

CITY OF MUSKEGON  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**

**April 6, 2021**

Vice-Chairperson A. Riegler called the meeting to order at 4:13 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: T. Emory, Muskegon, Michigan; K. George, Muskegon, Michigan;  
S. Radtke, Muskegon, Michigan; A. Riegler, Muskegon, Michigan;  
D. Gregersen, Muskegon, Michigan

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch; L. Mikesell

OTHERS PRESENT: P. Stone, 1752 Jefferson; D. Kamps, 1129 Peck St.; J. Potts, 394  
Houston

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of March 2, 2021 was made by K. George, supported by S. Radtke and approved with S. Radtke, A. Riegler, K. George, D. Gregersen, and T. Emory voting aye.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Case 2021-08 – 1752 Jefferson Street (Windows and Door). Applicant: Peggy and Rod Stone.**  
**District: Jefferson. Current Function: Residential.** J. Pesch presented the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to 1) remove a window on the rear (east) side of the house to the right of the back door, 2) replace a double wood casement window on the back of house with a replacement wood window of the same size but with a single pane of glass, 3) remove a door on the south side of house and side over the opening with matching wood siding, 4) remove a window on the back patio area and replace it with a full view metal door stained to match the doors installed on the front porch. Staff had already approved a request to replace damaged wood siding with like material retaining all exterior trim where possible. P. Stone was present to represent the case. J. Pesch explained that the numbers in the discussion section of the staff report corresponded to the numbers labeled on the photos included in the staff report.

It was clarified that the house was located on a corner and that most parts of the exterior of the house were visible from the street. K. George asked if the first item would only involve removal of the window and covering over the opening. P. Stone stated that was correct and explained that the opening would be sided over with wood siding and that removal of the window would also allow for eventual installation of an awning over the back door to prevent ice build-up in that area. K. George stated that because the window was visible from the street, it would be difficult to approve its removal. P. Stone said that it was unclear if the window or the door below it were

original to the house. D. Gregersen noted that it was a difficult decision because it was not a great design as it existed. A. Riegler referenced the HDC's local standards with regard to removal of windows and recommended that interior privacy film be installed on the window instead.

The board moved on to discuss the second item requested. A. Riegler asked if the plan was to replace the existing casement window with a picture window. P. Stone stated that the existing windows were replacement windows and that the plan was to install two, side-by-side crank-out casement windows maintaining the same appearance, but with one pane of glass in each window instead of the current windows' double-hung configuration. A. Riegler noted that the entire house had double-hung windows, and P. Stone pointed out that there were three stained glass casement windows dating from the 1970s 80s installed by a prior owner and that she would like to do something similar if it was not so expensive. D. Gregersen stated that casement windows would be inappropriate for the house. P. Stone explained that casement windows were preferred to make it easier to open the windows which were located over the kitchen sink, and would be the same configuration. D. Gregersen asked if the primary window behind the storm window was a double-hung window. P. Stone stated that it was. D. Gregersen pointed out that casement windows would not have a horizontal divider in the center, but that it could be possible to get casement windows with the appearance of a double-hung window. A. Riegler asked if the HDC could issue an approval that would require casement windows that appeared as double-hung windows. K. George stated that she was not familiar with such a product.

The board discussed the third item requested. A. Riegler noted that windows and doors were among the primary things that the HDC did not allow for modifications. P. Stone explained that the request was due to a large stove that required an exhaust hood, that the 10' x 12' kitchen already had five doorways into the space, and that the door proposed for removal was located off the back patio and not visible from the street. K. George noted that the third and fourth items requested should be evaluated together because the proposed door in the fourth item would allow for continued access to the back patio.

D. Gregersen was less concerned about the items that were not visible from the surrounding streets. S. Radtke asked if the window that would be replaced with a door would be the same size as the current window. P. Stone stated that it would be the same size. P. Stone said that the casement windows in the second item could be changed to wood double-hung windows, and asked for suggestions as to what could be done to accommodate the needed exhaust hood. S. Radtke proposed that the glass in the door be replaced with black architectural glass so that the door could remain in place but could be walled over on the interior, and that the same could be done with the small window in the first item requested. P. Stone restated the preference was to remove the small window entirely to eventually accommodate an awning. The board discussed whether or not the rear entry door below the window was original to the house, what the door's present purpose was, and how the issues with ice build-up could be addressed without requiring an awning.

The board decided to separate the motion into four motions.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to remove the window on the rear (east) side of the house over the rear entry door and have siding installed over the opening as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by D. Gregersen and failed, with A. Riegler, T. Emory, and K. George voting no, and S. Radtke and D. Gregersen voting aye.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace the existing double wood casement windows on the rear of the house with new windows of the same configuration as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by T. Emory and unanimously approved with S. Radtke, A. Riegler, T. Emory, K. George, and D. Gregersen voting aye.

