

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI
DECISION UPON APPEAL

City of La Crosse having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to allowing barbed wire on top of an 8 foot fence that was already constructed

at a property known as: 2000 Marco Dr., La Crosse, Wisconsin

and described as:

GOVERNMENT LOT 4 EX COM NE COR SEC 7 W 1625.5FT TO C/L MARCO DR S 717.46FT W 30FT TO POB S ALG W LN MARCO DR 221.62FT W 819.98FT S 678.38FT W 270.47FT N2D28ME 151.30FT N12D48M20SE 270.1FT N2D31M20SW 252.2FT N2D44ME 233.77FT E 1024.02FT TO POB & EX PRT TAKEN FOR MARCO DR IN V833 P500 SUBJ TO ESMT IN V1395 P273


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 16th of October, 2019

Date Filed: 18th of October, 2019







Phil Nohr, Chairman

ATTEST


Teri Lehrke, Secretary deputy city clerk

Concurring:



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

2636 – City of La Crosse - An appeal allow barbed wire on top of an 8 foot fence that was already constructed at 2000 Marco Dr., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Farmer: Mr. Chairman the property limitation here is it is in basically an industrial area. And that barbed wire on top of the fence would not be a surprise to anybody. The problem with the fence ordinance is that it covers the City from the river to the bluffs and it is not the same down in this area that used to be the landfill. And so that is not only the unique property limitation in this case, but it is in a sense why we would grant the variance. The public interest here is served in that they are trying to secure evidence before it becomes an issue rather than after someone has gone in there and planted something and compromised the legal case. So the public interest is very much served. The unnecessary hardship would be if they don't have this they'd have to find some other location and this is the perfect spot for an evidentiary lot; it is on the edge of the City, it is patrolled, and to put it somewhere else would not make sense. So I would move for approval.

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