

**CITY OF MUSKEGON
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
TIME OF MEETING: 4:00 p.m.
PLACE OF MEETING: **City Commission Chambers, City Hall**

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting of:
 - October 2, 2018
 - November 6, 2018
- III. New Business
 - Case 2018-42 – 240, 250, 254 Monroe – New Construction
- IV. Old Business
- V. Other Business
 - HDC Local Standards Review – Residing and Trim Cladding, Roofing (Worksession)
- VI. Adjourn

“We admire that which is old not because it is old, but because it is beautiful.” Winston Churchill

AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT POLICY FOR ACCESS TO OPEN MEETING OF THE
CITY COMMISSION AND ANY OF ITS COMMITTEES OR SUBCOMMITTEES

The City of Muskegon will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as signers for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting, to individuals with disabilities who want to attend the meeting, upon twenty-four hour notice to the City of Muskegon. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the City of Muskegon by writing or calling the following: Ann Marie Cummings, City Clerk at 933 Terrace Street, Muskegon, MI 49440 or by calling (231) 724-6705 or TTY/TDD: Dial 7-1-1 and request that representative dial 231-724-6705

II. MINUTES

CITY OF MUSKEGON HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

October 2, 2018

Chairperson J. Hilt called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; D. Warren

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Kroes; A. Riegler, excused

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch, D. Renkenberger

OTHERS PRESENT: K. Zimmerman, Community enCompass;

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of September 4, 2018 was made by J. Hilt, supported by K. Panozzo and unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Case 2018-33 – 1267 Ransom – Windows. Applicant: Mark Krier. District: McLaughlin. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to replace twenty-nine (29) deteriorating windows with new vinyl windows. The rough openings will remain the same. A sketch of the home's layout was provided, showing the windows to be replaced.

Board members and staff discussed the many windows on the house. They concurred that they would not require that all windows be replaced with wood; however, they did want the 9 windows facing Ransom Street to be wood.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace twenty (20) deteriorating windows with new vinyl windows within the same rough openings, and to replace nine (9) windows from the front-facing façade with wood windows within the same rough openings, as long as the necessary permits are obtained was made by S. Radtke, supported by J. Hilt and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; and D. Warren voting aye.

Case 2018-34 – 421 W. Webster Ave – Garage. Applicant: Kevin and Jacquelyn Huss. District: Houston. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to construct a detached, 26- x 26-foot garage behind the home. The proposed garage will be located approximately 8 feet from the easterly lot line, and a concrete apron will extend to approximately 2 feet from the rear lot line along the alley. The proposed garage will be sided with "SmartSide" siding of a cedar shake

design to resemble the cedar siding on the house. Two garage doors will face the alley, and two adjoining entry doors will face the yard.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to construct a detached, 26- x 26-foot garage behind the home sided with “SmartSide” siding of a cedar shake design to match the shadow lines of the home’s siding, with two steel garage doors facing the alley, two adjoining wood entry doors facing the yard, and vinyl windows for secondary façades, as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by L. Wood and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; and D. Warren voting aye.

Case 2018-35 – 446 W. Webster Ave – Fence. Applicant: David and Lori Loring. District: National Register. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to install 30 feet of 30” tall fencing and two gates to enclose the backyard of the property.

A motion that the HDC approve the request install 30 feet of 30-inch tall fencing and two gates to enclose the backyard of the property as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by J. Hilt and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; and D. Warren voting aye.

Case 2018-36 – 1173 4th St – Chimney Removal. Applicant: Community enCompass. District: Houston. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to remove the existing chimney to just below the roofline, or remove and rebuild the chimney up to four feet for aesthetic purposes only.

S. Radtke confirmed that the fireplace was no longer used and that there were safety issues to consider. K. Zimmerman stated that was correct; it would cost approximately \$10,000 to restore the fireplace to working order. She stated that the chimney’s construction was compromised and they were concerned it could fall down at any time. It was being held up by a metal rod at this time, and was causing leaks in the house. She stated that they would enclose the fireplace inside the house so it couldn’t be used, leaving the recently remodeled mantel.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to remove the existing chimney to just below the roofline, and rebuild the chimney to 4 feet for aesthetic purposes as long as the necessary permits are obtained, was made by D. Warren, supported by L. Wood and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; and D. Warren voting aye.

