

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND
MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 08, 2025 at 1:00 PM

City Hall – Council Chambers, 7358 Market St., Mackinac Island, Michigan

I. Call to Order

Chairman Finkel called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT

Lee Finkel

Lorna Straus

Nancy Porter

Peter Olson

Shannon Schueller

Lindsey White

Rick Linn

Staff: Dennis Dombroski, David Lipovsky, Erin Evashevski, Richard Neumann

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Approval of Minutes

a. June 10, 2025

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Straus, Seconded by Porter.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

V. Adoption of Agenda

Evashevski stated she would like to address Schunk under Old Business. Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Straus, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

VI. Correspondence

None.

VII. Committee Reports

None.

VIII. Staff Report

a. C25-016-046(H) 7279 Main Railing & Gate Replacement

Lipovski stated the applicant needed to replace rotted railing. The application states a gate as well, but that was not done. Motion to approve the Staff Report.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by White.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

IX. New Business

a. MD25-067-049(H) Schunk Roof

Schunk stated the roof is leaking and there is water damage to the back building. A cedar shingle contractor came to look at the big house and it was determined the front porch roof needed to be replaced. They would like to replace the cedar with asphalt shingles. Porter stated the architectural review is favorable. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

b. MD25-067-050(H) Schunk Fence Replacement

Discussed under Old Business.

c. MD25-069-054(H) Doud Change of Use and Alteration for Home to Hotel

Doud stated a year ago he and his wife purchased the May house. They looked at preserving the main house and build a possible expansion for a hotel. In looking he has found that Caskey Cottage is similar. Additions in a historic district should be different than the original house. Doud presented photos. The height was similar and the addition was bigger than the original house on Caskey. You can tell the new from the old. Doud would like to add an addition that is separate from the main house. The main house would remain stucco and the addition would be board and batten. The Use would change from house to hotel. In the review, the connector building issues are the Use and the connector between old and new being too big. Neumann agreed on the two main concerns. First Doud would like to address the Use. There have been many uses that have not come in front of the HDC. On Market Street Rose Gazebo changed Use. If Change of Use is portrayed in a negative light in the Secretary of Interior Standards, he does not agree. Neumann stated the Corner cottage was a low density use. Doud asked if density in the Use makes a difference. Evashevski stated that Use is part of Secretary of Interior Standards. Doud stated in standard one, article 10 of the HDC ordinance, it states to only focus on the exterior.

Doud agrees with Neumann on the connector being too big. Doud worked with Richard Clements and discussed taking the connector down to two stories and also not connecting the buildings at all and have an exterior staircase. Doud questioned Neumann's comment on the mass being tripled. Neumann stated in terms of visually the effect of the mass on the property viewing from Market street would almost triple it. Neumann thinks the two story connector is a great idea. There would be a staircase coming down from the 3rd story to the connector. the proposed third floor would become a 2nd level to a second-floor suite. The proposed architecture is appropriate on that property. Olson stated if we are viewing from the shore would dropping the height of the connector and annex enable more of view up to main house? Then the historic view is not lost from the water. Neumann stated the road slopes down so much from the Annex there probably not much view from the water. Olson thinks keeping the higher annex provides further differentiation from the original house. Doud would rather not do that. Evashevski asked if there are any changes to original structure. Doud stated there is a small addition on the back. There is to be no demolition. Doud would like to make the changes discussed today. Doud asked Neumann what he thought of no connector. Neumann stated that would be fine too. Porter asked Doud if the connector might be more attractive with an outside stairway. White asked where the check in would be because Market street is a super busy corner. Doud stated it is a pretty extensive lobby. White asked where taxi drop off would be. Doud stated in front of building. He wouldn't be opposed to drop off on the hill. White was concerned with the traffic on the corner. Lipovsky asked about the smart siding. It would have to be wood siding. Doud agreed. Doud asked if Use comes in front of HDC. Neumann stated the use for HDC is that it has an impact on the historic use of the property. A change of use could have a negative impact. Evashevski stated that a change of use in a historic district could be denied because it is not in line with the historic use of the building. Planning Commission determines if the Change of Use is approved. HDC can take that change of use in to consideration. Neumann gave an example of if the connector height couldn't be reduced than the impact of the large connector has a negative impact. The two concerns he raised are related to the Use. The lower connector would have less of a negative impact on change of use. Doud would like to table until August. Neumann asked about the roof slope on the annex which is different from the house. If buildings are separated it wouldn't be as much of an issue. Neumann asked Clements to take a look at them being the same. Olson encouraged the commissioners to read Neumann's conclusion carefully which encourages the HDC to look at the compatibility. Motion to table for a new plan. Straus asked about the managers living quarters.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

d. HB25-092-056(H) Mackinac Cycle Doors and Awning

Ira Green is planning on moving the setup of bicycles inside. The single door needs to be changed to a double. In addition an awning needs to be installed for the protection from rain. Neumann gave a favorable review. Lipovsky is good with it. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Linn.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

e. C25-024-019-057(H) MIPD Security Cameras

Nobody was present to discuss the application. The cameras are to be mounted on two buildings. One is the Pontiac Lodge building and the other is on the tourism bureau building. Neumann gave a favorable review. Motion to approve one camera on two locations. Straus confirmed the two locations. Straus asked if the HDC approval implies they can put on other buildings. Straus feels that being shown where three will be and would like some assurance that more will not be installed. Straus was told that any other cameras would have to come for approval. Evashevski stated only two cameras were approved for purchase. White asked about the built-in mics and audio surveillance. If there is no mic does that change the look of the camera? Evashevski stated if the look changed the applicant would need to come back for approval.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

