



February 15, 2024

Via e-mail at grentrop@rentropmorrison.com

Gary Rentrop and
Mackinac Historic District Commission
PO Box 176
Cross Village, MI 49723

Re: Mackinac Island Historic District Commission
6948 Main Street, Mackinac Island, Michigan ("Property")
HB24-041-009

Dear Gary and the Mackinac HDC:

The purpose of this correspondence is to clarify both the recent action of the Mackinac Island Historic District Commission ("HDC") as well as to clarify your reply to my e-mail yesterday. We also ask that this letter be added to the Owners application on file with the City. As attorney for the Owner of the Property, I inquired whether the City Architect will in fact perform a written review. My understanding from being in attendance at the meeting of the HDC was that the HDC requested such a review. As the Owner paid the \$1,500 application fee, we were expecting a review. I also inquired in my email whether the Owner would have an opportunity to weigh in on the selection of the "*independent*" engineer prior to the HDC retaining any such engineer.

In reply, you stated that "*the HDC would need to request a review...*" and that expecting a review was "*putting the cart before the horse...*". I believe the HDC used the "*horse and cart*" analogy recently when it denied the Trayser request to demolish a shed at its property on Main St. on the basis the owner failed to provide the HDC with plans on the replacement for the shed. Here we provided you and the City Architect plans to review over a year ago. In fact, the City Architect offered suggested changes in order to enhance the historical integrity. Then, on a timely basis, we attached the plans to the application but still no review of the proposed home. Given the complete transparency of the request and application we do not agree that the Owner is putting the "*cart before the horse*".

Assuming we timely receive the review of the **proposed home** (which is a separate issue from the demolition) from the City Architect, we would expect we would be afforded the opportunity to have the application and review reviewed by the HDC. If this can be accomplished soon the City can save the cost of an unnecessary evaluation from a Detroit engineering firm.

ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS AT LAW

406 Bay Street, Suite 300 • Petoskey, MI 49770 • T: (231) 347-1200 • F: 248-901-4040 • plunkettcooney.com

As for the engineering report, the Owner objects to retaining WJE Detroit for engineering services. First, they would have an inherent bias having represented the HDC in the past (and based on the bias shown in their own web site). Your email failed to disclose both the estimated expense and the particular scope of engagement. The engagement is particularly important given the terms of Act 169 of 1970 and the City's Ordinance which both clearly provide that the HDC's jurisdiction is to review and act upon **only exterior features** of a resource. We therefore seek clarification concerning the resolution to engage an independent engineering firm.

We look forward to your reply.

Very truly yours,



James J. Murray
Plunkett Cooney
Direct Dial: 231-348-6413

CC: Mackinac HDC and client
JJM/tll

Open.29035.21118.33177913-1