

# CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

## MINUTES

### HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, October 08, 2024 at 1:00 PM

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

---

#### **I. Call to Order**

Finkel called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM.

#### **II. Roll Call**

PRESENT

Andrew Doud

Lee Finkel

Lorna Straus

Nancy Porter

Peter Olson

Shannon Schueller

Staff: Erin Evashevski, Richard Neumann

ABSENT

Alan Sehoyan

#### **III. Pledge of Allegiance**

#### **IV. Adoption of Agenda**

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Straus, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

#### **V. Approval of Minutes**

a. September 10, 2024

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

## **VI. Correspondence**

None

## **VII. Committee Reports**

- a. Demolition Application Committee

Motion to table until November.

Motion made by Doud, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

## **VIII. Staff Report**

None

## **IX. Old Business**

- a. HDC Legal Counsel Discussion

Evashevski reached out to Steve Fox and she stated he seemed nice. Evashevski noted he does not have specific HDC experience but does have historic preservation experience. Evashevski thinks he would be great. Fox has some hesitation because he has a busy practice and would like more information on what the job would entail. Evashevski stated that Fox would make himself available to attend next months meeting if they would like. Doud asked if we know, as a group, what we want to hire. Doud thinks we still need to define the position. As a commission we should discuss what we want legal to be. Schueller thinks that is part of the hiring process. Porter thinks we are looking for a more limited role than Rentrop. Porter would like someone we can go to for questions but not drive the bus. Porter stated that Rentrop was making his own agenda and the new lawyer would be more transparent with what he would do. Finkel likes what Schueller said. He thinks it is an effective method to have the applicant define the job. Olson stated at some point there was discussion on a subcommittee for this issue. Straus thinks if he has experience, she thinks it would be interesting and relevant to describe to the HDC two cases he has been involved in and the way he resolved them. We need to know what he is like, not just what he will tell us in a blank slate situation. Straus would like a couple of histories. Olson agrees but he would like to hear some positives of what Rentrop did. Evashevski stated in terms of Fox, he does not have any experience with an HDC commission. She thinks what Straus suggested is a good idea. She would be happy to give him an idea of what the HDC is looking for so he is prepared for a discussion. Another aspect is that the City Council is the body that hires and

appoints the attorney. It might be a good idea for Sehoyan to carry the information to City Council but we can also send a letter to City Council letting them know Fox will be here, in the event they want to meet him as well. Neumann stated he has no idea on Fox's background, but he would guess that his experience is with historic easements and historic tax credit. Evashevski stated she thinks that is correct. Finkel asked if she thought that was a problem and Evashevski stated she didn't think so. Straus would like Fox to tell us what he knows and does not know. Doud stated that he agrees we should put together questions for Fox. Olson asked if we could each provide questions to the chair to forward to Evashevski but also make it clear that he has freedom to explain his experience. Motion by Doud to put together questions for the next meeting. Motion died due to lack of support. Olson asked if we want to form a committee. Motion that each member provide some questions to Evashevski, for Fox to answer at the next meeting. The deadline for questions is next week. (October 18)

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

b. HB24-041-016 Jaquiss Amendment

Porter left the chambers. James Murray stated that the Resolution passed last month is rock solid. Murray turned it over to Ryan Spencer for the amendment. Spencer stated we submitted some documents that were not correct and new documents were sent yesterday. He believes he and Neumann have an understanding on what is going on. Neumann stated there were significant departures from what the HDC approved. Much more than minor window change. Neumann listed the changes in his review. Neumann stated that the Spencer drawings are incomplete. Final drawings will reflect the approved. Some examples of changes are the grade and the foundation. In addition there are some significant changes to front of house. One is to eliminate the third floor so roof in back is 2' lower. In so doing the roof on west side is now in same roof plane which detracts from the idea that we are trying to replicate historic front of house. Another concern of Neumann's, in relocating chimney (which he doesn't think is a problem) now three new windows are added to the two existing windows. This makes a bank of 5 windows in a row which is very inappropriate. The tower windows at top have been reduced to one window. Spencer stated this was not a requested change and somehow was carried over from original submittal. Neumann further stated the back part of house has a lot of window changes. He does not think significant departures from what was approved. The bay window at the kitchen is a shed roof rectilinear bay window. Spencer stated he now understands it should be an angled window. Neumann's opinion is that the changes do not meet the Standards for Review. Finkel asked Spencer for a response but he wanted him to know that approval was not approved cart blanche and put this very much in question that this could happen at all if you're not able to comply with Neumann's suggestions in a very high degree. Spencer stated he will work with Neumann to comply. Engineers are looking at stepping down the roof and will step up the new roof. The windows on tower will be

