

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND
MINUTES

**PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING HOUSING
FOCUSED ZONING AMENDMENTS**

Tuesday, January 13, 2026 at 12:00 PM

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

I. Call to Order

Acting Chairman Finkel called the meeting to order at 12:02 PM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT

Trish Martin

Jim Pettit

Anneke Myers

Mary Dufina

Lee Finkel

ABSENT

Michael Straus

Staff: David Lipovski, Erin Evashevski (via Zoom)

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Myers.

Voting Yea: Martin, Pettit, Myers, Dufina, Finkel

V. Committee Reports

None

VI. Old Business

a. Housing Focused Zoning Amendments Draft

Adam Young presented an updated, dated draft, dated December 16, 2025, based on discussion from the last meeting. The changes made are under definitions, corral, page 23 accessory building and cargo containers being used for storage which is prohibited with a couple of exceptions for construction or a trailer permit was issued, page 42, R3 residential district, F, 2 language was kept in the draft, and minimum lot size and width in R4. Young presented a map reflecting all lot sizes. It was suggested to change the minimum size to 5000 square feet, which is the same as R3. Changing

to 5000 square feet would mean a good number of properties would become conforming. Pettit likes the 5000 square feet because it makes almost everyone in compliance. Septic systems were discussed and Myers pointed out the septic requirements are part of our Ordinance. David Jurcak pointed out ^{some of} the lots on 4th street are zoned Commercial. Young acknowledged this. Young stated if 5000 is the size, he recommends reducing the width to 50 feet to match the R3 sizes. Another amendment is on page 72, PUD minimum size for eligibility. Presently the required size is 2 acres of contiguous land. The proposed change is 1 acre. Young provided a map analyzing all properties on the island to see how many existing properties are 2 acres or more. Myers read the PUD section aloud. Dufina suggested leaving it the way it is now, since 19A allows for the reduction, for flexibility. Young stated that actually doesn't apply here. He stated that IF you are eligible, you may request a smaller area, but you would need to have the 2 acres. For example, a PUD development may request 4000 sq ft lots if they are part of a total of 2 acres. Myers asked for housing PUD examples for their better understanding. Young stated mixed use development that has commercial on ground floor, residential on top and something else in the back part. Another example could be some civic space as part of a development. Pettit asked about the argument made last month for zero minimum size. Young stated he agrees the process to get a PUD approved is expensive, but a size line needs to be drawn at some point. Dufina asked if variances are allowed for PUD sizes. Young stated no. This does not fall under ZBA review. This represents a change to zoning, and rezoning is not under the jurisdiction of the ZBA. Pettit likes the idea of making the minimum smaller to please the public that had requested it last month. Myers stated maybe if we reduce to one acre we will see more people applying for a PUD. Most of the provisions in 19A have to do with the environment. Dufina asked how density is calculated. Myers stated a PUD allows for 35% more than the underlying district allows. Lipovsky likes the 1 acre because it allows for more housing. If the property doesn't have any unique features and has no benefit to the community, a PUD would not be approved on that property. Dufina does not see a reason to change to 1 acre. Myers stated she understands her misgivings, but in this exercise, we are trying to achieve more housing and is in favor of the change to 1 acre. The majority of commissioners in attendance are in favor of the change to 1 acre. Young stated he will add that to the draft. Young asked if there are any other changes? None noted. Myers asked for progress from here. Young stated the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Council to adopt the proposed changes. Evashevski stated this was posted as a special meeting and not as a hearing, so you can make the motion here. Pettit confirmed that the Planning Commission has done everything that they were supposed to do. Young confirmed yes. Evashevski stated it would be better to vote in the regular meeting. Young stated in the regular meeting, it would be a motion to recommend to City Council that they adopt the proposed amendment, dated December 16, 2025.

VII. New Business

None

VIII. Public Comment


None

IX. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 12:54.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Dufina.

Voting Yea: Martin, Pettit, Myers, Dufina, Finkel



Lee Finkel, Acting Chairman



Katie Pereny, Secretary