

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, April 18, 2011

Administrative Center – County Board Room

6:00 p.m. – 6:25 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Howard Raymer, Jr., Dave Eilertson, Terry Larsen
MEMBERS EXCUSED: None
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
OTHERS PRESENT: Nathan Sampson, Jonathan Kaatz (minutes)

CALL TO ORDER

Howard Raymer, Jr., Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Let the record show that this meeting is called in full compliance with the requirements of Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

APPEAL NO. 2011-10 Robert & Julie Schuppel, W4437 Gills Coulee Rd, West Salem, WI 54669. Permit denied to construct a 24-ft X 30-ft addition to an existing 30-ft X 42-ft detached accessory building that together with a second 10-ft X 28-ft existing detached accessory building will exceed the 1,500 sq. ft. area limit for such buildings on this 5.0 acre lot. Property described as Lot 1 of Certified Survey Map No. 64, Volume 5. Property is located at W4437 Gills Coulee Rd. Town of Hamilton.

Appearing in favor: Robert Schuppel, W4437 Gills Coulee Rd, West Salem, WI 54669.

REMARK Schuppel: I've applied for the zoning variance. The reason I'd like to add on to my existing detached building is because I've looked at putting an addition on the house garage and I live in a brick house. To do that would be about two and a half to three times more expensive than to put out the front of my other unattached garage. I've also looked at attaching the existing house roof line into the unattached roof there but that's a floating slab underneath the 30 by 42 foot building and I'm just worried that with the floating slab there could be damage to the roof line down the road if I were to tie it in. It's impossible to put a frost wall between there because my utilities are buried in between the house and the 30 by 42 building right there. Also I have equipment that I've had to store down at a friend's house. I've got an enclosed trailer that I use for hunting for out west. I've got a friend that has a pole building south of St. Joseph's Ridge. I've had to store it down there during the winter months. It's an inconvenience to go down there. Also when I built my other garage behind there, I had a different lawn mower and that one has since died and I got a bigger one. So it's kind of hard to get it in to there. It's not a lot bigger one but it's just an inconvenience. Also the existing driveway I have there right now in front, as far as for green space, the grass, I'd only be losing about 15 feet for width by 24 feet for length. Otherwise everything in front of it now is driveway. Also there's no way I can buy any more land because I'm kind of land locked where the neighbors are. The lot to the east of me there, he has five acres and there's no way I can get anything off of him. For Dinger's, I believe behind me there, he has about seven and a half acres and that would probably put him below if he wanted to build on that. Also the neighbor behind me would be hard to buy anything from them. I've also talked to all my neighbors, except for Mr. Hauser that has the farm across the street. Nobody is opposed to putting this addition on. Originally when I bought out there about 20 years ago, I was going to be buying 10 acres but the zoning at that time they only wanted to give me five acres. Mr. Schams, he wanted to sell...originally there was going to be two 10 acres lots sold there. Because I wanted to buy and he wanted to sell but the board only wanted to rezone for the five acres so that's what I ended up buying. I guess originally I would have put a pole building years ago when I built but I've only built what I've been able to afford over the years to add on. I have plenty of land there. What I don't keep for a yard, Oldenbergs farm it either in hay or in corn. I've had that arrangement with them for the last 19 years that I've been out there. And this won't affect any of the acreage that they're farming. Like I say, I'm just taking a little bit out of the driveway in front there and to the right there of where the concrete apron is, that's where the green space is that would be lost. Everything will be in line with the existing building as far as the 30 foot width. It's just going out the 24 feet to the front.

QUESTION Eilertson: I have a question Bob. What do you keep in the 30 by 42, the larger detached garage?

ANSWER Schuppel: I keep my truck in there. And then I got a little wood working shop where I putz around with inside there.

REMARK Eilertson: According to, and this is a rough estimate. You have an attached garage on your house. When we were out there the other day I estimated that to be 24 by 24 approximately. That would be 576 square feet. The detached garage is 30 by 42. That is 1,260 square feet. The 10 by 28 shop is 280 square feet. That's currently 2,116 square feet. And you're asking the committee to approve 720 square feet more, for a total of 2,836 square feet in garage area. That's more garage space than 99 percent of the people in La Crosse County have.

