

# CITY OF MUSKEGON

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MEETING

**May 5, 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 3:58pm and roll was taken.

#### ROLL CALL

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: J. Pesch, W. Webster

OTHERS PRESENT: M. Dickinson and P. Mayer (Renewal by Andersen), 475 W. Webster; E. Shephard, 1102 Terrace; S. Benedict, 58 E. Grand

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**A. Approval of the minutes of the April 7, 2026 regular meeting.** Planning  
A motion to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2026 regular meeting was made by G. Borgman, supported by K. Kochin, and approved with S. Radtke, C. Davis, K. Kochin, D. Gregersen, G. Borgman, and J. Huss voting aye.

#### OLD BUSINESS

None

#### NEW BUSINESS

**A. Case 2026-07: 475 W. Webster Planning**

The applicant was seeking approval to replace 17 existing wood windows in the house with wood composite (Fibrex material) windows with grill patterns and sash ratios to match the original windows, and to replace the existing patio door with a two-panel sliding patio door with a 3w x 5h grill pattern on each panel. J. Pesch explained that a one-story addition was built onto the house likely in the 1970s, and that the proposed patio door appeared to be original to that addition but not original to the house.

J. Huss asked if the sidelights surrounding the existing patio door would be removed and the full opening filled with the two sliding door panels. P. Mayer confirmed that the sidelights would be removed to accommodate a gliding patio door with a larger opening. He added that grill patterns could be customized to match the proportions of the glass lights within the existing door, and if needed, the door could be made 4w x 5h to maintain the size of the lights. K. Kochin asked why the door would change from a swinging door to a sliding door and M. Dickinson explained that the door was difficult to close and not weathertight, he also stated that the larger opening would be easier to navigate.

S. Radtke mentioned that the HDC generally advocated for maintaining original wood windows, and noted that they appeared to be in decent condition. The board suggested seeking quotes on having the original windows restored. M. Dickinson shared his concern with the energy efficiency of the existing windows and G. Borgman suggested storm windows as a solution and S. Radtke said that weatherstripping would also help. S. Radtke also confirmed that the parts, pieces, and mechanisms used in the existing windows were basic materials which could be replaced where needed for repairs. The board decided to approve the proposed replacement windows and sliding door separately.

A motion that the HDC deny the request to replace 17 existing wood windows in the house with wood composite windows with grill patterns and sash ratios to match the original windows was made by G. Borgman, supported by D. Gregersen and approved with C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, S. Radtke, and J. Huss voting aye, and K. Kochin voting no.

The HDC moved on to discuss the proposed replacement patio door. D. Gregersen asked if a three-panel door with two fixed panels and a hinged middle panel had been considered. P. Mayer stated that with an 86"-wide opening, it would be difficult to walk through such a door. J. Huss asked if the patio doors could be replaced with french doors rather than a slider, and P.

Mayer said the largest they could make would only be 75"-wide and the efficiency of a sliding door was better and would improve mobility and accessibility. The board agreed that they tend to allow more changes on elevations not visible from the street and acknowledged that the existing patio doors were a part of the house's newer addition. S. Radtke noted that the doors also appeared as if they may have been cobbled together since the sidelights were not the full height of the main doors.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace the existing patio door with a two-panel sliding door with a proportional grill pattern on each panel as depicted in the May 5, 2026 HDC staff report as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss and supported by D. Gregersen. K. Kochin asked if the HDC had a preference on the location of the mullions. S. Radtke stated that typically they would be applied to both the inside and outside of the glass, as well as sandwiched between the glass panes to appear as true divided light windows. G. Borgman suggested an amendment to the motion to specify that the door panels would contain upright, rectangular simulated divided lights with the mullions applied to the inside and outside faces of the glass as well as sandwiched between the glass. J. Huss accepted the amendment.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to replace the existing patio door with a two-panel sliding patio door with a proportional grill pattern on each panel containing upright, rectangular divided lights with the condition that the mullions are applied to the inside and outside faces of the glass as well as sandwiched between the glass as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss, supported by D. Gregersen, and approved with G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, K. Kochin, S. Radtke, J. Huss, and C. Davis voting aye.

The HDC continued to discuss the proposal and again suggested seeking quotes for repair. P. Mayer asked if the HDC might consider approving replacement of some of the windows or those that were not on the front elevation, S. Radtke stated that all projects are treated on an individual basis, but in some cases, the HDC had been more lenient with windows that were not highly visible from the street. J. Pesch noted that there were a few local contractors that could repair historic wood windows. S. Radtke suggested that if quotes for repairing the windows were significantly different, they could discuss the case again at a future meeting.

**B. Case 2026-08: 1102 Terrace Planning**

The applicant was seeking approval to reconstruct the existing fence along the south (side) and east (rear) property lines and install new 6'-tall privacy fence in the same style along the north (Hartford Ave) property line, and to remove the

existing accessible ramp on the south side of the house and construct a 10'x12' deck in the same location using the existing posts with 2"x2" treated vertical railing and spindles spaced 3" apart. J. Pesch explained that he was not able to approve a 6'-tall fence in the proposed location as staff, and stated that the deck had already been demolished and portions of the deck had been constructed.