Case 2018-37 – 28 W. Forest Ave – Residing. Applicant: David Shedd. District: Clinton-Peck. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to remove the Masonite siding on three sides of the house (excluding the rear facade) as well as the garage, and to replace it with wood grain, cement board siding with cedar style siding to be installed on the peaks of the three front-facing gable ends. The applicant is also requesting to replace the exterior trim around the windows and door with new 4-inch trim.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace siding on three sides of the house and the garage (excluding the rear facade) with a smooth-surfaced, cement board siding with cedar shake- style siding installed on the peaks of the three front-facing gable ends, and to replace the exterior trim

around the windows and door with new 4-inch wooden trim as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by D. Warren and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; and D. Warren voting aye.

OLD BUSINESS

None

OTHER

HDC Local Standards Review – Signage – S. Radtke suggested starting with a smaller section of the standards, as efforts to review the signage section had not worked yet. Board members concurred, and it was decided that the first sections to review would be the Roofing and Residing and Trim Cladding sections. Suggested changes would be reviewed by the board after their November meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

CITY OF MUSKEGON
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

November 6, 2018

Chairperson J. Hilt called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; D. Warren. A. Riegler

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Kroes

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch, D. Renkenberger

OTHERS PRESENT: B. Playford, 427 W Muskegon Ave; K. Hunter, 1133 6th St.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The regular meeting minutes of October 2, 2018 will be presented for approval at the December meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

J. Pesch requested that the board hear the cases out of order, with 2018-39 and 2018-40 being presented first.

Case 2018-39 – 1641 Jefferson St – Fence. Applicant: Karen Panozzo. District: Jefferson. Current Function: Residential. J. Pesch presented the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to replace a 6-foot tall wood fence with a 4-foot tall aluminum fence on the south side of the property and to install the same aluminum fence along the north side of the property.

K. Panozzo stated that they would keep the existing privacy fence at the rear of the property along the alley and install the 4-foot black aluminum fence along the sides of the property.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace a 6-foot tall wood fence with a 4-foot tall aluminum fence on the south side of the property and to install the same aluminum fence along the north side of the property as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by J. Hilt, supported by D. Warren and approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, D. Warren and A. Riegler voting aye. K. Panozzo abstained from voting, as she was the applicant.

Case 2018-40 – 427 W. Muskegon Ave – Siding. Applicant: Brent Playford. District: Houston. Current Function: Residential. The applicant is seeking approval to reside the southwest façade of the structure using a treated engineered wood lap siding with a wood grain texture. B. Playford stated that the weather had aged the exposed southwest façade of the building and he wished to replace the siding before its condition worsened. S. Radtke stated that the board preferred a non-textured siding, as the original wood would have been non-textured. B. Playford stated that he had suggested

the textured wood as it would more closely match the rest of the wood on the house, which had been in place for decades and no longer had a smooth texture. K. Panozzo asked B. Playford if he planned to replace the siding on the rest of the house. He stated that he planned to replace the remaining siding with cedar boards as needed. On the exposed façade, he wanted a consistent look and the engineered wood would provide that. Board members and Mr. Playford discussed textured vs smooth siding and which would be a better match. S. Radtke asked if the reveal would match the rest of the house. B. Playford stated that the overlap (reveal) would be the same. He also stated that the textured boards he proposed still looked smoother than the original wood siding that was still on the house. S. Radtke and A. Riegler stated that the standards disallowed a textured product; they realized it would not look exactly like the current wood siding due to the age of it. B. Playford stated that he would do textured or smooth, depending on what the board decided.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to reside the southwest façade of the structure using a treated engineered wood lap siding with a smooth texture as long as the necessary permits are obtained, was made by A. Riegler, supported by K. Panozzo and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, K. Panozzo; D. Warren and A. Riegler voting aye.

