BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

La Crosse, WI DECISION UPON APPEAL

Kwik Trip Inc. having appealed from an order of the Building Inspector denying a permit to allow a solid fence over ten feet in height located on a heavy industrial zoned property
known as 1813 Kramer St., La Crosse, Wisconsin
and described as:
CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP NO. 9 VOL 18 LOT 1 DOC NO. 1721790
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: 21st of August, 2020 Date Filed: 21st of August, 2020 ATTEST Teri Lehrke, Secretary James Cherf, Chair
Concurring: CHERF CHE
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

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

2646 – **Kwik Trip** - An appeal to allow a solid fence over ten feet in height located on a heavy industrial zoned property at 1813 Kramer St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

And

2647 – Kwik Trip - An appeal to allow a solid fence over ten feet in height located on a heavy industrial zoned property at 1735 Kramer St., La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Farmer: I would propose for variance request 2646 having to do with 1813 Kramer Street and variance request 2647 having to do with 1735 Kramer Street, that we would approve the variance of 1 foot six inches to the maximum height and a variance to allow the fence to be constructed of solid materials not of an open type. The reasons for that is the limitation is caused by the fact that the parcel being used is divided by the property line. This is evidenced by the variances required for two small "rumps" on this first application and the rest of the fence3 on the second application. The parking lot section is also a limitation because it is in the floodplain and combining the lots would require the entire parcel subject to flood limitations. I know that from personal experience having to deal with flood insurance and it becomes cumbersome. There'd be no harm to the public interest and there has been no demonstrated harm to the public interest; the truck traffic referenced is not unusual for this area. The additional screening resulting from 11.5 fence and the architectural similarity to the building both are in public interest and desirable. The unnecessary hardship is addressed because the fence relating to servicing the gas pumps would be serviced outside. Not granting the variance would require servicing and related forms to be done inside resulting in air quality issues. I move for approval of both.

Second by Spies.

Concurring:

James Cherf

Douglas Farmer George Kimmett Delores Spies

Dissenting:

None

Date Filed:

August 21, 2020

Attest:

Teri Lehrke, City Clerk