

**CITY OF BAYFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
Minutes of October 24, 2016**

Chairwoman Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. at the Bayfield City Hall.

**Present:** Bill Cornelius, Dan Curran, Hannah Hudson, Rob Riemer, Sharon Johnson, Sheryl Burkel (Alt.) and Dionne Johnston – Deputy Zoning Admin.

**Absent:** Bob Durfey and Tina Nelson

**Others:** Dan & Sue Beeson, Rich Ryan, Greg Carrier, David Eades and Mayor Gordon Ringberg

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

**Burkel/Hudson made a motion to approve the minutes of July 11, 2016, August 29, 2016. Motion carried.**

**Public Input:** Chairwoman Johnson stated to the audience that the Board will be reviewing a second set of plans for the Beeson project which are available in the packets but for anyone who was not at the July meeting and wanted to see the original plan, one was available on the table. Rich Ryan asked to see the plan but had no input on the agenda items.

**Building permits:**

- 1. Dan Beeson & Sue Woods-Beeson – 113 North Second Street, Permit Application #32-16 B.** Dan & Sue Beeson were present with a request to build a new residential dwelling. Johnson stated she like the revised plans and it's exciting to have a new home in Bayfield. **Curran/Cornelius made a motion to approve the application as presented. Motion carried.**
- 2. Matthew Carrier – 221 South Sixth Street, Permit #01-15.** Greg Carrier was present representing Matthew Carrier with a request to amend the front porch plans. Greg explained Matt could not be at the meeting because he was in Boston. Burkel stated she was not at the meeting where the project was approved and asked for a background. Johnson stated that the current design that you currently see was not the plan that was approved by the Board. The original plan didn't have the gable overhang projecting over the exterior stairs, nor did it have an exposed porch foundation. Greg gave a history of the project, when Matt got into the project it should have been condemned in that there were bat feces in the walls caked in like bread and when he got to the porch they discovered the porch foundation was deteriorated beyond repair. In spite of all the obstacles Matt chose to move forward and gutted the inside and when he got to the porch and couldn't repair the damage he removed it and built a solid porch with poured concrete walls. He encouraged Matt to check with City Hall about the change in porch roof but Matt had read the exposed stairs were exempt from the set back. Johnston explained had Matt talked with her, she would have explained that yes uncovered stairs are exempt from the setback, but still need to be on your property and the original porch may have been nonconforming regarding the setback, but you cannot increase the nonconformity which he has done by added the gable over the exterior stairs. The ARB does not have the authority to approve a lesser setback and Matts only option if he wants to keep the current design is to request a variance to the front yard setback. Curran stated the drawing submitted isn't accurate with regards to the roof pitch, currently it's a 10/12 and the drawing is a 12/12. He thinks the idea of having a covering over the stairs is not a bad idea otherwise the stairs will continually fill with ice and be a hazard. However all he had to do was pick up the phone. This Board does not have the authority to grant a variance. He encourages all the Board members to review the Historic District Guidelines which clearly stated exposed concrete foundations are inappropriate but are appearing more with new construction. The Guidelines also discuss appropriate porches, decks and railings and they really should be used as a guide when making decisions. Cornelius stated the Board did not approve the exposed foundation, it was done without prior authorization. Johnson understands that issues come up when remodeling/renovating a structure, but asking forgiveness after the fact and/or requesting a variance because you didn't get prior authorization is very disheartening. **Cornelius/Curran made a motion to approve the application of stone veneer to the exposed porch foundation. Motion carried.** More discussion ensued. Burkel stated she had plans to extend her porch but was told she could not because it didn't meet current setback, so the porch doesn't function as it should. She wasn't happy with this but complied with current zoning rules. Curran stated the issue of noncompliance will have to be review by a different board. Johnson stated do we really want to do that, how many feet are they over the front yard setback. Johnston stated they will need a survey to determine how close or over they are to the front yard setback. **Curran/Burkel made a motion to approve the porch roof**

***change to cover the exterior stairs as it currently exists contingent upon obtaining a variance to the front yard setback. Motion carried.***

**Other Discussion:**

1. **Building permit fee schedule.** Johnson is always looking at ways for the City to generate more revenue and feels the current fee schedule is too low and for anyone that comes to City Hall either looking for information or has dealings with staff there is a lot of time spent on projects. The current fees for new construction have been the same for the last 10 years and we have seen at least 3-4 new homes in that time. Johnson would like the fees to be increased especially the penalty fees. Lengthy discussion ensued. ***Burkel/Hudson made a motion to approve increasing the fee schedule after staff checks with other communities and comes up with fair and justifiable rate structure then forward to the Council for approval. Motion carried.***

**Zoning Administrator Report:** Neil Schultz submitted a letter of approval to change the entrance to the southeast corner from the State Historical Society. Johnston is looking for guidance from the Board on how to handle this change. Curran has no objections to the change, but Schultz needs to come back for approval and if he continues without approval penalties need to be applied for noncompliance.

The next meeting will be November 28, 2016, 5 pm at City Hall.

***Curran/Hudson made a motion to adjourn at 5:57 p.m. Motion carried.***