

**CITY OF BAYFIELD**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Minutes of August 4, 2014**

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

**Present:** Tom McMullin, Corey Bakken (left 6:17 p.m.), Dan Curran (arrived 5:16 p.m.), Sharon Johnson, Bruce Moore, Rob Riemer, and Dionne Johnston – Deputy Zoning Admin.

**Absent:** Stephanie Bresette, Bob Durfey (alt.)

**Others:** David Eades, George Hof, Peter Georgeson, Linda Georgeson, Ashley Newbrough, Pete Skoro, Dede Eckels, Rich Ryan, Bob Wood, Patricia Wood, Tom Shrider, Michelle Shrider, Barb Hoekstra, Bruce Hoekstra, and John Johnson

**Moore/Riemer made a motion to approve the agenda with the following amendments: move item 2 to 1, item 3 to 2, and 1 to 3. Motion carried.**

**Johnson/Moore made a motion to approve minutes of July 7, 2014. Motion carried.**

**Public Input:** McMullin asked if there was any public input on the agenda items. Lengthy public input ensued. **Peter Skoro** addressed item #3. The size of the accessory structure doesn't adhere to the historic district guidelines. The accessory structure should be subordinate to the primary structure. He has concerns with the roof pitch going one way or the other. Accessory structures should be in the rear yard and the proposed is in line with the primary structure. The pictures of the front elevations of the surrounding neighborhood are hard to see and doesn't fulfill what the ARB requires for the surrounding area. He would like to have them fill out two applications; one for the remodel of the house and one for the auxiliary building. He is also concerned with the asbestos test and when he called the company he was told they were told not to talk to anybody and he should talk to Corey Bakken. He called Bakken but hasn't received a call back regarding the sample that was submitted. He isn't satisfied with the test results because he doesn't know where the sample was taken and questions its credibility. The root of his concerns regarding the asbestos is he was told by Kathleen Russell – Apostle Islands Realty, the listing agent when the property was for sale that the siding contained asbestos. **Michelle Shrider** 141 South 5<sup>th</sup> St had concerns with the Linda Georgeson application specifically with the size of the accessory structure which is almost 2 times the size of the existing house. She appreciates they are trying to improve the existing structure. The guidelines stated it should be subordinate to the primary structure. She drove around the community looking for other garages the size of the proposed and there are a few but they are not 2 x the size of the principle structure. She is concerned if this application is approved what's to prevent the next one or the one after that. We need to be looking out for the integrity of the whole historic district.

**Deanna Eckels** stated in one of the proposed drawings there is a patio shown and a round window. Does the 10 foot setback apply to the patio and does the round window fit into the historic district? **Ashley Newbrough** responded to Eckels question and stated the view of the back is the existing but the program she used didn't allow her to change the elevation with respect to the topography. The back porch roof will need to come off to replace the siding.

**Barb Hoekstra** 120 South 6<sup>th</sup> St has concerns with size and presented a scenario to the Board: she operates a B&B in her 22' x 102' house which includes an addition with a 2 car garage. She sells her house to a single family with 3 kids and they decide to use the addition and garage as living space and then request a detached garage. If they build a garage with a footprint that is 1 ¾ bigger than the house which is what the Georgeson's are proposing it will be huge and do you want to see that in the Historic District?

**Peter Georgeson** stated he has a charter business and he needs storage. The garage doesn't conflict with anything else and he needs to store his trailers and other things which is the reason for a two car garage.

**Peter Skoro** brought up the question of commercial use of the property and questioned if it's allowed in the residential district. **Johnston** responded a residential property could obtain a conditional use permit for a home occupation business which would be reviewed by the Plan Commission.

**Deanna Eckels** concerned with the style of lighting proposed. Is the style appropriate for the Historic District? What is the range for the motion detection lights and will they be triggered by someone walking down the street? Will they be shielded and be specific to the property?

**Bakken** stated he called back but there was no answer.

**Chairman McMullin** stated Bakken cannot participate in any of the discuss pertaining to the Georgeson application.

**Skoro** asked Johnston who he would talk to regarding the asbestos issue.

**Johnston** replied if you have any concerns with the test to contact the State there is a phone number listed on the brochure provided at the last meeting.