E. Shephard apologized for starting the work prior to HDC review and approval, explaining that the ramp had collapsed, becoming a safety hazard. His dad began demolition and construction of the new deck not knowing that HDC approval was needed. J. Pesch noted that the existing ramp was approved by the HDC in September 1993, and was not historically significant or particularly unique. The HDC agreed that the proposed changes to the deck were acceptable; J. Pesch added that the Staff Approval Policy had more recently been amended to allow for approval of secondary porch and deck designs that either replicate the existing design or match the HDC Local Standards' Porch and Deck Standards and Guidelines' Decking, Sample Ballustrade Construction, and Railing Detail drawings. He explained that this was a unique situation that actually took place prior to the change to the Staff Approval Policy, so it was being brought before the HDC.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to remove the existing accessible ramp on the south side of the house and construct a 10'x12' deck in the same location using the existing posts with 2"x2" treated vertical railing and spindles spaced 3" apart as depicted in the May 5, 2026 HDC staff report as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss, supported by K. Kochin and approved with J. Huss, C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, S. Radtke, and K. Kochin voting aye.

The HDC moved on to discuss the proposed fence. J. Pesch shared that the fence would be on the side property line where there currently was no fence, and run along Hartford to tie into the existing fence and enclose the rear yard. The existing fence would also be repaired. The board reviewed the applicable local standards and where the proposed fence strayed from these. E. Shephard explained that where vertical fence boards were used on the existing fence, they would be replaced with horizontal boards so that the entire fence would be uniform.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to reconstruct the existing fence along the south (side) and east (rear) property lines and install new 6'-tall privacy fence in the same style along the north (Hartford Avenue) property line with horizontal boards and six-foot spacing between fence posts as depicted in the May 5, 2026 HDC staff report as long as the work meets all zoning

requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss, supported by C. Davis, and approved with S. Radtke, J. Huss, C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, and K. Kochin voting aye.

**C. Case 2026-10: 58 E. Grand Planning**

The applicant was seeking approval to construct a new single-family house with an attached garage on the lot. The HDC reviewed proposed elevation, floor plan, and site plan drawings, as well as photos of an existing house that was the mirror image of the proposed house. J. Pesch explained that the proposed house would locate the garage doors closer to the corner.

G. Borgman stated that, in that area, garage doors were not typically in front of the house. S. Benedict stated that the lot was too small for a different house plan or a detached garage, adding that there was also no access to a rear alley. S. Radtke echoed the concerns with the garage being the dominant architectural feature of the front elevation, and was also concerned that the house was proposed for a corner lot with no windows on the side elevation facing Clinton Street.

J. Pesch shared a photo of the house that was previously on the lot and noted that it only had a driveway or a very small garage away from the street corner. The HDC also noted that the former house looked very similar to the proposed new house.

D. Gregersen asked whether the front-load garage could set back so that it was not aligned with the front wall of the house. S. Benedict stated that shifting the garage back was not feasible as it would interfere with a staircase, require reworking of joists, and significantly reduce the size of the living room. J. Pesch asked whether D. Gregersen was instead referring to the optional garage, and S. Benedict noted that the optional garage was set back about a foot from the house's front wall and that he did not have an issue with removing it. K. Kochin suggested that there could be a way to make the garage doors less conspicuous. D. Gregersen suggested that the garage doors be a color that more closely matches the color of the siding on the body of the house.

S. Radtke asked why the house was not flipped like the other house shown in the photos in the staff report and S. Benedict stated that he was trying to avoid having the house's patio adjacent to the sidewalk. S. Radtke suggested that the proposed house plan be mirrored to avoid having the garage as the dominant feature at the intersection.

D. Gregersen recommended adding windows to the bedrooms and stairway so that the side elevations would not be blank walls. S. Benedict asked whether clerestory windows (rather than double-hung egress windows) could be used as

a means of limiting the loss of wall space on the interior. He also stated that, if windows were required to be added to one of the second-story rear bedrooms, his preference was that both bedrooms match. The HDC proposed an egress window on the side elevation, facing Clinton Street, and a clerestory window on the rear elevation, but S. Benedict was concerned that the egress window on the opposite side elevation would not be accessible with the house being closer to the property line. Following further discussion, the HDC settled on the proposed placement of the additional windows.

K. Kochin left at 4:58pm

G. Borgman shared concerns with setting a precedent when it came to the design of new houses in the historic districts. S. Benedict noted that this was the last City-owned vacant lot in a historic district, and J. Pesch stated that there were a few privately-owned lots as well.

A motion that the HDC approve the request to construct a new single-family house with an attached garage that is the mirror image of the plan depicted in the May 5, 2026 HDC staff report (with the garage sited on the east side of the house) with the condition that the garage door color blends with the color of the body of the house and three clerestory windows be added going up the stairs on the west (side) elevation and another clerestory window be added on the west (side) elevation in the second-story rear bedroom as long as the work meets all zoning requirements and the necessary permits are obtained was made by J. Huss, supported by C. Davis, and approved with C. Davis, G. Borgman, D. Gregersen, S. Radtke, and J. Huss voting aye.

J. Huss left at 5:12pm

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. HDC Door Hangers** Planning

C. Davis and G. Borgman created draft door hangers that could be used to notify residents of their home's location in a historic district, and the role of the HDC in reviewing exterior work. G. Borgman explained the intent of the project that would be undertaken through the Nelson Neighborhood Improvement Association and how it would align with the HDC's annual goals. The board was in favor of the effort and discussed the content of the door hangers and C. Davis stated that he could make updates based on feedback collected.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:38pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamie Pesch, Planner