## **BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

La Crosse, WI DECISION UPON APPEAL

Patrick G. Blees having appealed from an order of that fill around the perimeter of a building shall be not less 15 feet beyond the limits of any structure at	of the Building Inspector denying a permit with regard to the requirement as than one foot below the flood protection elevation and shall extend at least
at a property known as710 George St., La Crosse, V	Visconsin
and described as:	
PRT SW-NE COM INTER S LN ST CLOUD ST & GEORGE S PRT SW-NE COM E LN GEORGE ST 50FT S OF INTER S L ST N 100FT TO POB EX PRT FOR ST IN V670 P586 & V671	ST S ALG E LN 150FT TO POB S 144FT E 150FT N 143.3FT W 150FT TO POB & N & EXTD`S LN ST CLOUD ST E 150FT S 100FT W 150FT TO E LN GEORGE P520 & V1296 P206 T/W ESMT IN V1173 P425
the subject of this appeal, and similar notice having been	a Crosse property owners and lessees within 100 feet of the property which is bublished in the La Crosse Tribune more than five (5) days prior to the time I and heard by said Board in respect thereto, and having been duly
WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED: That the decision of	of the Building Inspector be: Affirmed 🔲 Reversed 🔀
	(See attached)
Dated this Nov. 21, 2018  Date Filed: Nov. 27, 2018  ATTEST My Lynn  Teri Lehrke, Secretary	Phil Nohr, Chairman
Concurring:  Concu	La feloria
Dissenting:	
The decision of the Board may be appealed to ci	ircuit court within 30 days of the decision being filed pursuant to
	80 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THIS DETERMINATION

You are hereby notified that when a variance is granted from the provisions of the flood plain regulations, increased flood insurance premiums may result.

## **DECISION UPON APPEAL**

**2616** — **Patrick G. Blees** - An appeal regarding the requirement that fill around the perimeter of a building shall not be less than one foot below the flood protection elevation and shall extend at least 15 feet beyond the limits of any structure at 710 George St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Farmer: the motion for File 2616 at 710 George Street; there's a request for two variances, one for nine feet on the north side and one for four feet on the west side. This would be a variance to the fifteen foot requirement for elevated fill beyond the limits of the structure. The unique property limitation is that the property is configured or bound by street to make the use of the loading docks and the flood fill extremely difficult if both were to be honored. You could have the fifteen foot flood fill, but the loading docks would become immaterial and that would severely compromise the utility of the building. There's no harm to the public interest; the main floor of the building would be above the flood level and thus no direct harm to the public interest. And then finally the unnecessary hardship – compliance with the flood requirement would result in a substantially smaller building which wasn't what they were thinking they were buying when they bought it. So that being the case I would move for the approval of the two variances.

Seconder: Cherf

CONCURRING:

Douglas Farmer

Phil Nohr James Cherf Lu Seloover

DISSENTING:

None

Date Filed:

November 27, 2018

ATTEST:

Teri Lehrke, City Clerk