T. Emory asked if the door discussed in item #3 was visible from the street. P. Stone stated that it was not as the door was screened by a fence running along the side yard of the house.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to remove the existing door, infill the opening, and side over the opening with wood siding to match the house as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by T. Emory. The motion was approved, with S. Radtke, T. Emory, D. Gregersen voting aye, and A. Riegler and K. George voting no.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace the existing window on the back patio area with a full view metal door as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by T. Emory and unanimously approved, with S. Radtke, A. Riegler, T. Emory, K. George, and D. Gregersen voting aye.

**Case 2021-09 – 1129 Peck Street (Doors). Applicant: Step Up (Dick Kamps). District: McLaughlin. Current Function: Residential.** J. Pesch presented the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to replace the front (east) and side (north) exterior doors with the one of the options included in the April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021 staff report. J. Pesch also shared D. Gregersen's drawings for potential door options (Attachment A) and noted that the foursquare options would apply to this case.

J. Pesch noted that, while they were included in a past case brought before the HDC, he was unable to verify whether the existing doors on the house were replacements. D. Kamps stated that the reason the doors were proposed to be replaced was for energy efficiency; gaps of ¾" or more existed around the doors that may not be repairable. D. Kamps also noted that security was a concern with the existing doors. The board noted that the three-quarter lite door could be replaced with something that matched it, but that the door being proposed was a full lite door. D. Kamps stated that they were unable to find a door that matched the existing door. J. Pesch suggested that Staff could work with the applicant to locate an appropriate three-quarter lite door. The HDC decided to reference D. Gregersen's drawing of foursquare door options in their motion.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace the front and side doors with one of the options that were drawn by D. Gregersen under the foursquare category shared at the April 6<sup>th</sup>,

2021 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 unanimously approved, with S. Radtke, A. Riegler, T. Emory, K. George, and D. Gregersen voting aye.

D. Kamps requested a copy of the foursquare door drawings referenced in the approved motion. J. Pesch stated that he would send a copy and requested that, once a door style is selected, it be shared with Staff so that the board can be made aware of the final selection.

**Case 2021-10 (Walk-on) – 394 Houston Avenue (Shed).** Applicant: Jeffery Potts. District: Houston. Current Function: Garage/Storage. J. Pesch presented the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to construct an 8' x 12' shed in the back yard of the house, sided and painted in a similar color as the house, and roofed to match the house with a 3/12 pitch roof sloping away from the house. The shed would be seven feet from the house, six feet from the side property line, and would contain one four-foot wide double door.

A. Riegler asked why a gable roof was not being proposed. J. Potts explained that he has had issues with water at the back of the house and, with the shed's proposed location being so close to the house, was trying to stop water from running toward the house. A. Riegler stated that a gable roof with a steep pitch would be more appropriate for the shed and that there could be other ways to control the water. D. Gregersen recommended that a gable roof be turned to shed water to the side property lines, rather than toward the house and alley, or that gutters could be added. A. Riegler referenced recent discussions of the HDC regarding the design of sheds and proposed that drawings be created to help guide future decisions. A gable roof with at least a 6/12 pitch was deemed favorable by the board. K. George recommended using double service frame doors rather than the barn-style double doors depicted in the application and asked that Staff share the guidelines provided during a past request for a shed. J. Pesch shared the motion used for a case from the September 2020 HDC meeting.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to construct an 8' x 12' wooden shed in the rear yard, sided and painted to match the house on the property, with a gable roof of at least a 6/12 pitch, and with double service frame doors as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained, was made by S. Radtke, supported by K. George and unanimously approved, with S. Radtke, A. Riegler, K. George, T. Emory, and D. Gregersen voting aye.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**477 W. Western Update** – Staff reviewed the history of work completed at this property since 2018 and determined that the replacement door discussed at the March 2, 2021 HDC meeting did not receive HDC approval, but was approved as part of the larger building permit for the conversion of the former ground-floor retail space into a restaurant. The work did go through the site plan review process, but did not come before the HDC Staff Liaison as it was not noted at the time as being located in a historic district. While the work could not be required to comply with the HDC's standards, the board asked Staff to send a letter to the property owner requesting that they consider replacing the door with one that matches the one it replaced and would be in line with what the HDC would approve.

### OTHER BUSINESS

Due to time constraints, most of the items listed under Other Business were pushed to a special meeting to be held later in the month.

**Public Comment Period** – Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

JP

Attachment A