

**CITY OF BAYFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Minutes of May 14, 2012**

Acting Chairperson Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Bayfield City Hall.

Present: Tom Torke, Corey Bakken, Bill Heytens, Sharon Johnson, Dan Curran and Dionne Johnston – Deputy Zoning Admin.

Absent: Tom McMullin, Stephanie Bresette, and Bruce Moore (alt.)

Others: Jeff Bodin and Martin Burkel

Bakken/Torke made a motion to approve the agenda with the following amendment to move item #3 to #2 and item #2 to #3. Motion carried.

Heytens/Bakken moved to approve the minutes of April 16, 2012. Motion carried.

Public Input: None.

Building permits:

1. **Martin Burkel – 141 North Second Street, Permit Application #14-12.** Martin Burkel was present with a request to replace his back porch, insulate walls and ceiling and install new windows and a door. Burkel stated he intends to convert a deteriorating back porch into a usable space and has no plans to change the exterior design of the house. He also stated the roof was in need of some repairs and wants to include roof repairs into the application. Torke asked if he would be reusing the existing windows. Burkel stated he would not; the new windows will be double hung similar to others on the house. Torke suggested a steeper roof pitch on the porch would be appropriate. Burkel will talk to the contractor about raising the roof. Bakken/Torke made a motion to approve the application to include replacing the back porch with the option of raising the roof and roofing repairs with singles to match existing as close as possible. Motion carried.
2. **Bodin's Inc. – 208 Wilson Avenue, Permit Application #16-12.** Jeff Bodin was present with a request to replace the roof with Duro-Last membrane and provided samples of the product in white and gray. Bakken, Johnson and Torke prefer the gray. Heytens/Curran made a motion to approve the application as presented to replace roof with gray Duro-Last membrane. Motion carried.
3. **Bayfield Properties LLC. – 40 South Second Street, Permit Application #15-12.** Bill Heytens was present representing Bayfield Properties LLC with a request to install a new roof and renovate the building. Lengthy discussion ensued. Heytens stated the owners spent a lot of time on the project. Heytens provided before and after pictures of the previous project the ARB approved. The project follows the comprehensive plan with retail below and residential above. The building structurally needs work, the roof has failed and the brick walls on the west gable and south need to be repaired. The new project will need to be conditionally approved pending State approved plans and Plan Commission approval of the parking plan. The lot to the North can accommodate some parking and they are looking for an alternative parking area for additional parking. Johnson stated the plans need to be put together better instead of flip flopping around. Heytens stated when he did his project he had to flip flop around between the Plan Commission, ARB and State review of his project. Johnson asked how many parking stalls would be required for the new six units. Johnston replied six parking stalls will be required for the new units. Curran asked if they would need to provide parking for the commercial units below. Johnston responded additional off street parking for the existing businesses will not be required. Torke asked if they would be providing off street parking for the commercial units even though the ordinance doesn't require it. Heytens stated he they won't. Johnson stated there was also a new unit done over the new garage and wouldn't they need to have 7 parking stalls. Heytens stated there is a parking stall along the retaining wall in the back of the building for that unit. Heytens stated the preferred design is the large one he provided. Curran and Bakken don't like the design and feel it's out of character. Johnson asked about the balconies overhanging the sidewalk. Heytens stated they really are not balconies, they are an architectural feature and the double doors open into the unit. To market the units you need to provide a view and open exposure. Bakken preferred windows on the south elevation instead of balcony doors. Torke feels it's an improvement to the building but stated if he was coming to rent a unit he would be confused on where the entrance is and a wider door and possibly a sidelight would define the entrance more clearly. He feels the scroll design on the balcony is out of character and should be removed. Curran stated the ARB went through the same thing with the building at 100 Rittenhouse Avenue in regards to the balconies overhanging the sidewalk over the property line and would set a dangerous precedence if allowed and they just don't fit. Torke stated it's an industrial building and the balcony is a design feature which he doesn't feel is inappropriate, it would be in a Victorian building. Heytens stated the adjacent property owned by Phil Johnson already has a balcony feature on his building.