REMARK Schuppel: Well what I got in the garage that's on my house there is my wife's car is stored in there and I have a fishing boat in there and then it's my ATV for plowing. And that pretty much takes up what's in there for the garage. The 10 by 28, I have my duck boat back there. That's a 16 and a half foot duck boat. Like I say, my lawn mower for cutting is there. I went from a regular tractor to a zero clearance for cutting. That takes my area back there up. Like I say, since I built out there I bought a six by eight enclosed trailer, I think is what the size is, that we use for taking out west for hunting.

REMARK Eilertson: What this committee has to respond to is, in granting a variance is an unnecessary hardship. I don't know if you're demonstrating having this or not having it is an unnecessary hardship.

REMARK Schuppel: That's right. I talked to Chad in Zoning and even then I said I don't really know how to come up with a hardship, to prove that it's a hardship on there. The Town of Hamilton, they were out and looked at it too and they didn't have a problem. I was with them last Tuesday at the committee meeting there. They were supposed to send a letter down that they had no opposition to me adding onto that. Like I say, if I had had known now I would have built my house garage a lot bigger years ago. I had what I had, what I could afford to build, and so on and so forth. I had a real hard time trying to show what a hardship is other than the fact that I keep my property up. With Bud being the building inspector, when I built out there I had no problems with any building codes and stuff. I talked to all my neighbors and they have no problem. The hardship is storing equipment around other areas, the trailer and that. And that lawn tractor from what I had before. It's kind of jammed in that back building back there. I asked for some guidance as far as, from zoning, how do you prove a hardship. I keep my property up and I think it's going to blend in.

REMARK Eilertson: You keep your property very nice. It's very nice and clean. I have no problem with that. What we do here is scrutinize.

REMARK Schuppel: I guess like I say the thing is the garage on the house, that's full. Like I say, I bought a fishing boat a few years ago and that's in there. It's nice enough boat that I don't want to store it outside in the winter months to get wrecked. That's a big enough boat that it's in there. The house garage has an offset into it where the back door goes into the house. I think the garage would be 30 feet by 20 or so, 24 maybe. The house is 30 feet wide.

QUESTION Eilertson: Your attached garage?

ANSWER Schuppel: Yeah, the garage and the house. Like I say, there's some of the house that goes into that garage. Like I say, I looked at adding onto the house garage. It would be two and a half times roughly more to add onto that. Just for financial reasons it would be more economical for me to add onto my existing unattached garage. I guess the thing is from talking to Chad, he suggested too that I attach the two buildings. I'm just afraid that with a floating slab there that down the road that if the heaves or whatever that I'm going to have problems with my roofline there. I'll have more problems as far as financially to have to repair things. If I understood him correctly, if I attached the unattached garage to my house then that would make it part of the continuing building and then I could still add on even bigger than this 24 by 30. I don't want to do that. I don't want to build another building. Like I say, if the law allows me to attach them and then add on...I mean all I'm asking for is to build on with not attaching the 30 by 42 to the house.

QUESTION Larsen: What's the addition going to be used for?

ANSWER Schuppel: Just for storage. For my truck in the front part and that enclosed trailer. And I'll be pulling the lawn mower out of the back side that's in that 10 by 28. I got a full size pickup truck. When I first built out there I had a little S-10. Then I went to a bigger truck. I measured it out. I even looked at going smaller than the 24 for going out. It's going to cramp as far as where the truck going in there. Say for down the road if I ever get a four door pickup truck then I still wouldn't...to put my enclosed trailer in there and everything else, I wouldn't have enough room that way either. But by going 24 feet out I would.

QUESTION Raymer: Anything else Bob?

REMARK Schuppel: Like I said if I attach them it doesn't seem to be a problem. I guess what it boils down to is that I'm just asking to be able to put the addition on without attaching the unattached to my current residence.

REMARK Raymer: An attached garage, there is no size limitations.

REMARK Schuppel: Right.

REMARK Raymer: However if there was a way to put even an archway, a five foot wide walkway from the garage to this garage.

REMARK Schuppel: That's what I even looked at. I've talked to a couple different, you know like one other contractor. And I talked to Carl Walls at the lumber yard. And they all said with that garage being on a floating slab that you could have problems.

REMARK Raymer: Well if you made it too big of an addition to it, it could be a problem, but if you just made a covered entry way.

REMARK Schuppel: Right and that's what I was just looking to do.

Appearing in opposition: None.

Correspondence: None.

QUESTION Raymer: You went to the Town of Hamilton?

