

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

MINUTES

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, February 11, 2025 at 10:00 AM

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

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:09 AM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT

Andrew Doud

Lee Finkel

Alan Sehoyan

Peter Olson

ABSENT

Lorna Straus

Nancy Porter

Shannon Schueller

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

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve the Agenda as amended. The amendment was to add "Education Segment" under "New Business"

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

V. Approval of Minutes

a. December 10, 2024

Motion to approve the minutes as written.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

VI. Correspondence

None

VII. Committee Reports

None

VIII. Staff Report

a. Job Status Report

Sehoyan asked about the accuracy. Dombroski stated it is as accurate as of the time Pereny left. Sehoyan would like to work with Pereny to update the projects. Motion to place on file.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Olson.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

b. CD24-043-090(H) Straus Roof

Dombroski stated one of the Straus properties needed new shingles.

c. R325-016-002(H) Gale Front Door Wendell House

Dombroski stated a new door and side lights are needed on the Jacob Wendell house.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Doud.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

IX. Old Business

a. R324-008-057(H) Benser New Home

Neumann stated he reviewed the drawings but is still confused as it appears to be a different house from what he first reviewed. Neumann was not able to speak with Dombroski about this., Dombroski stated the pool was part of the discussion last month in the Planning Commission meeting having to do with lot coverage. Clements made some changes to the pool to make it smaller and the patio was changed to pavers with holes, like in front of the yacht dock and St Clouds, so grass grows through the pavers. Finkel asked if as presented now, the lot coverage requirement is met. Dombroski stated yes. Neumann stated generally speaking it looks to be an appropriate design, but hasn't had the chance to study it in detail. Sehoyan stated he is uncomfortable moving forward without the review. Straus stated that Planning Commission already approved the lot coverage requirement. Benser had told Planning Commission that he hoped to move forward in the spring. The HDC just needs to approve the architectural side of it. Motion to table for formal written review.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Olson.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

b. C24-057-055(H) GHMI Merchants Building Amendment

Megan, from Barry Polzin's office, recapped the amendments. The roof framing on the front porch was in much better shape so they will be keeping the existing framing. The column to be removed could not be removed because a huge concrete beam was discovered during the demolition. That column will remain and be wrapped like the others. The windows on the 2nd floor street frontage will be changed. The railing will now follow the slope of the pitched roof. Neumann had no problem with the changes and said it actually remains more like it is today. The proposed changes are appropriate. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Doud.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

c. Exterior Lighting Changes to Guidelines

Neumann stated this involved a minor addition to the guidelines for exterior lighting. There was concern about certain types of lighting in soffits. Under "styles" the proposed revision was added. Neumann read the revision aloud as "Typically fixtures should be ceiling or wall mounted. Modern styles and types such as soffit and roof edge illumination are not appropriate in historic settings." Finkel asked about the conclusion of the temperature of lights. Neumann stated that is in the last paragraph of the guidelines. Motion to adopt the revision.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Olson.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

X. New Business

a. R125-076-003(H) Dorcey Dormer

Neumann stated he did a review. The dormer is proposed to make room for a bathroom. This property is a non-contributing structure and feels the dormer is fitting. Overall dormers are appropriate features throughout the district. It does meet the standards for review. Dombroski stated they are also removing a skylight and thinks that is more appropriate as well. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Doud, Seconded by Olson.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

b. C25-066-004(H) Mary's Bistro Retractable Awnings

Neumann spoke with Ryan Green regarding the application and got the needed clarification. Neumann stated the application was incomplete and he was confused on the scope of work. Neumann stated the awning shapes are not appropriate. He has done a written review but has not submitted it. The windows are appropriate. The building is non-contributing and guesses the patio is a later addition to the building. As long as the awnings are shed shaped it would be appropriate. Green agreed to that change. If you desire to approve, it should have the stipulation that it

be the shed shaped awning. Doud thinks they should table for the written review like they did for Benser. Motion to table for the official written review.