**Shrider** asked if the diagram was to scale.

**Newbrough** stated the diagram is not to scale its purpose was to show the distance between buildings.

### **Building permits:**

- 1. West's Big Lake Properties, LLC – 17 North Second Street, Permit Application #31-14.** Rich Ryan was present representing West's Big Lake Properties, LLC with a request to demolish the dilapidated building and return site to green space. Ryan stated he received the survey today and there are no encroachments. The reason they want to remove the building is it's a mess and trashed. All the main beams are busted and there was a water leak running for 8 months upstairs, the floors are rotten and the building is extremely dangerous. He had an asbestos test taken and has not gotten the results back. If there is asbestos he will take the necessary steps to remove it safely. They plan to return the site to green space with a row of shrubbery along the south property line and there is already a line of shrubbery along the north property line installed by the adjacent property owner. Plans to hook up of the water supply to water it and keep it nice. Johnson stated the Plan Commission has identified this property as being neglected and it's a shame Bayfield is losing another house. **Johnson/Riemer made a motion to approve the demolition of the building at 17 North Second Street and return the site to green space.** Discussion: Moore asked if the property was 2 or 3 lots. Ryan stated 1 lot. **Motion carried.**
- 2. Bay Front Inn, Inc. – 1 Rittenhouse Avenue, Permit Application #32-14.** McMullin asked Sharon Johnson to recuse herself from discussion. John Johnson was present with a request to replace vinyl siding with Diamond Kote engineered wood siding on the Pier Plaza building. Color to be burgundy and gray with white trim. **Curran/Moore made a motion to approve the application as presented. Motion carried.**
- 3. Linda Georgeson – 112 South Fifth Street, Permit Application #26-14.** McMullin asked Corey Bakken to recuse himself from discussion. Linda Georgeson was present with a revised application to build a garage, replace roof and siding on the house and replace/add windows and doors on the house. **Lengthy discussion ensued.** Georgeson is amazed that this house is in the historic district. There is no historical value of the structure when it was looked at by the State Historical Society in 1949 it had aluminum siding, no trees, no trim, no architectural distinction and included additional information "severely altered". We don't really know what the original house looked like and provide a photo of the structure from the 1890's. The photo shows a farmhouse with no trees because all the trees were taken due to logging and the east portion doesn't exist anymore. Since then the property has been divided which was around the 1940's and that is when the Eckels house was built. The front of the house and property are in horrible shape and not good for anyone's property values. We are willing to clean it up, need to cut down scrappy trees, add siding and make it look like it belongs in the historic district. The idea is to install 3 ½" white trim, double hung windows, some decorative approach to the top to make it look old. The outdoor lighting will have a carriage house antique approach with a timer that complies with the exterior lighting ordinance. The garage is less significant than the house, by being shorter and setback and does not yield to anyone on the street driving or walking by that it is a particularly large garage. We have chosen a carriage house look for the garage which puts it into an era which is consistent to the historic district and to make it a more interesting 2 car garage. There are other 2 car garages in the historic district of similar size and approach. Georgeson stated the concern regarding the asbestos test is most distressing and she watched her uncle die of asbestosis and she would never put anyone in harm's way. They took the sample by going underneath the aluminum siding and taking a piece/chunk of the fibrous siding material and sent it to a national testing lab where it came back negative for asbestos. She would never expose anybody to asbestos not her co-workers, neighbors, and definitely not her son and his wife. If your standing in the 3 lots no neighbor faces us, or has a direct view or will have to look at something they may not like. The approach will assist the historic district. We have been in Bayfield all of our lives and her son and his wife live here. Her daughter in law works 3 jobs and her son has 2, they are a young family helping the economy which are all of the things you put in the comprehensive plan. We also have family here we are related to the Aiken's and Hokenson's. Her mother in law is the daughter of the candy store owners from the 20's and we value Bayfield and its history. We believe all of the issues raised have been addressed and the other 2 car garages in Bayfield don't look as nice as what they are proposing. The building season is short and they would like to get started. Georgeson asked if any of the Board members had any questions for her. Moore asked if there was a drawing that showed the house height. Georgeson stated the garage is 25' and the house is 30'. Johnson asked if the metal roof will be ocean blue. Georgeson stated no it will be ash grey, house and garage will have the metal ash grey roofing, and 4" vinyl pacific blue siding, with white 3 ½" trim. Curran

