CALL TO ORDER
Howard Raymer, Jr., 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. 2014-22 Ron A and Cynthia L Peterson, N2904 State Rd 35, Stoddard, WI 54658, on behalf of PTM Inc., W6757 Abbey Rd, Onalaska, WI 54650. Permit denied to construct an approximately 850 sq. ft. addition to an existing building in the Light Industrial District that together with the existing 13,874 sq. ft. building will exceed the 35% lot coverage allowed on this 0.91 acre parcel by 490 sq. ft. Property is described as Lot 6 of Block 4 of The Commercial Quarter. Tax parcel 10-2356-0. Property address W6757 Abbey Rd. Town of Onalaska.

Appearing in favor: Ron Peterson N2904 State Rd 35, Stoddard, WI 54658. The current computer room holds nine seats, is 15’ x 25’, and everyone is packed in. Right next to that room is a lunch room. There is a front room that is small, where the secretaries are. We are seeking to add on to the front to make two rooms into one big one so people can spread out. I have comments from the neighbors, all except one.

Question Eilertson: You are saying you want to put on a 936 square foot addition. On the front of our sheet it says 850 square feet, which is correct?

Answer Peterson: 936 square feet.

Appearing in favor: Jason Skipton with Brickl Brothers, 400 Brickl Road West Salem WI, 54669. I am the design build general on this and am just here to say I am in favor of this appeal.

Appearing in opposition: None.

Correspondence: None.

Discussion: Discussion by Eilertson and Raymer that it was not a setback issue and the variance was for exceeding the 35% of building coverage allowed. Raymer stated that these have historically been approved.

Motion Eilertson/Warzynski to approve with conditions and ordered the following:

A condition of approval requires that the addition be constructed within 12 months of the Board’s decision.

3 Aye, 0 No, and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.

APPEAL NO. 2014-23 Dean H Blegen, W2795 Kriebich Coulee Rd, Coon Valley, WI 54623. After the fact appeal to retain an existing 12-ft x 24-ft detached accessory building that together with a 40-ft x 100-ft detached accessory building authorized by Appeal No. 1990-48 exceeds the area limit for such buildings on this 1.61 acre lot. Property is described as part of the NE/NW of Section 25, T15N, R6W. Tax parcel 6-590-0. Property address W2795 Kriebich Coulee Rd. Town of Greenfield.

Appearing in favor: Dean H Blegen, W2795 Kriebich Coulee Rd, Coon Valley, WI 54623. We have two lots out there and this is the second one. I purchased it about 30 years ago. I bought an Amish building on skids, and put it on the second lot. Originally it was below, but then I moved it up in
the woods. I wanted to make room for this 40’ X 100’ pole building. I had some antique cars and trucks I wanted to park in there. I had to get a permit for the 40’ X 100’ building. I haven’t put it up, but I have a permit for it. I never knew I had to get a permit for the one that is out there, because it is just temporary. The building is up in the woods, there is no plumbing or electricity. It’s a man cave. I put things up there my wife does not want in the house. This building that’s there, with the 40’ X 100’ building, goes against the limit. There is one other building there that is going.

**Question Eilertson:** Did you say this building is on skids?

**Answer Blegen:** Yes, just the 12’ x 24’.

**Question Raymer:** Is there anything else?

**Answer Blegen:** It is a hardship. I didn’t get a permit when I bought the thing. It was ignorance on my part. I don’t want to take it out; it was hard enough to get it up there. I want to continue using it for what we are using it for. I think all the neighbors have been notified.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** No correspondence was received.

**Discussion:** There are not any setback issues. It won’t be over until he builds the other building.

**Question Raymer:** How did you arrive at the 4,000 square feet for size limit of detached buildings?

**Answer Sampson:** They were approved on the appeal in 1990. And the location allows for a reduced building setback.

**Question Raymer:** Did we know the 12’ X 24’ was there back during the appeal.

**Answer Sampson:** No.

**Discussion:** Discussed if it was readily moveable. Decided that was not a factor in this situation. It had been there a long time and was a small building.

**Motion Warzynski/Eilertson to approve 3 Aye, 0 No, and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2014-24** William J and Peggy J Arentz, W689 State Rd 33, Rockland, WI 54653. Permit denied constructing a 10-ft x 14-ft living space addition to an existing single family residence that will lie within the required 50-ft setback from the State Road 33 right of way. Property is described as part of the NW/NE of Section 11, T15N, R5W. Tax parcel 12-241-1. Property address W689 State Rd 33. Town of Washington.

