

**CITY OF BAYFIELD**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Minutes of August 18, 2014**

Chairman McMullin called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. at the Bayfield City Hall.

**Present:** Tom McMullin, Dan Curran, Bob Durfey, Sharon Johnson, Bruce Moore, Rob Riemer, and Dionne Johnston – Deputy Zoning Admin.

**Absent:** Stephanie Bresette

**Others:** Corey Bakken, George Hof, Tim Sullivan, Linda Georgeson, Tyler Wickman, David Eades, Dede Eckels, Larry MacDonald, Peter Georgeson, Tanya Georgeson, Patrick Georgeson, Ashley Newbrough, Barb Hoekstra

**Johnson/Curran made a motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.**

**Minutes from August 4, 2014. Not available.**

**Public Input:** McMullin asked if there was any public input on the agenda items. Lengthy public input ensued.

**George Hof.** Concerned with the size and location of the garage. After seeing the new site plan which places the garage 8' behind house removes one of his concerns. Still concerned with the size of the garage which is approx. 825 sq. ft. and the house is a little over 600 sq. ft. and the size makes you wonder if the garage is really subordinate to the main structure. A written summary was provided to each board member. He is pleased with the house details which will be good for the neighborhood, but is the size of garage appropriate in the Historic District.

**Deanna Eckels.** Size of garage is a concern and at the last meeting Peter Georgeson stated it will be used for boat storage, is a boat storage building appropriate in a residential district? According to the Historic District Guidelines section 3 page 8, does the structure have a significant impact on the surrounding area? She feels a boat storage building would have a significant impact. Locating an accessory structure in the rear of the lot is preferred, locating an accessory structure (this being a boat storage building) to the side of the primary structure setback substantially is preferred, and locating it in the front yard is not appropriate. The accessory structure is supposed to be visually subordinate in scale to the main structure, should be unobstructed and not compete visually with the house and should remain subordinate in mass, scale and height. The boat storage building does not meet any of these qualifications. This is something the ARB needs to consider seriously and as far as she knows there are no other boat storage buildings in the Historic District. There are a lot of two car garages that are standard 25'x25' which fit two cars and a work bench. There are other larger garages that existed prior to the ARB's creation. She warns if ARB allows this project what is to prevent others from coming forward with excessive structures on lots with little houses in our community. She is grateful she has been in the community for almost 60 years and is glad the ARB is in existence. The landscape plan is drawn very nice, however, no plantings will be allowed on the north side of the house because the property is hers. She agrees with Hoff that the scale and size is not appropriate in a residential neighborhood and neither is boat storage.

**Patrick Georgeson.** He and his family have been coming to Bayfield for almost 30 years and investing money in the community and he plans to raise his children here for the majority of the time. Characterizing a garage as boat storage is not accurate just because a boat is stored in it. We are trying to establish a place for my parents to retire to and a home for his brother and soon to be wife. Space is needed; it's going to look nice and there is not a house in view of the proposed garage. It will not interfere with or impose on anything around it.

**McMullin** made it clear that whatever is put into the garage is not part of this review process. The ARB is looking at the aesthetics and how the building fits within its surroundings and that it complies with the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

**Corey Bakken.** He took the pictures of the garages that were included in the packet and stated there is a 60 ft. long 2 car RV storage garage in the alley between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> St. between Old Military and Wilson which is visible from the Highway. The purpose of the pictures is to show there is no consistency historically with garages. Most garages are 1 car garages but there are other 2 car garages. The Kinney residence had a 2 car garage and recently it was converted into a cabin. The newer garage built by the visitors center is essentially a 3 car garage, granted there is a larger main structure. There is a green door garage past 6<sup>th</sup> St in the alley that is essentially a 3 car garage. There is no real precedence set with regards to garage sizes. What they tried to do with the current style of the garage was to incorporate the characteristics of the three houses on 4<sup>th</sup> street with gables on the front.

**Tim Sullivan.** He made a clarification that the drawing on page 3 states it is not to scale, but it is.

**Barb Hoekstra.** Wanted to make a point that the picture of her house with the attached garage that Linda

Georgeson has is not an accessory structure but an addition to the house which is a total different set of rules and she worked with the ARB to get it approved.