corrected to the approved. The window mullions will be changed back to one cross member. The bay window will be framed onsite. With Neumanns guidance, he has no problems with Neumanns list. Doud asked to look at each elevation. Finkel stated the plans are not complete and would be a waste of time. Olson stated there seems to be some difficulty with the new and old documents. It seems to him we should trust the relationship with Spencer and Neumann or ask to see the real deal. Finkel stated they can withdraw the amendment. Murray stated either approve or table. Doud asked Neumann about the South elevation, three windows going back to one, and height issues with grade. Olson interrupted stating the commission is not in agreement with going over each plan. Finkel stated the application is incomplete and it would be counterproductive to consider hypothetical plans. Doud noted the 60 day time clock. Olson stated the burden is on the applicant to provide the plans. Doud thinks they are messing with discussion. Olson stated not at all. Murray stated that Spencer used the wrong plans to come up with the amendment. Given that, Murray thinks it is best to table and come back next month with complete plans. Motion to postpone the discussion for the amendment to next meeting subject to receipt of complete plans. Dombroski asked if the clock can start next meeting. Murray agreed and stated he would put in writing. Evashevski stated if commission doesn't act today we still have until next month. if the HDC is not ready next month, then an extension will be needed.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Olson, Schueller

Voting Abstaining: Porter

Porter returned to the table.

## **X. New Business**

### **a. CD24-025-064(H) McKeon Patio and Fire Pit**

Doug Darga stated he was asked to design a patio fire pit area. Darga now knows how to proceed in the future with projects in an historic district. Finkel asked if this type work is allowed. Dombroski stated the flower stuff is landscaping and not permanent. The patio and fire pit are in the same category as bird baths and things reviewed in the past. Due to the size he asked Darga to submit a Zoning permit for lot coverage as well. Neumann stated it meets standards 2 and 9, which are the applicable standards to this type of project. Straus asked if we are dealing with 2 or 1 issues. Straus believes we need legal advice on enormous projects in a historic district. Straus was troubled and puzzled why it had never come to HDC. Straus asked if we are we dealing with the fact that this is a change in a historic district in Annex that did not go through this committee. Dombroski stated Darga did pay the penalty fees. Dombroski stated the penalty is assigned by the HDC to assess if work is done without a permit. Straus stated she was not told the penalty was paid and she thinks that is relevant. Straus believes that when penalties are assessed the Commission should be informed. Dombroski stated this would not be reported in the

Staff Report. A member just needs to ask Dombroski or Pereny if a penalty has been paid. Then issue two is "the" issue. Darga stated the project is not complete. Straus stated she wasn't aware it was not complete. Neumann stated he was not aware and wants to make sure there are not other elements involved. Darga stated there are just 8 stones that need to be cemented around the fire ring. Everything else is complete. Doud stated landscaping in the future will be easier for Darga now that he knows. Doud asked Dombroski how he feels about letting him finish without presenting formal plans. Neumann stated he is still ok with the project and it still meets the two standards. Doud asked how Straus feels about this. Straus stated she is ok with it. Dombroski stated there is a lot of case-by-case merit you need to address when making the decision to continue or not continue. To keep it consistent he thinks the stop work order was the right thing to tell him. Doud agrees and wonders if Dombroski is comfortable with allowing him to proceed. Schueller asked if homeowners don't know if permits have been pulled how do we help the contractors. Dombroski said call the office. Doud asked when can landscaping be done without permission. Dombroski stated it has to do with impervious surfaces. Raised structures, like the fire pit, need to be approved. Motion to approve the project given Neumann's positive review. Straus added regarding the question for when and how to know. The Annex has an association to which all homeowners belong that has regular meetings and minutes so in the future it would not be inappropriate to inquire if Annex was aware of a project.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

b. C24-042-065(H) Doud Hotel

Doud stepped down from the table

Doud summarized the Doud building change. There will be a window placement and back elevation changes. The awning will come off and the porch will be different. The siding on the first floor will be removed and replaced with wood siding. The windows will be changed. The back stair case will be removed and the fire exit on the east side is being removed. The park side of building will be cleaned up. Doud stated this is a three year project. Doud hopes to get to the outside next year. The wheel chair lift will be on the park side. Neumann stated overall all work does meet the standards for review. The front facade will stay exactly as it was and the alley and west side will be improved. The park side inappropriate windows will be replaced with double hung windows. The renovation of Nadias storefront entrance is the biggest change, to a covered porch. The side closer to Main Street will remove the inappropriate awnings. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson.

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

Voting Abstaining: Doud

Doud returned to the table.

**XI. Public Comment**

None

**XII. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn 2:21

Motion made by Doud, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Doud, Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller

---

Lee Finkel, Chair

---

Katie Pereny, Secretary