Case 2018-38 – 1133 6th St – Rehabilitation. Applicant: Kirk Hunter. District: Clay-Western. Current Function: Residential. J. Pesch presented the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to undertake extensive renovations to the house, including the following: 1) replace the existing windows with new wood windows of the same size and design, but with metal or vinyl clasps, 2) replace the existing wood siding with matching concrete siding, 3) eliminate five windows and the door on the southeast side of house adjacent to the alley, 4) remove two second floor windows and install a total of four 18”x48” transom windows, 5) remove a tree and pave a parking pad on the north side of the home in anticipation of a garage, 6) eliminate the second door opening on the north side of the porch and move the original wood door to replace the existing steel door that faces 6th Street, 7) eliminate a first floor window and enlarge an existing window opening for French doors on rear façade, 8) install a 6-foot tall, wood stockade fence along the alley and rear property line, 9) addition of a second story, double-hung window on the north façade, 10) installation of exterior accent lights recessed in soffits, solar panels, and a small wind turbine. Extensive changes were made to this house by a previous owner without HDC approval. None of the changes in progress were done by the applicant.

Pictures of the house showing its previous and current state, along with drawings of the proposed changes were reviewed and discussed by board members, staff, and the applicant. A. Riegler stated that the front façade was more important than the other sides of the house. S. Radtke stated that he was not opposed to changes proposed to the front of the house. The board concurred that the first floor front window near the porch that would be replaced could be approved due to the awkward angle at which the roofline hit the window. K. Hunter explained the reasoning behind the garage location proposal, stating that it would be difficult to build it behind the house, as there was about a four-foot drop-off in the rear by the alley, which would require extensive fill and a retaining wall. He preferred to place the garage alongside the house facing Sixth St. The board moved on to discuss the 2nd floor windows and attempted to determine which were original. J. Pesch stated that there appeared to be an offset area of the siding where a double window may have existed in the past. Another window looked in on an indoor closet area. Board members then discussed the first floor row of windows on the alley side of the house; they were not in favor of replacing those 8

windows with 3 as proposed. K. Hunter stated that several of those windows looked in to a closet and were covered over inside the house. S. Radtke stated that records did not show whether this area was an addition or original; it could have been added on later. A. Riegler stated that she was opposed to the space between the new windows as shown on the renderings provided. S. Radtke stated that he had been in the house in the past and the windows were in poor condition. He preferred that the replacement windows not have the gap in between either, as having the windows right next to each other better reflected the sunroom design currently there.

A. Riegler and D. Warren left at 5:00 PM.

S. Radtke discussed the bump-out on the rear of the house and asked if that was going to be a sided area without windows. K. Hunter stated that was correct. S. Radtke went back to the front features of the house to confirm which changes the board members had agreed on. He stated that the boarded-up, second floor window was architecturally awkward and the proposed changes to that would make the house more aesthetically pleasing. He asked if the new windows would have the same headers and trim. K. Hunter stated that they would. S. Radtke asked about the texture of the new siding. K. Hunter stated that it would be smooth boards and the same width as what was currently there. Board members continued discussing the proposed changes with the applicant and determined which requests would be approved and which would be postponed until a later date.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to make the following changes to the house: 1) replace the existing wood siding with matching concrete siding with a smooth finish retaining all architectural embellishments (profiles, moldings, trim, brackets, headers, waterboards, etc), 2) eliminate the second door opening on the north side of the front porch and move the original wood door to replace the existing steel door that faces 6th Street, 3) eliminate the first-story rear door and replace the 8 windows on the southeast side of house adjacent to the alley with four windows with no spaces between the windows, 4) install a 6-foot tall wood stockade fence along the alley and rear property line, 5) replace the existing first-story door and add a second-story double hung window on the northwest façade, 6) replace existing windows with new wood windows of the same size and design, with the exception of allowing changes to the openings as listed in items 7 – 12 as noted: 7) eliminate the window partially under the porch roof on the front façade, 8) replace the second-story vinyl double hung window on the front façade with a new wood window matching the original window opening size, 9) eliminate the setback second-story window facing 6th Street on the north side of the front façade, 10) remove three second-story windows and install a total of four 18"x48" transom windows (two on the southeast, one on the rear, and one on the northwest façade), 11) eliminate the first-story window on the rear façade and, 12) enlarge the existing window opening for French doors on the rear façade as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by K. Panozzo, supported by J. Hilt and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, and K. Panozzo voting aye. Board members and the applicant concurred that the requests to 1) remove a tree, 2) pave a parking pad on the north side of the home, 3) install solar panels, 4) install a small wind turbine, and 5) install exterior accent lights recessed in soffits would be suspended until a future meeting.

