## **BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

La Crosse, WI DECISION UPON APPEAL

La Crosse County having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement to provide a vision clearance triangle in three locations
at a property known as: 333 Vine St., La Crosse, Wisconsin
and described as:
TOWN OF LA CROSSE LOTS 1-10 BLOCK 26 & ALL OF VAC ALLEY IN BLOCK 26 & ALL OF VAC PINE ST LYG BETWEEN BLOCKS 26 & 27 & LOTS 1-8 BLOCK 27 & ALL OF VAC ALLEY IN BLOCK 27 EX PRT LOTS 8-10 BLOCK 27 & E 10FT VAC ALLEY ADJ DESC AS FOLL BEG NW COR LOT 10 N62D40M20SW 10FT S28D 7M40SW 128.92FT S62D39M0SE 51.45FT N28D7M40SW 25.32FT S62D39M0SE 75.39FT TO W LN 4TH ST N8D5M20SE 45.75FT N 68.06FT TO S LN BADGER ST N62D40M20SW 69.13FT TO POB & EX THAT PRT TAKEN FOR 4TH ST R/W
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)
Date Filed: 18th of October, 2019  Date Filed: 18th of October, 2019  ATTEST  Teri Lehrke, Secretary deputy Concurring:  City clerk  Arpl Flact  Anne
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 DAVS AFTER THE DATE OF THIS DETERMINATION

## **DECISION UPON APPEAL**

2631 – La Crosse County - An appeal regarding the requirement to provide a vision clearance triangle in two locations at 333 Vine St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Motion by Farmer, second by Haefs, to combine number 2631, 2632, 2633, and 2634 into one package. Motion carried.

Farmer: Mr. Chairman, then in terms of the motion to approve, I would address the unique property limitation in that the downtown properties all have some form of unique property limitation especially inside of 7<sup>th</sup> Street simply because of urban congestion. Each one of these pieces of property are inside of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and as a rule all have that same issue and it is an issue across every single block in the downtown area. I don't think there's any harm to the public interest; in fact, I think the County should be applauded for taking signs that are extremely dated and are doing nothing to approve downtown and they are replacing them with signs that have some aesthetic appeal. These will be much better than what we have. The unnecessary hardship would be on the public if we had to put the signs where the Code would mandate, the signs basically would be back far enough and in such fashion as to not be readily seen. They would be, in some cases, sitting in the parking lot and that is not what people expect to see. So I would move for approval.

## Clemence seconded.

Farmer made an amendment to his motion: assuming the County is in good faith, we request that they be placed as far back as possible in that area as practical and as possible.

Clemence seconded.

CONCURRING:

Lu Seloover Carol Haefs

Phil Nohr

Charles Clemence

Doug Farmer

DISSENTING:

None

Date Filed:

October 18, 2019

ATTEST:

Nikki Elsen, Deputy Clerk