

CITY OF MUSKEGON

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MEETING

January 6, 2026 @ 4:00 PM
MUSKEGON CITY HALL, ROOM 204
933 TERRACE STREET, MUSKEGON, MI 49440

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

S. Radtke called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM and roll was taken.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: K. Kochin, S. Radtke, D. Gregersen, J. Huss, G. Borgman, C. Davis

MEMBERS ABSENT:

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch, W. Webster,

OTHERS PRESENT: A. Nulf and B. Nulf, 1314 Peck

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes of the November 4, 2025 and December 2, 2025 regular meetings. Planning

A motion to approve the minutes of November 4, 2025 and December 2, 2025 regular meetings was made by G. Borgman, supported by K. Kochin, and approved with S. Radtke, J. Huss, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, K. Kochin, and C. Davis voting aye.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

J. Pesch noted that S. Radtke was the current Chairperson and J. Huss was the Vice Chairperson. G. Borgman made a motion to retain S. Radtke as

Chairperson, supported by K. Kochin. S. Radtke accepted the nomination. A vote was taken and approved, with J. Huss, C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, and K. Kochin voting aye, and S. Radtke abstaining. S. Radtke made a motion to retain J. Huss as Vice Chairperson, supported by K. Kochin. J. Huss accepted the nomination. A vote was taken and approved, with S. Radtke, C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, and K. Kochin voting aye, and J. Huss abstaining.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

A. Case 2026-01: 1314 Peck Planning

The applicant was seeking approval to replace six wood double hung windows on the first floor of the house. Two windows in the bay on the south elevation, one on the rear portion of the south (side) elevation (broken by falling ice), and two on the rear portion of the north (side) elevation were proposed to be replaced with vinyl double hung windows of the same size and appearance (and the same type that were installed elsewhere on the house following approval at the April 2025 meeting); one window on the east (rear) elevation was proposed to be replaced with a vinyl casement window of the same size or slightly shorter, and contain a simulated meeting rail. The exterior wood was not proposed to be refinished, but the exterior of the replacement windows were proposed to be wrapped in color-matched metal around the borders (beige, to match the exterior color of these windows), but retaining the existing crown molding detail above the windows. The applicant was also proposing to install gutters on the house and replace all siding on the back of the house and the garage with cedar siding with the same six-inch (6") reveal, adding new insulation and repairing any damage beneath the existing siding in the process.

G. Borgman stated that the HDC did not typically approve vinyl replacement windows, but acknowledged that these would match the vinyl replacement windows previously approved and installed in the house, and J. Pesch shared photos of the previous replacement windows. B. Nulf and A. Nulf explained the condition of each of the windows they were proposing to replace. S. Radtke noted that nearly any wood window could be restored, but stated that he could be more flexible given the limited visibility from the street of the windows proposed to be replaced and their proximity to other, previously-approved vinyl replacement windows. G. Borgman asked about the window on the rear

elevation proposed to be shortened and why this was being considered. A. Nulf explained that this window was directly behind the kitchen sink and shortening it would help keep water from splashing up onto the window; the window was also difficult to operate due to its location, so a casement window was preferred. S. Radtke suggested that the simulated meeting rail be located midway between the top and bottom of the window, regardless of the final height of the window. The board noted that if the window were to be shortened, the concurrent request to reside this wall would eliminate the need to patch in siding below the window.

J. Pesch shared photos as B. Nulf explained the various reveal dimensions of the existing siding on the back of the house. B. Nulf added that the vertical trim board on the north elevation would likely be eliminated in favor of continuous siding on that wall. S. Radtke explained that this board could be retained to differentiate between the original house and the newer rear addition, but considering the location and its limited visibility, he did not feel keeping it should be a requirement. The HDC asked about the small door that was on the same elevation and B. Nulf said that he would prefer to eliminate it as well; the board agreed that it could be eliminated if it served no purpose. B. Nulf stated that he planned to use existing siding supply that was left over from residing the front porch, but that once it came time to reside the main body of the house he would likely switch to a narrower siding reveal to match the existing siding's dimension. J. Pesch explained that the wider reveal on the front porch matched what was previously there, noting that the porch was not original to the house and likely added at a time when the house contained a commercial use. The HDC noted that the wider reveal was also used on the garage and A. Nulf noted that there were many boards missing. S. Radtke acknowledged that the garage was a secondary structure at the rear of the property, and that the proposal was to match the existing materials.