Case 2018-41 – 1561 Peck St – Windows. Applicant: Kurtis Fowler. District: Clinton-Peck. Current Function: Residential. J. Pesch stated that the applicant was seeking approval to replace 21 wood windows with vinyl windows of the same size and design. Three existing windows (currently

boarded-up) on the north and west façades are proposed to be eliminated. The work had already been partially completed without HDC approval; a stop-work order had been placed on the house, as no building permit had been obtained either.

Board members were unhappy that most of the work had been done without approval, and that most of the windows had already been replaced. They concurred that they could not deny the request to replace the windows since the original windows were already gone. They requested that staff look into what action could be taken by the HDC and that fines be levied if possible. They agreed that they would not approve the removal of the boarded-up windows.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace 21 wood windows with vinyl windows of the same size and design as long as the necessary permits are obtained, and to deny the request to eliminate three existing windows currently boarded-up on the north and west façades, was made by S. Radtke, supported by J. Hilt and unanimously approved, with J. Hilt, S. Radtke, L. Wood, and K. Panozzo voting aye.

OLD BUSINESS

None

OTHER

HDC Local Standards Review – Residing and Trim Cladding, Roofing – Commissioners agreed that this would be postponed until a future meeting due to the late hour.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Case 2018-42 – 240, 250, 254 Monroe – New Construction
Applicant: City of Muskegon/Dave Dusendang Custom Homes
District: Houston
Current Function: Vacant Lot

Discussion

The applicant is seeking approval to construct six rowhouses on three vacant lots on the north side of Monroe Avenue between 3rd Street and 4th Street (four additional rowhouses will be built across the street on 235 and 239 Monroe, but those will not be located in an historic district). The units are of modular construction, and will have attached garages accessed from the rear alley. Similar to the Midtown Square development, the project is in partnership with the City of Muskegon, and aims to add new and varied housing options to the near downtown Nelson neighborhood. Additional drawings will be available at the meeting.



Front façade



Standards

The Historic District Commission strives to protect the historical fabric of Muskegon. The major objectives of the Commission are to safeguard the heritage of the City by preserving historic districts which reflect elements of its cultural, social, economic, political, and architectural history; to stabilize and improve property values in such districts; to foster civic beauty; to strengthen the local economy; and to promote the use of historic districts for the education, pleasure, and welfare of the citizens.

Although a significant amount of the Commission's work is centered on historic structures, the construction of new structures on vacant lots within historic districts is permitted and encouraged. However, those professionals designing new structures should strive for excellence in design whether small individual infill construction within the existing historic district blocks, or larger independently sited projects. New structures should be in keeping with the existing historical character of the neighborhood or district with a design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the surrounding buildings and landscaping. Good design which responds positively to its surroundings can be done in several different ways; therefore, it is impossible to develop specific interpretations which will apply in all cases. Every site has its own design opportunities.

The following design recommendations shall be used by the Historic District Commission in evaluating requests for new construction within the districts. These basic criteria should be a part of any proposed design brought before the Commission for approval.

Recommended

Height - Relating the overall height of new construction to that of adjacent structures. As a general rule, construct new buildings to a height roughly equal to the average height of existing buildings from the historic period on and across the street.