ANSWER Schuppel: Yes.

QUESTION Raymer: And they approved it?

ANSWER Schuppel: Yeah. Blaine Lee, he went out and looked at it.

QUESTION Raymer: But did the board themselves vote on it?

ANSWER Schuppel: Yes, they voted on it that night. Schomberg. Ray Ebert was there. One other board member was sick. It should have been sent down here that they were in favor of it.

REMARK Raymer: They must have not got it done.

QUESTION Raymer: And none of the neighbors, no correspondence from the neighbors?

ANSWER Sampson: None.

Discussion:

QUESTION Raymer: Would we have any way of knowing how big that garage is to the east? That big pole shed on the other property.

ANSWER Sampson: On the other lot? We issued a permit for that. What was permitted was a 50 foot by 48 foot. What was permitted back in 1994 was a 50 foot by 48 foot detached building.

QUESTION Raymer: 50 by 48?

ANSWER Sampson: Correct.

QUESTION Raymer: So that was under different rules or how did he get one that big? Did he get a variance?

ANSWER Sampson: The only variance granted for that was from the 12 foot height limit. The way area limits for detached accessory buildings were back then, you took the width of the rear lot and the required rear yard space of 25 feet, which in this case would be 330 feet times 25 and then you multiply that times 30%. You came up with roughly, just shy of 2500 square feet allowed.

REMARK Raymer: So that's 48 by 50. That building over there is 2400 square feet now.

REMARK Sampson: Yeah. With the new aerial photography we believe there may have been a carport that was constructed on that.

REMARK Raymer: That's something else we're going to have to deal with.

REMARK Sampson: Outside of tonight.

REMARK Raymer: The permit that was issued to that is supposed to be 48 by 50 which is 2400.

REMARK Sampson: Correct.

REMARK Raymer: And that lot is the same size as the Schuppel lot.

REMARK Sampson: Correct.

REMARK Raymer: I think as I look at it, the neighbors aren't complaining. They got that pine tree line all around the neighbor's lot. I think the 5 acres is...I think in the new zoning thing, Nate indicated there is going to be a little more of a... We go from three to 10. I mean that's a pretty big spread. That probably should have went three to five. Is that what it is going to be down the road?

REMARK Sampson: That's what we're proposing. That's not written in stone. And actually it would be 5.01 acres.

REMARK Raymer: Like this is, 3.01. So he would still be the .01 short in that ordinance too then.

REMARK Sampson: Correct.

REMARK Eilertson: Well they keep their property very, very nice. It's immaculately clean. I would trust that this addition will...they're probably going to use siding that matches the rest of the building and that.

Without any neighbor's complaining or anything, I make a motion to approve.

Motion Eilertson/Larsen to approve.
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.

APPEAL NO. 2011-11 Lisa A Bruring, 1312 La Crescent St, La Crosse, WI 54603. Permit denied to construct a 16-ft X 28-ft two-story addition to an existing residence where the addition will lie within the required 60-ft setback from the centerline of La Crescent St. Property described as Lots 4 & 5, Part of Lot 6, Block 4 of Beaudette's Addition & part of Gov't Lot 5, Section 19, T16N, R7W, further described in tax parcels 4-865-0 & 4-977-0. Property is located at 1312 La Crescent St. Town of Campbell.

Appearing in favor: Lisa A Bruring, 1312 La Crescent St, La Crosse, WI 54603.

REMARK Bruring: We're looking to put on an addition to add two bedrooms and a family room. We've out grown our home.

QUESTION Eilertson: This is going to, from a height standpoint, just match the rest of your house? Just be an extension to the south.

ANSWER Bruring: Right. We're not going out any further towards the street.

Appearing in opposition: None.

Correspondence: Phone call from neighbor on April 18, 2011 to the La Crosse County Zoning Department stating four neighbors are in support of the petition for the proposed two-story addition.

Discussion:

REMARK Raymer: I drove out there the other day on my own and I don't see any problem with it.

REMARK Eilertson: The tavern on the corner encroaches as much as that house. The house on the south encroaches as much.

REMARK Larsen: The ones across the street do too.

REMARK Eilertson: Then they have a big side yard here. It's actually two lots.

REMARK Raymer: Even with the addition it's a long ways to the next lot.

Motion Eilertson/Larsen to approve.
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion Eilertson/Larsen to adjourn at 6:25 p.m.
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.