

**CITY OF BAYFIELD**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Minutes of April 16, 2012**

Chairman McMullin called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Bayfield City Hall.

**Present:** Dan Curran, Bill Heytens, Sharon Johnson, and Dionne Johnston – Deputy Zoning Admin.

**Absent:** Corey Bakken, Stephanie Bresette, Tom Torke and Bruce Moore (alt.)

**Others:** Cheryl Fosdick, Dana Noteboom, and Leo Ketchum

Heytens/Curran made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Heytens/Johnson moved to approve the minutes of February 20, 2012. Motion carried.

**Public Input:** None.

**Building permits:**

**1. Richard London – Block 23, Lots 1-4, corner of Sweeny Avenue and Front Street, Permit Application #11-12.** Architect Cheryl Fosdick was present representing Richard London with a request to build a new residence on the corner of Sweeny and Front Street. Lengthy discussion ensued. Fosdick provided a model of the proposed structure and updated elevation drawings that showed more details.

*Fosdick* stated she knows this will be a difficult discussion. When Bayfield was founded it was a group of progressive forward thinking ecological and environmental driven people/leaders. The site is just outside the Historic District; however there has been a new movement in Bayfield and the City recently declared it to be the Greenest City in Wisconsin. Rich London is a member of Historical Preservation Alliance, Bayfield Regional Conservancy and Nature Alliance of Minnesota, and this is not a thoughtless venture on his part. This is a modern statement that hasn't been seen in Bayfield before, but he wants to live in a walkable town. He proposes to have a live green roof (images are provided in the packet), this project perceived from above as a subtle insertion into the landscape, building has a very close relationship to the land and can come and go freely. It doesn't have the historical porch, but has a covered veranda; front area will be an extensive flower garden and her client like this site due to sun exposure. North side of building has stone expression and not many openings. The stone wall wraps around to the east. Materials include Red sandstone or cast stone color, siding Trespa Phenolic panels wood veneer look, rain screen and Loewen windows from Canada. All materials are indigenous or implied indigenous. This is a thoughtful building, cools in summer and provides heat in winter and there is no overflow of water from the roof, it is all captured and filtered to green roof and in heavy rains water is collected and filtered through the house. It's a small building only 2400 square feet with a partial lower level that includes an extra family room and garage. There is a deep double driveway. The context that exists here are some ranch homes that are across the street and around the corner. The house will be parallel to the site.

*Heytens* stated the house doesn't fit with the rest of the neighboring structures.

*McMullin* stated right outside the City limits this would fit, but inside the city limits it is so foreign to everything else in the city and he understand his desire for the structure, but this will set a precedence.

*Fosdick* stated it is a precedence setting building and London wants to do a building that will be an asset and demonstration building that says this is how a building can fit within the landscape and promote good ecology.

*McMullin* stated there are plenty of places in the area right outside of town where this would be appropriate.

*Curran* stated this is just as foreign as the dome house which is no longer there and it's across the street from a 120 year old stone church and other historic structures including the Chateau and Stephanie Bresette's house.

*Curran* stated there was something previously on that site that didn't look like what is being proposed and he has seen similar technology in Superior, but that was near a parking lot away from a historic neighborhood. It needs to go where it belongs and if you put this in the proposed neighborhood people are going to wonder what this Board is doing. Curran likes the floor plan but they need to realize where they purchased the property which is surrounded by historic structures. The language of the building is so foreign to vernacular of everything around it.

*Heytens* asked what the history of the ARB was.

*Curran* stated it was formed as a result of the dome house and many historic structures being ruined and the community wanted to preserve them. There were two committees then the ARB and Historic Preservation Board which has since become one. The Board is not going to rubber stamp any idea that is presented. It's a great lot with a great view and like the floor plan, but they need to do something with the outward appearance of the building, Curran said.

*McMullin* stated the stone was not the issue it was the flat roof that didn't work and the building would be more congruent if it had porch.

*Currán* stated to go back to the Architectural Guidelines which normally apply to a building within the historic district. It talks about the effects of a porch and decks on the outward appearance of the structure and how they can dominate to a point where the porch becomes a statement and the occupied space is secondary. This is what is happening here and not sure which is fighting for more attention the garage door, flat roof or patio.

*Heytens* stated above this lot and in the surrounding area they have large historic wraparound porches.

*Johnson* stated it looks like you are trying to eliminate what is already present in the neighboring properties in regards to porches.

*Currán* stated it looks like it's coming right out of the 1950's.

*Fosdick* stated it is, and that's what's driving the design and idea of the porch as you walk out directly into the garden and it's intergraded into the landscape no steps. It is an open plan 1950's idea, no factory produced engineered materials, and this is a handmade project that has quality to it. It has characteristics of the 1950's idea with respect to view, air, light and open plan, and the client feels this is an asset not a distraction. It's a lesson for those who want to sit before the light, view, air and open plan.

*Currán* made reference to a previous project that came in with plans for a new home but the design looked like it was from Brickyard Creek which was foreign to the neighborhood especially the roof design and was denied. If we approve this we have just set precedence and granted it's not in the Historic District itself is just across the street from it.

*Fosdick* asked if it would be possible before denying the plan to investigate how powerful a precedence would be by polling the neighbors for input and present it to the Board.

*Currán* stated they could sell property tomorrow then the community is stuck with it.

*McMullin* stated people from out of town move to Bayfield and they want Bayfield to look like where they came from.

*Fosdick* stated there is a representative group that has invested in Bayfield that could talk in favor of this project and she does have other clients who want modern homes and want to live in Bayfield. There is talk of a green ecological initiative that is pushing to the surface on the Chamber level and on the City's website and how to live in common with the land, landscape and within our environment.

*Heytens* asked *Fosdick* if her client would be receptive to porches and a different roof style.

*Fosdick* stated she could ask and that they originally started with a standing seam metal roof lifted up a little but the scale wasn't right so it was scaled down and the roof was greened to give a more subtle look and London wanted to avoid having to deal with runoff and gutters.

*Currán* said there is new state regulations pertaining to stormwater runoff control with flat roofs.

*Fosdick* responded that is the reason for the green roof so it will capture the water.

*Currán* said if the ARB is going to look at more of the same types of applications and this is where the City is heading we need to revise the ordinance to allow for areas with modern homes.

*Johnson* explained the duty of the ARB is to review the aesthetics of the plan whether in the Historic District or not. The choice of materials is great, but not the flat roof. This is a great walkable community and your client has made an investment which she understands but it doesn't fit.

*Fosdick* asked the board to table the application and she would go back to her client to discuss the plan and how they can move forward.

*McMullin* stated we are voting on this plan and you can come back anytime with an alternate plan.

*Heytens* stated once something is there it's there for a long time and this is a very prominent block. It's a unique design and we like the floor plan but would a wraparound porch be something that meets your client's needs? We can deny it, there is really nothing to table or you can withdraw the application. He likes the natural exterior details and likes the way it sits on the lot and the small scale of the structure.

*McMullin* stated the plan is disharmonious within the surrounding environment and we can table the application if the Board chooses.

*Currán/McMullin* made a motion to deny the exterior appearance of the project based on its incompatibility with the surrounding area and the applicant can come back with an alternate plan. Motion carried by voice vote: all ayes.

**Zoning Administrator Report:** None.

**Other discussion:** None.

Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 14, 2012 at 5:00 p.m. or immediately following the Council meeting.

*Heytens/Johnson* made a motion to adjourn at 5:58 p.m. Motion carried.