

CITY OF MUSKEGON
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 4, 2022

J. Huss called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Gregersen, T. Emory, G. Borgman, J. Huss, K. George

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Radtke (excused)

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch

OTHERS PRESENT: D. Mulder and K. Osterhart (593 W. Western); H. Sherman (1347 Peck)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of September 6, 2022 was made by J. Huss, supported by T. Emory and approved with S. Radtke. D. Gregersen, T. Emory, G. Borgman, and J. Huss voting aye.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Case 2022-32 – 593 W. Western Ave. – New Construction

Applicant: Mulder Western Ave LLC - District: Clay-Western - Current Function: Vacant Lot

The applicant was seeking approval to construct a new three-story mixed-use building with a community room penthouse level. J. Pesch added that, due to zoning requirements, all storefront entry doors facing W. Western Avenue would be recessed at least three feet, rather than being flush with the sidewalk (as was shown in the drawings presented).

The board discussed the neighboring buildings and agreed that the new building, while taller than its neighbors, still fit in well with the scale of its surroundings. D. Mulder and the board discussed the parking configuration proposed for the building. The HDC voiced concern with a concept that would involve demolition of a neighboring building for additional parking, and D. Mulder agreed that such an outcome would not be favorable.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to construct a new three-story mixed-use building with a community room penthouse level as presented at the October 4, 2022 HDC meeting as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by D. Gregersen, supported by T. Emory and approved with J. Huss, T. Emory, D. Gregersen, G. Borgman, and K. George voting aye.

Case 2022-33 – 1347 Peck St. – Fence

Applicant: Helen Sherman - District: McLaughlin - Current Function: Residential

The board agreed to review a walk-on case regarding a request to install a four-foot-tall chain link fence in the front and side yards of the property. J. Pesch explained that the fence was proposed to be located in front of the

house along Peck Street and Morrall Avenue. Because HDC local standards only allow chain link fencing in the rear yard, this fence could not be staff approved.

K. George asked why a chain link fence was the style being proposed. H. Sherman stated that it was more affordable, could be easily removed, and would not affect the structure of the house. G. Borgman said that he was concerned that approval of a chain link fence in a front yard would set a precedent. H. Sherman explained that changing family dynamics were the reason a fence was needed at this time, and mentioned that there was not enough room in the rear yard to warrant fencing in that area.

The board and applicant discussed alternative styles of fencing that could be approved in the front yard of the property, including a black aluminum fence. H. Sherman expressed concern with the cost of a black aluminum fence. D. Gregersen mentioned the possibility of not building the fence all the way out to the property lines along the street as a means of reducing the fence's cost. J. Pesch reviewed the fence styles that could be staff approved and where they could be located on the property. It was determined that the applicant would seek to construct a fence that complied with the HDC's local standards and work with staff for HDC approval.

OTHER BUSINESS

Staff Approval Update #3 – Since the last update in July 2022, staff had approved three projects, those bolded were discussed with the HDC chairperson prior to approval.

- **1314 Peck – Removal of defunct chimney**
- 1541 Clinton – Repair damaged siding and trim
- 1642 Jefferson – Installation of 4'-tall black aluminum fence

Staff and the board discussed various other work that had been completed in the historic districts without HDC approval and agreed that staff would contact the respective property owners and provide an update at a future meeting.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

JP