

MACKINAC ISLAND

PLANNING COMMISSION ★ HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ★ BUILDING DEPARTMENT

April 15, 2026

City of Mackinac Island City Council
Mayor Margaret M. Doud
City Council Members

Dear Mackinac Island City Council,

At the public hearing of the Mackinac Island Planning Commission, April 14, 2026 at 12:30 p.m. , the commission took written and verbal comments on the proposed amendment to Ordinance 479, Article 22, Section 1, Section 22.01

There was 1 written comment.

At the regular meeting of the Mackinac Island Planning Commission held on Tuesday, April 14, 2016, at 1:00 p.m., there was a motion made and supported to recommend to the City Council to recommend the approval of the proposed amendment. The vote was all yeas, in support of the motion, from the five (5) members present.

The Commission wanted to suggest some other items for you to consider in related to this amendment.

- 1 – Adopt procedures for the ZBA alternate member appointment process.
- 2 – How alternates will be used
- 3 – Recommend an odd number of members to avoid a tie scenario. The Commission suggested possibly 5 members, and if allowed by the Zoning Enabling Act, 5 City Council members.

Sincerely,



Katie Pereny
Mackinac Island Planning Commission Secretary

enclosure

Katie Pereny

From: Neal Liddicoat <nliddicoat@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:38 PM
To: Katie Pereny
Subject: Planning Commission Public Hearing re: Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Katie –

I have several questions regarding the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance addressing the makeup of the Board of Zoning Appeals (commonly referred to as the Zoning Board of Appeals). I am submitting these in advance of the April 14, 2026, Planning Commission public hearing so that they can be addressed at that time.

1. The original draft of the amendment specifically stated that the alternates would be the elected city supervisor and the elected city assessor. Based on Ordinance Committee input, this requirement has been removed. Is it still the unstated intent that the alternates would be elected officials?
2. The amendment states that the two alternate members will serve, “. . . for the same term as regular members.” However, the regular members are the members of City Council, who serve for rotating three-year terms, with two members being up for election (or reelection) each year. As such, there are three separate terms that apply to the City Council at any given time. Which of those terms would apply to the alternate members?
3. Who will determine that an alternate member is needed at any particular meeting?
 - a. The Planning Commission chair?
 - b. The city attorney?
 - c. The mayor?
 - d. A vote of the Planning Commission as a whole?
4. When will the determination that an alternate is needed be made?
5. When it is determined that an alternate is needed, which alternate will be appointed? Who will make this decision? (Will they be designated as Alternate No. 1 and Alternate No. 2?)

Please transmit these questions to the members of the Planning Commission as well as to Erin Evashevski for their consideration.

My hope is that by addressing these details at this time, future uncertainty will be avoided.

Thanks.

Neal Liddicoat