**Appearing in favor:** William J Arentz, W689 State Rd 33, Rockland, WI 54653. I wanted this addition onto my house because I have a lot of grandkids that live in the area. My house is only 24’ X 50’. My kitchen is only 11’ X 14’; the eating place is in there too. I just want to double it. It will go out to the highway. I will still be 82 feet from the centerline after I put the addition on. After they put the new highway in next year, there will be curb and gutter. They will also drop the speed limit down to 35 miles per hour. I could not put it anywhere else in order to make my dining room bigger.

**Question Eilertson:** Are any of the grandkids living with you?

**Answer Arentz:** No, they come to visit. We have ten that live in West Salem, The Town of Shelby, And the Town of Washington.
**Question Eilertson:** There is no alternative location?

**Answer Arentz:** No, I need it out the front. Out the back is my sewer and water. Besides that, I need the addition in the dining area. If you look at the plan, it shows there is a bathroom on the other side of the dining room. When everyone comes over, they all end up in the kitchen. There is a gradual slope going to the road, so there are no drainage problems.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** We did receive one phone call from someone in support within the buffer area of those who received a notice.

**Comment Arentz:** I did go to the meeting at the Town last Wednesday night, and it was approved. They didn’t let you know?

**Comment Sampson:** We did not. Typically I will receive an e-mail from the Town in regards to their decision.

**Discussion:** Discussed where the new road will be and agreed a temporary easement will not affect this project. The taking of right of way will be on the other side of the road. The highway department already purchased the portion of highway they needed. The highway department had an opportunity to object and did not.

**Motion Eilertson/Warzynski to conditionally approve and ordered the following:**

The construction to be completed within 12 months.

3 Aye, 0 No and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPEAL NO. 2014-25** Barbara A Larson, W7771 Van Dunk Pl, Holmen, WI 54636. Permit denied to construct a 16-ft x 24-ft addition to an existing attached garage that will partially lie within the plat required 25-ft building setback line from the right of way of Sunrise Lane. Property is described as Lot 9, Block 1 of Brentwood Addition. Property address W7771 Van Dunk Place. Tax parcel 8-1813-0. Town of Holland.

**Appearing in favor:** Barbara A Larson, W7771 Van Dunk Pl, Holmen, WI 54636. I am requesting a variance to allow an addition to an attached garage that will lie within the required setback of Sunrise Ln. I had been in contact with county officials and other individuals. Initially we were thinking of putting in a detached garage, but because of the septic and drainage easement, this was decided as a better option. I have photos, and very nice landscape regime. There will be 12 spruce trees that will hide the addition.

**Comment Eilertson:** How many car garage do you have right now?

**Answer Larson:** Three. One of them is a workshop area for me. I have hobby crafts.

**Comment Raymer:** It looks like the curve in the street is why you are here. They could have moved the house over more when it was built.

**Comment Larson:** That’s exactly it.

**Appearing in favor:** Doug Klenke, N6954 Sunrise LN, Holmen, WI. I am just here to help Barb out. We tried to fit a garage in the back yard. The easement was misplaced, when the addition was put in. Then the septic was put in and we were confined. If the house was on a different lot, we wouldn’t have this issue. It’s not that wide of a house. But, being a corner lot you kind of get penalized. I understand the 25’ setback is to protect the neighboring lot. This is unique, the way the road arcs. It wouldn’t really impede on the view of any neighbors.
**Appearing in favor:** Michael Anderson 833 6th Ave. N. Onalaska WI. 54650. I am here in support. I have talked to Barb and the other gentleman in regards to the design. It sounds like the garage will be incorporated into the roofline. With the trees it won't be an eyesore or anything. She has the hobby shop in one garage. It would fit in nicely with the area. The road curves as well.

**Question Eilertson:** This Board makes its decisions based on hardships. It’s hard for me to believe if you have a three car garage, and not having a four car garage granted to you is a hardship. Most houses in the area, when I drove around have a two car garage. Can you help me to understand that?

**Comment Anderson:** It’s not all used as a garage.

**Question Eilertson:** That’s your choice to use it (for) other uses.

**Comment Larson:** I also spoke to my immediate neighbors. None of them had concerns. They know I keep my property up. I have lived in the Town of Holland 25 years. Many have 3 car garages and detached garages as well.