Scale - Relating the size and proportions of new structures to the scale of adjacent buildings. Although a building may be much larger than its neighbors in terms of square footage, it should maintain the same scale and rhythm as the existing buildings.

Massing - Breaking up uninteresting box-like forms into smaller, varied masses such as are common on most buildings from the historic period. Variety of form and massing are elements essential to the character of the streetscape in historic districts. For example, if an infill site is large, the mass of the facade can be broken into a number of small bays.

Directional Expression - Relating the vertical, horizontal, or non-directional facade character of new buildings to the predominant directional expression of nearby buildings. Horizontal buildings can be made to relate to the more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the facade into smaller masses that conform to the primary expression of the streetscape.

Setback - Maintaining the historic facade lines of streetscape by locating front walls of new buildings in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. If exceptions are made, buildings should be set back into the lot rather than closer to the street. If existing setbacks vary, new buildings should conform to historic siting patterns.

Not Recommended

Height - Introducing new construction that varies greatly in height (too high or too low) from older buildings in the vicinity. Extreme differences in building heights will have a detrimental visual effects on the appearance of surrounding property.

Scale - Creating buildings that in height, width, or massing violate the existing scale of the area. The new building should not disrupt the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, although it might be appropriate in a different location.

Massing - Introducing single, monolithic forms that are not relieved by variations in massing. Box-like facades and forms are intrusive when placed in a streetscape of older buildings that have varied massing and facade articulation.

Directional Expression - Creating strongly horizontal or vertical facade expressions unless compatible with the character of structures in the immediate area. A new building that does not relate well to its neighbors or to the rhythm of the streetscape because of an unbroken horizontal facade should be avoided.

Setback - Violating the existing setback pattern by placing a new building in front of or behind the historic facade line. Placing buildings at odd angles to the street, unless in an area where diverse siting already exists, even if property setback is maintained, should be avoided.

Sense of Entry - Articulating the main entrances to the building with covered porches, porticos, and other pronounced architectural forms. Entries were historically raised a few steps above the grade of the property and were a prominent visual feature of the street elevation of the building.

Roof Shapes - Relating the roof forms of the new buildings to those found in the area. Although not entirely necessary, duplication of the existing or traditional roof shapes, pitches, and materials on new construction is one way of making new structures more visually compatible.

Rhythm of Openings - Respecting the recurrent alteration of wall areas with door and window elements in the facade. Also considering the width-to-height ratio of bays in the facade. The placement of openings with respect to the facade's overall composition, symmetry or balanced symmetry should be carefully studied.

Design Expression - Composing the materials, textures and colors of the new building facade to compliment adjacent facades and relating details and decorations of the new building to those of existing surrounding buildings.

Imitations - Accurate restoration of or visually compatible additions to existing buildings and former construction, contemporary architecture that well represents our own time yet, enhances the nature and character of the historic district.

Deliberation

I move that the HDC (approve/deny) the request to construct six rowhouses on the vacant lots at 240, 250, and 254 Monroe Avenue as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained.

Sense of Entry - Introducing facades with no strong sense of entry. Side entries or entries not defined by a porch or similar transitional element result in an incompatible "flat" first-floor facade.

Roof Shapes - Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally used in the area.

Rhythm of Openings - Introducing incompatible facade patterns that upset the rhythm of openings established in surrounding structures. For example, glass walls and window and door shapes and locations which are disrespectful to the adjoining buildings.

Design Expression - Violating the existing character of the district by introducing non-compatible materials, textures, colors, details, and decoration on new buildings.

Imitations - Replicating or imitating the styles, motif, or details of older periods. Such attempts detract from the character of the district by compromising what is truly historic.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None

V. OTHER BUSINESS

HDC Local Standards Review – Residing and Trim Cladding, Roofing – The November 6th worksession to review the Residing and Trim Cladding section and Roofing section of the local standards was postponed until the December 4th meeting.

VI. ADJOURN