

# CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

## MINUTES

### HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, February 10, 2026 at 10:00 AM

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

---

#### I. Call to Order

Chairman Finkel called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM.

#### II. Roll Call

##### PRESENT

Lee Finkel

Nancy Porter

Peter Olson

Lindsey White

Rick Linn

##### ABSENT

Lorna Straus

Shannon Schueller

Staff: David Lipovsky, Erin Evashevski, Richard Neumann

#### III. Pledge of Allegiance

#### IV. Approval of Minutes

a. January 13, 2026

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by White, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Porter, Olson, White, Linn

#### V. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by White, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Porter, Olson, White, Linn

#### VI. Correspondence

None.

#### VII. Committee Reports

None.

## **VIII. Staff Report**

None.

## **IX. Old Business**

### **a. CLG Report Review**

Pereny asked the commission for their input on the report. Olson said he would like to continue the pattern to have the architect talk to applicants prior to approval. A goal is to continue with continuing education. Evashevski suggested we review policies and procedures; for example, statues being reviewed. Finkel brought up the subject of the review of colors. The HDC previously decided they did not want to review colors. Finkel asked if the commission still agrees with that? Porter stated color is historic. Finkel pointed out there are some colors prohibited by the City. Olson wondered if Neumann had some kind of historic color database. Neumann stated there is a database available, but that both the Planning Commission and Historic District Commission did not review, in the past, as long as the colors were not outlandish. If the HDC did review it would be subjective for sure. Neumann stated he could gather information as to what Mackinac Island colors were historic. Finkel stated that could be like stepping in to a left hook. Neumann spoke about the history of colors in the area. Neumann stated you could hold a public meeting of some sort to make the public more aware of colors. Pereny will pull some information from last year's goals and add the topics noted today.

## **X. New Business**

### **a. C26-044-002(H) Chippewa Hotel Add 3 Windows**

Roy Shryock stated they would like to install 3 windows in the rooms overlooking the hot tub. Those four rooms share a walkway so there is no privacy. The idea is to give them privacy with a window so the 6' doorwall could remain covered. Shryock stated they would like to give our customers something back by providing privacy. The windows are Anderson double hung windows. Shryock believes the new windows will disappear. He is aware it will change the look of an historic building. Finkel clarified it is to allow curtains in the room. Shryock stated there are curtains on the doorwall but the window would allow the customer to open the window and retain privacy. Neumann stated these are small insignificant windows but these windows would be at odds with the historic placement of existing windows. It would be a small erosion of the historic integrity of the building. This could have a huge negative effect. Shryock stated they are not trying to modernize any trims. The building was completely remodeled in 1995 and has been changed 5 times since it was built. The proposed windows are modern but fit in.

Porter left the table at 10:25 am.

Neumann stated the doorwalls that are there now are certainly not original. Typically, the dormers and mansard roof, line up with the roof line. White pointed out if the windows were ever removed, it would be easy to revert to the current design. Linn stated the windows are right next to the ones that already have a problem. Shryock stated the doorwalls go all the way to the floor. The windows would allow for more privacy. Neumann stated historically double hung windows were tall and narrow. The short proportion does not look appropriate. The proposed look like casement

windows but historically were in- swinging. In this application it would not work. Evashevski clarified what Neumann means by his statement. Would the casement change the vertical and horizontal look. The fact that they are short and double hung, and do not line up with anything above, make them look odd. Linn asked if they make some kind of dutch door curtain where half of the doorwall curtain could be opened and have the same result as a window. Shryock reiterated that he believes these windows would not be obvious. Lipovsky asked if he could get a bigger window but Shryock stated they already are large 36x32. Any taller would make a window that anyone can look in. Neumann thinks going narrower would help the proportionate look; maybe 24". Olson asked Neumann about the balance of which period we select that controls the architectural style. What point do we use to reference the history of the building. Neumann stated the greatest period of significance is what is used by the National Register. Neumann agrees the bayside of the building has had the most changes and maybe less historical integrity. Olson stated in the modern pictures taken from the water the thing that sticks out the most is the part that projects out. Neumann stated historic preservation is to maintain buildings and allow for changes that are the most in keeping with the original design and historical significance. Porter stated that it would be very difficult to do curtains like that. Olson clarified that the three rooms have lost square footage due to the Pony store expansion. White stated the doorwalls present a safety concern as well. White confirmed it is not an egress concern. Shryock stated he could go with a narrower window. Lipovsky stated the 2'x3' would be better and Neumann agreed that would be better as well. Motion to approve with the adjustment of the double hung window size to 2'x3' as discussed at the meeting.

Motion made by White, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Olson, White, Linn

Voting Abstaining: Porter

b. C26-044-003(H) Verizon Antenna Replacement on Chippewa Hotel

Porter back to table at 10:54 am.

Amy Rodriguez was on Zoom representing Verizon. There are existing antennas and they want to add 3 antennas to improve service. This will minimally change the roof line, and there are no changes to historic building. The new antennas will be mounted on the roof. Evashevski asked if they have SHPO approval. Evashevski referred to the old approval from SHPO that noted that any changes would need new SHPO approval. Rodriguez stated that is another department that does the regulatory approvals. Rodriguez stated that Section 106 and 110f approval appears it will take too long to do the work before the season starts. So there is time to get the SHPO approval. Evashevski recommended tabling this until the required approvals come through. Evashevski asked for something in writing with the Chippewa owners approval of this project. Evashevski would like to see a little more information on this. Shryock stated the proposed changes are of no concern to him or the owners. Evashevski stated she would just like that in writing. Shryock will provide that. Olson asked if Verizon pays a fee to Chippewa and Shryock confirmed they do. Rodriguez stated an amendment to the agreement is being worked on now. Motion to table for Section 106 and 110f, and any necessary SHPO approvals.

Evashevski asked how long she is expecting to wait for approvals. Rodriguez asked that we table until they get it, or in two meetings. White asked if this will disrupt

service. Rodriguez stated no. Neumann asked about the added antennas. Rodriguez stated the additional are for the seaband. Evashevski confirmed the new antennas will be visible from the water side but not Main Street. Evashevski stated we have a timeline of 60 days to review. Evashevski asked the applicant to send an email agreeing to extending the timeline for the approval by the HDC. Rodriguez will send an email to Pereny after she double checks with Verizon.

Motion made by White, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Porter, Olson, White, Linn

## **XI. Public Comment**

None.

## **XII. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn at 11:04 AM.

Motion made by White, Seconded by Olson.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Porter, Olson, White, Linn