J. Huss asked where gutters were to be installed and B. Nulf explained that they had not yet consulted with a contractor, but that he expected them to be on the front porch where they have had issues with water running onto the porch steps. S. Radtke stated that he would be comfortable approving modern, K-style aluminum gutters on the front porch, as they would serve as preventative maintenance for the house. J. Pesch asked whether the HDC had a preference for the location of downspouts, as that had been a topic of discussion in previous, similar cases. The board speculated on the location of gutters, and B. Nulf said that the specifics could be reviewed at a future meeting. D. Gregersen suggested that the final motion permit downspouts only if they are not located on the front wall of the front porch - any diversion from this could be brought back to the HDC for review.

A. Nulf asked about needed repairs to the soffit and fascia, and J. Pesch explained that if it was repaired with like materials and no change in appearance, HDC review was not necessary. B. Nulf said that he would contact J. Pesch if additional work beyond this scope ended up being necessary.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace two windows in the bay on the south elevation, one on the rear portion of the south elevation, and two on the rear portion of the north elevation with vinyl double hung windows of the same size and appearance, replace one window on the east elevation with a vinyl casement window of the same size or slightly shorter containing a simulated meeting rail at the center of the window, with the exterior of all replacement windows wrapped in beige-painted metal around the borders to match the exterior color of the windows and retaining the existing crown molding detail above the windows; and to install gutters on the front porch with downspouts on the sides of the front porch, and replace all siding on the back of the house and the garage with cedar siding with a six-inch (6") reveal as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss, supported by G. Borgman, and approved with S. Radtke, J. Huss, C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregesen, and K. Kochin voting aye.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2025 Staff Approval Update #4 Planning

Since the last update in September 2025 (but before the end of that year), staff had approved 13 projects. Those in bold were discussed with the HDC chairperson prior to approval:

- 44 Iona - Reroof house
- **1497 Peck - Installation of handicap ramp**
- 448 W. Muskegon - Reroof house
- 432 W. Muskegon - Replacement of glass block basement windows
- 1011 2nd - Reroof main sanctuary
- 74 Delaware - Siding and porch repair (later came before the HDC)
- 1326 Ransom - Reroof house
- 123 W. Larch - Reroof house
- 1640 Peck - Demolish rear handicap ramp and construct new steps and landing to match HDC local standards
- 511 W. Clay - Construct four foot tall fence to match HDC local standards
- **390 W. Muskegon - Replace exterior side door with new door to match front door**

- 1284 Ransom - Reroof house
- **413 W. Webster - Construct shed and chicken coop in rear yard**

J. Pesch explained the projects that had been discussed with the HDC chairperson. S. Radtke asked about the replacement glass block basement windows that had been approved at 432 W. Muskegon Avenue, and J. Pesch explained that there were few windows left in the house at the time of the request as most had been either boarded-up or completely replaced with boards. S. Radtke stated that he felt replacement of simple basement windows with glass block windows was usually acceptable.

B. 2025 CLG Annual Report Planning

J. Pesch explained that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requires that all Certified Local Government (CLG) communities submit an annual report to be in good standing and remain eligible for grant funding and technical assistance activities and that SHPO had created a template for CLG communities to follow when completing their annual report. The HDC members requested that this be included on the February meeting agenda so that they would have time to review the previous year's report answer the questions for the 2025 report. J. Pesch stated that he would share these documents with the board and collect and summarize their responses for final discussion at the February meeting.

C. Muskegon Historic District (Additional Documentation) Planning

J. Pesch shared that an update to the National Register of Historic Places listing for the Muskegon Historic District was presented to the State Historic Preservation Review Board on December 12th, and as a Certified Local Government, the HDC was tasked with reviewing the additional information and providing any comments to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The SHPO would include any comments the City, HDC, or the public had with the final submission to the National Park Service and correct any errors identified in the nomination. This update was initiated by ongoing work at 280 W. Muskegon Avenue and the discovery that the building was considered to be non-contributing because it was not yet 50 years old at the time of the original nomination. The update would address this, as well as add a considerable amount of information to the narrative that was lacking in the original nomination form.

J. Huss asked why the three houses at 404, 416, and 424 W. Webster Avenue were noted as non-contributing. J. Pesch said that his understanding was that this was because the houses were moved into the district in the 1990s. SHPO staff had shown an interest in the number of houses that had been moved into

or within the district, and highlighted this as a part of the updated narrative. However, because these three houses were not in their original locations, they were considered non-contributing. J. Pesch added that he would confirm this with SHPO staff along with asking for a deadline by which comments would need to be received.

J. Pesch explained the role of the National Register of Historic Places and noted a few of the listings in the city of Muskegon.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamie Pesch, Planner