Bakken stated the balcony feature should be removed and windows should remain keeping the same proportions as it currently stands. Heytens stated the problem with the current placement of the windows is they don't fit with the proposed layout of the rooms. Curran stated you could use a taller window and have them stacked. Curran also questioned the scale of the plans they're not accurate. Heytens doesn't like the scroll railing feature either, but didn't have the time to remove it from the drawing. Heytens stated the roof will need to be totally reconstructed and will keep it at the same height and pitch. Curran has an issue with balcony doors on the south elevation and they should remain windows. Bakken stated the drawings aren't correct the windows sit too low. Torke doesn't object to the balconies, but if they come back with windows he would not object to larger windows. Heytens asked if more double hung windows would be okay. Torke stated he understands you want to get as much light as you can into the rooms and the windows need to fit the exterior appearance of the building. Johnson is in agreement with Torke with the entrance door it needs to be clearly identified. Bakken suggested a sign over the door identifying the units. Curran suggested a sidelight or recessing the door back on both the North and South elevations. Heytens asked what the thoughts were in regards to the dormers. Bakken stated the dormers should be set back but no more than 2 feet. Johnson stated it's a multiuse building and the layout is confusing. Torke asked how they proposed to heat and cool the building and where the units would be, he doesn't want to see them stuck in the windows. Curran stated the building next to the current project has mechanical units on the roof enclosed so they are not visible. Curran/Torke made a motion to table the application and ask the applicant to come back with accurate revised drawings to include the South elevation window arrangement, address the entrance doors to the units to make them more visible, push dormers back no more than 2 ft., an exterior lighting plan, remove the railing on South elevation, a parking plan to include ADA accessibility and placement of the mechanical a/c units. Motion carried with Heytens abstaining.

Other discussion: Bill Heytens explained that Kathleen Russell made a comment at the Council meeting regarding the ARB decision on the London project and asked Johnson to explain. Johnson stated Kathleen Russell came with concerns that she wants the ARB to look better at plans and that the City needs to give realtors and prospective buyers of property more guidelines on what they would approve and feels we are putting all new projects into the same criteria that we are mandating they follow Historic Preservation guidelines even though the project is outside the Historic District. Torke replied he worked for 40 years going before boards and he never showed up to a meeting without first bringing plans ahead of time or canvassing members for input prior to the meeting. He stated he heard discussion about the property last year and the owner was thinking of a prairie house and stated if done right could work but that is not what was presented at the last ARB meeting. Torke stated the Board made the right decision to deny the project. Heytens stated he talked with Fosdick and it seems the owner forced her to present the plan to the ARB. Heytens stated if you read the Zoning code you will see there are guidelines for applications outside the historic district and the word disharmonious is part of the code. Curran stated the building was incongruent with the neighboring properties and totally unrelated to anything and suggested we go back to the guidelines and provide guidelines to properties outside the historic district and we are doing the best we can. Johnson stated to include all properties into one district and have the guidelines apply to all properties. Johnson stated Fosdick stated she worked with her client for 9 months and the general contractors are saying the Chamber and the City are promoting we are an eco-municipality and we need to get on the same page. Johnson stated we are allowing solar panels and metal roofs and we understand the changing times and we are very cognizant of what we have in Bayfield and we need to protect what we have. Curran stated you need to respect what is here and respect what is in the neighborhoods. Torke stated we are not against contemporary architecture and have allowed them outside the historic district. Heytens stated he is a volunteer on the board and is concerned with the comments made at the Council meeting and the ARB did not choose to be an eco-municipality. Curran stated there are areas the Guidelines didn't address that should be in the Historic District including Catholic Hill. Heytens has an appreciation for all the good things that are happening in Bayfield and wanted to open the discussion to the comments made at the council meeting.

Zoning Administrator Report: Placed on file. Heytens asked if the Bodin's application needed to go to the ARB or if Johnston could have approved the application. Johnson stated Bodin's Fisheries is in the Waterfront District and needs to be reviewed by the ARB.

Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 18, 2012 at 5:00 p.m.

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