENTING: None

Date Filed: November 27, 2018

ATTEST: Teri Lehrke, City Clerk