Motion made by Doud, Seconded by Olson.
Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

c. R325-008-005(H) Doud Shed Roof

This agenda item was not discussed due to the lack of a quorum. It will be moved to the March agenda.

d. CLG Report Input

Evashevski stated this is the Certified Local Government report. Evashevski worked with Rentrop since he worked on it in the past. This is due March 3rd. Evashevski asked if there were any changes they would like to make. Evashevski stated this is also a rough draft so some small changes may still be made. Finkel asked about number 7 at the end. The Commissioners were confused. Doud asked that the statement be stricken, "the entire island should be a historic district", under Misc information. Doud does not like number 7. He does not feel it represents the Commissions feelings. Sehoyan stated as a commercial business owner and developer, he does not like the sentence either. Sehoyan asked if they want to strike the response to number 7 in its entirety. Evashevski stated there has to be a response. The first sentence is fine. Doud suggested a Motion for each sentence. Evashevski stated you could but it sounds like everyone wants the 2nd sentence removed. The third sentence, Doud stated that "many also feel" is not appropriate. Evashevski stated that Rentrop was probably trying to represent what we feel, more than that the historic districts possibly create an obstacle for development and modernization. Dombroski suggested an alternative. Instead of "however many also feel", use "some property owners have expressed concerns". They decided to change "modernize" to "update". Doud feels the word "however" seems negative. The 4th sentence Doud stated could be true. He thinks it is painting the commercial district in a negative light. Evashevski didn't agree. Olson agreed, but we have an opportunity to plant a seed in the new CLG persons mind. It was decided to keep the 4th sentence. The 5th sentence starting with "HDC owners" is to be stricken. The 50 year sentence Doud did not agree with. We have said with Mr B's and Kay's house, were 50 years old but they did not fit. Nancy Mays house is older than 50 years old but does not fit, like Kay's' house. Evashevski clarified that Doud is saying the age is not the factor. Doud stated the 50 year rule is relevant and should be brought up, but is only a starting point. Neumann stated "period of significance" should be considered. Evashevski suggested a change to read something like a period of significance should be considered. Olson stated the sentence sounds like there is tension between the Study Committee and the HDC. Olson doesn't think that is something we want to convey. "Study Committee and HDC typically use the 50 year guideline."

Accomplishments are good. Evashevski is to check to see if the Study Committee charge is still ongoing. If not, that would be removed. Evashevski stated the last sentence means under our Secretary of Interior standards, we have a basis for demolition and one of them is "retaining the building..." that term being used for

demolition is something that the HDC has an issue with for preservation that we are facing right now. If this is used without other basis, it could be an issue for our preservation. Doud stated he thinks that is an HDC decision. Olson believes without context this sentence doesn't make sense. Evashevski suggested without further guidance as to how we can determine if something is not in the best interest, then the use of the criteria is extremely open ended and can create a loop hole. Evashevski stated the issue is, it exists. But there are times that you need that option to work through issues. Neumann stated it can over over used. Doud thinks we should stay away from that comment. Doud would like to strike the last sentence. We as a commission need to meet with SHPO and discuss these things. The Commission agreed to strike the last sentence. Evashevski stated she would reach out to our contact at SHPO to set a meeting when the whole Commission would present.

Education Segment

Neumann stated today he would discuss preservation change. Neumann read aloud his information he provided on preservation change. Sehoyan thanked Neumann and stated that he believes we are doing these things. Doud stated his last point was spot on and a good summary of what the HDC has done. Finkel agreed that this segment was very well done. Doud used an example if Doud's was destroyed would we want to rebuild. Many parts of SHPO say we should not, but we the HDC would like to. Neumann stated there are many radical modern designs being done in historic areas. He isn't sure if they are official districts but modern radical changes are being done. This will be a future segment to discuss. Doud commented on the SHPO thing that in the past we were in danger of losing our national landmark, and rightly so. We gave Main Street, East End and Market Street. That is all that was asked and that was good. We also go to Secretary of Interior Standards for 85% of the rest of the island. Our footprint is larger than any city in America, if you consider the state park as well. Doud believes we did the East End study properly. We took our time and decided it is an historic district. The thought that SHPO was upset with parts of the way we were doing things he heard from staff, but not SHPO. We gave everything asked and now suddenly there are new things and fear of things we needed to do, and Doud did not agree with this. Doud would like to discuss the process for creating a new district with SHPO. He thinks we have done really well and looks forward to the conversation with SHPO. Sehoyan agrees feedback from SHPO would be great so we don't do something or move in a direction that isn't good.

XI. Public Comment

None.

XII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:24.

Motion made by Doud, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Olson

Alan Sehoyan, Chair

Katie Pereny, Secretary