### **Building permits:**

1. **Linda Georgeson – 112 South Fifth Street, Permit Application #26-14.** Linda Georgeson was back with revised drawings. *Lengthy discussion ensued.* Georgeson stated based on the last hearing they responded to everything that was requested. They reduced the size of the garage and lowered the roof, provided current window placement on the house, provided proposed window size and placement on the house, as was requested. We exactly matched the porch style with the 1890 style that was presented previously with thin skinny posts, no railings because it's at ground level with a slanted roof which is spare in its approach. She worked with Tim Sullivan her architect on the garage roof pitch. The scaled drawing provided shows the garage is substantially less than the house now; and complies with the Historic District Guidelines with regards to scale. The garage is not overwhelming the scale of the house, it's shorter and architecturally designed to look like the house, and it meets their need for a 2 car garage and extra storage. She used the Guidelines to design the garage. The garage is setback 8' feet beyond house at street view and no one can see the back or south exposure at all due to the abutting ravine to the south of the proposed garage site. They need storage and the 2 car garage is slightly larger than other 2 car garages, but it will accomplish their needs for storage. There are a number of buildings in Bayfield that far exceed what they are trying to build, for example the 100 ft. long house that you see when coming into Bayfield is not what they are doing. The colored drawing that Tim Sullivan provided shows a modest house and garage which has merit, architecture, and a historical approach. They have changed color to a very light yellow with a grey accent, white trim and grey roof. We have addressed the egress issues when placing the proposed double hung windows on the house. The proposed changes will be an asset to the neighborhood and increase property values. Curran stated he would prefer to deal with the house then the garage. He asked what type of siding is on the house is it 4 or 5 inches. Georgeson responded its 4 inch. Curran stated the drawing isn't quite right but 4" siding is fine. He really likes what they are proposing and he doesn't have any issues with the house.

**Curran/Johnson made a motion to approve the house as shown on the plans presented.** Discussion: Durfey stated the colored drawing and the hard line drawings are different, the hard line drawings show round porch posts. Sullivan stated the posts will be 4"x4" posts with a wrap or casement. Durfey asked if there were any other discrepancies between the two drawings. Georgeson stated the colored drawing is what they are proposing and didn't think there were any other discrepancies. Johnson asked Bakken if he had a sample of the warm grey vinyl board and batten they are proposing to use for the accent in the gables. Bakken stated no. Curran asked what the width of the board and batten will be. Sullivan stated it's a simulated board and batten and depends on the manufacturer, but thinks its 6" to 8". Curran concerned the narrow siding and wider board and batten will cause a scale problem. Sullivan stated the contrast is typical because the siding is generally thinner than the board and batten, and historically it should be wider. Curran stated the drawing shows the same width of 6" for the siding and board and batten and further stated the batten strips on the roof are shown about 4" and aren't they usually 8-12". Bakken stated the batten spacing for the roof will be 9". Sullivan stated the drawing is correct. Curran stated the whole discussion is on the batten spacing and he will be ok with 4" lap siding, 6" board and batten and 8-10" metal roof. **Curran/Durfey made a motion to amend the motion to include the vertical batten strips above the 4 – 4 ½" horizontal siding not exceed 6". Motion carried.**

Curran stated the garage drawing isn't accurate either and the scale of the overhead garage doors are listed as 9'x9', but the drawing shows a rectangle door and it appears that the doors are off a foot. If the doors are shown at 9' wide then the height is really 8' high. Bakken stated the overhead garage doors will be 9'x9'. Bakken stated they will have to push it up to the top of the trim board to make it square. Georgeson stated the spec. sheet shows them at 9'x9'. Curran stated setting the garage back 8' helps and now the buildings aren't competing with one another. The house is primary and garage secondary. He likes the fact that the foot print is split up into 2 smaller forms. The one that fronts the road has a smaller gable which he feels is acceptable and the only problem he sees is the header height over the eave side but with a metal roof it may not be an issue. He is not sure if the opening in the gable is a window or vent. Sullivan stated it is a faux vent. Curran stated the 6" trim around the faux vent is heavy and it looks like a shadow box. Johnson stated the colored drawings shows the trim is 5". Georgeson stated the purpose of the faux vent was to incorporate some of the house details. Durfey asked if the space up in the gable was usable. Georgeson stated it will be used for storage. Moore stated the scale and mass still do not conform to the Historic District Guidelines and the width of the proposed 2 car garage is 30% wider than the house, which creates a mass problem and the garage is not subordinate to the house. Sullivan stated they originally presented the garage as a box. Since then they divided it up with a