**Appearing in opposition:** None

**Correspondence:** 1.) E-mail from an individual who received a notice. Will not be read into the record. 2.) E-mail from the Town of Holland Clerk Marilyn Pedretti dated August 13, 2014 for the town board meeting minutes, and was received today August 18, 2014. The minutes state the zoning variance for Larson 2014-25 was heard by the planning commission and they voted for approval by a vote of 3-2.

**Question Raymer:** You said you got an e-mail, but you’re not going to read it into the record? And that person was opposed?

**Answer Sampson:** We don’t read those into the record unless there is a representative here. That person was opposed.

**Discussion:** Eilertson indicated the limits the easement and septic have as far as having a detached garage. Raymer mentioned the Town Board approved. Discussed the reason for the 25’ building setback. By using the garage for what she is using it for, she has created her own her hardship.

**Motion Eilertson/Warzynski to deny because**

It is the Board's opinion that in the absence of a variance no hardship has been proven that is unique to the property and not self created. Reasonable use of the property exists.

3 Aye, 0 No and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPEAL NO. 2014-26** Tim Markgren of Ziegler’s Landscape by Design, LLC, W7069 County Rd ZN, Onalaska, WI 54650, acting on behalf of Jason E and Gayle K Lassen, 2211 Golfview Ln, Onalaska, WI 54650. Permit denied constructing a limestone retaining wall to stabilize a proposed grassed walkway to a stairway that would lie within the required 75-ft setback from the Ordinary High Water Mark of Lake Neshonoc. Property is described as Lot 13 in Block 3 of Neshonoc Lake, subject to an easement recorded as Document No. 1457174 in the La Crosse County Register of Deeds. Property address 520 Driftwood St. Tax parcel 16-1841-0. Village of West Salem.

**Appearing in favor:** Tim Markgren of Ziegler’s Landscape by Design, LLC, W7069 County Rd ZN, Onalaska, WI 54650. The Lassens would like a safe access down to the water before they build their house, since the neighboring houses are already built. (Tim showed pictures of several projects he had done that would be similar to this one. Showed his site plan, and explained it. Explained the site was very steep, and this retaining wall would allow for a gradual and safe access). If they put in stairs, it would be very steep, and dangerous. Their hardship is the current slope is steep and unsafe.
**Question Raymer:** Nate, would you explain what that 20’ wide easement is?

**Answer Sampson:** The 20’ wide easement was part of the plat approval. The intent was for the easement to connect the Shorewood Subdivision to Swarthout Park (with a pedestrian trail). The Easement extends 20’ landward from the ordinary high water mark.

**Comment Raymer:** This easement cannot have anything that impedes the public from using it.

**Comment Markgren:** I was told about that last week, and I have spoken with Jim from the Facilities Department. He basically said don’t build anything in the easement unless you are prepared to have the county take it out. I talked to the Lassens and they said that was fine. Jim said they may do a board walk because of the terrain. The walls are not within the 20’ easement, but the steps are. The steps are at grade. If a board walk is ever put in, that should be fine. I don’t think you can deny them access to their dock, so you could have a landing that goes off the board walk to the dock. If the board wants I can make the top step level so they easily put in a boardwalk. I talked to Jim and he said not to do anything but, would be willing to work with homeowners when the time came. He said there are currently no plans or funding for the boardwalk.

**Appearing in opposition:** None

**Comment Sampson:** I would like to clarify, the stairs are authorized under the shoreland ordinance, and the variance is for the retaining walls. I will also note, Mike Harding, a registered land surveyor, and Scott from our office, made a site visit and took survey grade measurements of where the retaining wall will be located.

**Correspondence:** 1.) An e-mail from Jim Speropulos, Director of the La Crosse County Facilities Department, dated and received Tuesday August 12, 2014 to Nathan Sampson. E-mail states he is opposed to any structure impeding the easement. 2.) Received a phone call from a neighbor who was opposed.

**Discussion:** Discussed that if approved, it would go to the Planning, Resource and Development Committee, and conditions could be added. The board established the variance was for a shoreland structure that did not meet setbacks from the ordinary high water mark and that it would be within their power to approve with conditions that the La Crosse County Facilities Department approve structures as they relate to the easement.

**Motion Eilertson/Warzynski to approve with conditions and ordered the following:**

The retaining wall is approved as depicted in the application; however anything constructed within the 20-ft wide easement shall be acceptable to the La Crosse County Facilities Director to not cause an impediment to the use of the easement as prescribed.

3 Aye, 0 No and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.

**Motion Warzynski/Eilertson to adjourn at 7:02 pm. 3 Aye, 0 No, and 0 excused. Motion carried unanimously.**