X. Old Business

a. MD25-067-044(H) Schunk Fence and Railing Replacement

Evashevski stated at the last months meeting the Schunk fence, Motion to Approve, was voted down. There was no finding of facts found and with a denial we need to provide Finding of Facts to support the denial. Evashevski recommends either voting on the new application or remedy last month's application. Porter strongly disagrees with the denial. Porter stated the role of the HDC is to make sure we are making sure the work is appropriate to a historic district. Porter thought that was understood by all of the Commission and was shocked the fence was voted down. Evashevski stated there was information submitted by the applicant that it was in a film back in 1947 or 48 and the fence was straight. The denial needs to be supported by finding of fact. Motion to review the old application and refund the new application fee. With no support this Motion died.

Straus pointed out the fence posts are in a different location. We need to be careful when referring to the fence before Mr. Woodfill made his changes in 1968. Porter still believes the review was historically appropriate. Neumann stated it is appropriate in the district. It is hard to say if the scallop is more appropriate than what was there before. Any of these that have been proposed are appropriate and meet the Standards for Review. Neumann believes the fence submitted in New Business is

slightly different. The applicant does not have a preference as to which application is approved. When the old application was denied they went back to history. Schunk would prefer the first submittal. Porter stated that was also given a favorable review. Evashevski prefers to go back to original application and review that one to remedy last month.

Motion to approve the first fence application submitted June 10 around the house and water side and refund the fees paid for the second application.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by White.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

Finkel stated he was told by Lipovsky the chippendale style was not original to the house. This was a much later addition. There are aesthetic and maintenance issues on this style in our weather. Lipovsky stated it also has code issues. Schunk stated her thought process was to visually match the fence and balcony. That would leave room for changes on the front porch. Neumann stated he did not review the railing. He assumed there would be a new application for the railing. He would like more information on the history of the house. Lipovsky stated if you look at the photos from 1947, look at the house behind and there were no rails. Schueller has a photo of wrought iron on the front railing. The railing would be straight. The applicant is willing to do something different. Olson asked about photo in new packet of front porch. He is wondering what the circle is pointing out. The applicant stated if the front rail is removed they would do the flower boxes there. Evashevski stated to be clear, are the flower boxes an alternative? Applicant would like to do the flower boxes and then the balcony rail to match the fence. Neumann stated he now sees that in the packet. He agrees that a straight railing on the balcony is appropriate to houses of this era. The flower box approach on the front works code-wise. All is appropriate. Olson stated the chippendale look does appear elsewhere in the district. The railing on Huletts house appears to be a thicker stock. If there is to be a review as to how it relates to other houses in the district that should be noted. Neumann stated the chippendale railing was popular in the late Victorian period. It could well have been used on other properties on the island. He doesn't think that is strong reason that it be used on this house. Applicant stated nothing was given to them when they purchased the house so she had to scrounge up the information she submitted today. Evashevski asked what style box she would be using. The applicant didn't know yet but it would be similar to the ones in the photo. Finkel asked if Neumann was comfortable with straight balcony railing. Neumann stated yes. Lipovsky stated back to flower boxes, we need to measure that the porch is not more than 30" off the ground. Neumann is comfortable with the concept of the flower boxes. Lipovsky will measure tomorrow. [It was determined to be 27"] Evashevski asked that without the design, is the commission comfortable approving. Straus stated she was hoping that it would be clear that this is a proposal for a fence on the house and waterfront. Straus doesn't remember talk of a window box last month. Straus was informed it was in the new packet. Neumann stated the railing removal was not mentioned in the application. Straus stated window boxes is a new discussion and the 30" height is important, and she thinks we should exclude any discussion or voting on the window boxes. Evashevski clarified that the application from last month did not include flower

boxes, but applicant is allowed one amendment and the flower boxes are an amendment to the railing. Olson thinks the look of flower box enclosure appears to be close to what is in the old photo and is a good solution. Evashevski asked if Neumann is comfortable with Grand Hotel style flower boxes. Neumann stated yes they would be appropriate to the house and the entire island. Evashevski stated you can make a motion contingent on the 30" being met. Straus thinks it is better to exclude any talk on the boxes. Evashevski stated all fencing has already been approved. Motion to approve the flower boxes contingent on the height being the appropriate 30", and the design based on Grand Hotel design and upper balcony the straight square ballast railing as presented.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Schueller, White, Linn

XI. Public Comment

None.

XII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 2:32 PM.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Porter.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

Lee Finkel, Chairman

Katie Pereny, Secretary