gable and the garage gable is smaller and narrow and is subordinate to the house gable. Durfey stated he drove the neighborhood and looked at all the garages and setting the garage back 8' is not enough. In order for it to be subservient to the house it needs to be setback even further. You can do that with a swale in the driveway and push the garage to the rear of the lot. Pushing it back will lower the appearance of the garage. A garage having a 28' mass driving by will not match anything in the neighborhood. Georgeson stated the terrain in the back is so low it would require an enormous amount of fill with additional cost to do that. There is no alley access either and it will start to block the lake view of the abutting neighbor to the north if it's pushed back. There are 3 lots associated with this parcel and lot 16 is not usable. We tried to balance the garage on the lot to not lose the lake view from the house and we took into consideration the amount of snow Bayfield gets. Bakken stated guidelines are to guide you, they are not law. Curran stated both surveys indicate the first floor elevation of the house is at 99.62'. What is the floor elevation of the garage, is it the same as the house or lower? Bakken stated the ground floor level of the garage will be about 8" lower than the house. Durfey asked if he was the only one who had a concern with the front setback. Johnson stated that was brought up at the previous meeting and since then they have set it back 8', scaled it back and lowered the garage. Georgeson stated they did what they were asked to do at the last meeting. The road is higher than the lot and we need to take into consideration the drainage issues with the ravine and the street. There are issues with lowering the grade. Johnson asked if there were any changes to the lighting plan. Georgeson stated there have been no changes to the light style since the last meeting. Moore stated the ordinance calls for a maximum of 15 Watt compact florescent. Georgeson stated we have the ordinance and are planning our lighting accordingly. Curran asked Johnston to pull out the topographical survey from the last meeting packet. Bakken stated the garage will be 12" to 24" lower than the house. Durfey stated the way the land is now the garage will be about 3' lower than the house. Georgeson stated they will have to have some fill brought in. Curran stated the runoff from the street is going to drain into the garage, and the further you push it back the more options you have at diverting the water. Curran suggested creating a swale to divert the water to the ditch and keep it from draining into the garage. **Curran/Durfey made a motion to approve the garage with the floor elevation 30" lower than the house.** Discussion: Johnson asked if we are accepting the rest of the garage features. Curran stated the logic is to try to make the garage subservient to the house and setting the garage back 8' may not solve the water issues and you may want to consider pushing the garage back a couple more feet so you can make a swale and divert the water. Georgeson urged the board to look at the guidelines and she doesn't think you can tell us exactly what elevation the floor should be at. She would prefer to work with an engineer regarding setting the elevation of the garage and the water movement. What is the basis for your decision making? Your fine tuning the application to the point of telling us exactly how to set the elevations. I don't think the guidelines allow you to do that. Curran stated they do because on the backside of the garage you are going to need roughly a 4' to 5' retaining wall and what is that going to be made out of. The guidelines states concrete retaining walls are prohibited and need to be made of stone or faced with stone. Bakken stated there will not be a retaining wall it will be a sloped bank. Curran stated the southeast corner is at 92' elevation and you will need to have the floor 7' above original grade. Sullivan asked what elevation do they need to be at to make the garage less of a focal point or subservient to the house disregarding the drainage issue. Johnson stated we need to come to a decision on this so they can move forward. **Curran/Durfey amended his motion to approve the proposed garage setback 8' with the floor elevation set at 97' or lower.** Moore stated they need to see a revised frontal to scale drawing showing the slope and elevation of the garage and house. Sullivan stated he could get drawings but needs to know the elevation they are looking for. Moore stated it's a visual judgment and perhaps getting a couple of scenarios would be appropriate. Durfey stated you have a complicated site due to the terrain. **Motion carried.** Johnson wanted clarification does the motion include the proposed garage features. Curran stated yes. **Moore/Riemer made a motion to have the applicant come back with hard line drawings of the west and south elevations showing the grades of the house and garage with the garage floor elevation set at 97'. Motion carried.**

**Other Discussion:** None.

**Zoning Administrator Report:** None.

Special meeting scheduled for Thursday, August 21, 2014, 5:30 pm at City Hall. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 2, 2014 at 5:30 pm at City Hall.

**Johnson/Riemer made a motion to adjourn at 6:30 p.m. Motion carried.**