asked if there was something which showed the size and placement of the new windows. Georgeson stated the window sizes are listed on pages 15-18, and pages 19-20 show the placement of the new windows. Curran asked if they were varying the widths of the windows. Georgeson stated some of the windows will be replaced with larger for instance all the roll out windows will be double hung. Johnson stated the proposed round window on the east elevation does not fit into the scheme of anything else on the house and it is not historic. Georgeson stated it could easily be changed to double hung consistent with other double hung windows on the house. Curran stated if you were replacing windows in the same openings he wouldn't have any issues, but the drawings are not sufficient to make a determination, on sheet 20 the eaves are drawn so thick they are almost as wide as the windows. Newbrough stated she created the drawings to just show the placement of the windows and color of the house and the distance between the garage and house. Curran doesn't have any issues with the color of the house or the roof, but he would like to see the correct size and placement of the windows on the house. Georgeson stated it is very costly to get a professional involved and we were trying to give you an idea of what it will look like with double hung windows. Curran stated you can do it yourself by taking photos of the exterior of the building and get the correct window sizes and put them on the photo. Georgeson stated the building season is going to end and they are consistently using double hung windows throughout the project and making it look like an old building. Moore stated the Board needs to make an informed decision that is consistent with what the historic district requires and one item the Board has to rule on is the proportions of the house and proposed garage. We need to know what the actual sizes are and is the garage subordinate to the house. The elevations provided don't have the height of the house or distance of the garage from the house and street. Georgeson stated the size of the house is listed on the survey. Moore stated page 9 shows the footprint of the two structures. Curran is looking for an actual visual comparison looking at the house and garage from the street and the mass of the garage is considerable larger than the house. Curran stated you are on the right tract, but need to fine tune the drawings. Moore stated standing on the street facing the house and garage the house is 20'6" wide and garage is 34' wide that is what is contributing to the visual balance between the house and garage and if the garage is subordinate to the house. The garage is half wider than the house and that is what you will see from the street. Georgeson stated when you have a narrow house and want to build a two car garage it is going to be wider than the house. Moore stated the problem is the fact the garage is detached. Georgeson stated if we attached the garage we would lose the entire south exposure. Moore stated his comment was just an observation. Curran stated even turning the garage it would still be wider than the house. Newbrough stated by turning the garage they would have to go through the ravine to get into it. McMullin stated we should keep things moving and asked what the Board's thoughts were. Curran asked if they have started on the project yet. Georgeson stated they have been tearing out the inside but don't want to go further because the roof is not properly supported. Curran doesn't have a problem with them starting on the roof and asked if they knew the topography of the lot. Georgeson stated it drops off a lot. Curran stated it might be to your benefit as lots 17 and 18 drop off and straddling them with the garage. 4' of fall across lot 17. **Curran/Moore made a motion to approve the metal roof on house. Motion carried.** Curran stated we have 2 more issues to address; the garage and the windows on the house. He would like to see all 4 elevations refined so they can see what the project is actually going to look like with no assumptions. Moore stated is there anything that could be done with the roof line to break up the mass. Curran asked if there was a loft in the garage making it so high. Georgeson stated there will be storage up there and stated there is no way to build a modern 2 car garage with a 1890's home. Moore stated you need to balance the garage and the house and one option could be lowering the roof line. Curran suggested turning garage so when you look at it from the street it will appear smaller. Georgeson stated it will be too costly to turn the garage. McMullin thinks it's important to let them know what they need to come back with rather than trying to solve their issues. Curran stated the house is 600 sq. ft. and garage is 900 sq. ft. Bakken stated this is ridiculous there are other people here who you've allowed to have 100' houses, "unbelievable". Bakken gave his resignation letter to Johnston then left the meeting. Curran stated the ordinance is clear on what should be the dominating feature on the lot in the residential zone. Georgeson stated how with a 2 car garage. Curran stated garage is 30% bigger than the house, and is not saying you can't build it but it needs to fit within the surrounding neighborhood. Georgeson stated as you look at the photos provided of the neighboring property owners and stated that if the garage down the street had a roof it would look bigger than the house. The abutting property owner has a barn which is bigger than the house. McMullin stated we cannot change what has happened in the past. Curran suggested splitting the garage, by running the gable through on the upper garage stall roof and lowering the garage roof so it would appear to be smaller. Georgeson stated she doesn't agree with lowering the garage down. Curran stated lowering it will make it appear smaller. Georgeson asked the board to tell them what you would like to see and we will do it. McMullin stated you

will need to come back with revised drawings of the garage, we need to see what we are approving. Curran would like more precise elevation drawings. McMullin asked if there were any issues with the proposed siding. Newbrough would like approval to remove the existing siding because they only have the dumpster for a short time. ***Curran/Riemer made a motion to include removal of the existing siding and replacing it with 4" blue vinyl siding and ask they come back with correct placement and size of the new and replacement windows on the house. Motion carried.*** They need to come back with revised drawings of the garage which addresses the roof and mass.

**Other Discussion:** The letters from City Attorney and Barb Hoekstra were placed on file.

**Zoning Administrator Report:** Placed on file.

Special meeting scheduled for Monday, August 11, 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 (due to Monday being a holiday).

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