

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ZONING ORD TEXT AMENDMENTS

Monday, December 08, 2025 at 2:00 PM

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

I. Call to Order

Chairman Straus called the Public Hearing to order at :01 PM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT

Trish Martin

Jim Pettit

Michael Straus

Mary Dufina

Lee Finkel

ABSENT

Anneke Myers

Staff: Erin Evashevski, David Lipovsky, Adam Young

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Dufina.

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

V. Correspondence

a. Letter from Jim Spoor

Straus read the letter aloud. Motion to place on file.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Dufina.

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

b. Letter from Cathy Arbib

Straus read the letter aloud. Motion to place on file.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Finkel.

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

VI. Old Business

a. Zoning Ordinance Draft For Review

Adam Young summarized where we are in the process. Young stated that we have been working on this since the spring. Language tweaks have been done based on the recently adopted Master Plan and current housing issues. Young stated we have had monthly meetings to discuss, conducted stakeholder meetings and had a public workshop. This afternoon is the official public hearing to gain additional public comments on the draft dated 11/21/25. Young summarized the revisions since the November meeting.

Straus opened the floor to the commissioners regarding the changes. Dufina asked about definitions and that corral and public corral be stated differently, to keep in alphabetical order. Dufina suggested listing private and public, under Corral. Dufina asked about connex boxes and pods. She asked about moving pods. Straus stated those are allowed on a temporary basis. Young stated that language doesn't specifically address moving. Lipovsky stated the vehicle permit that is required does ask for time parameters. Lipovsky is to email the exact language to Young so he can add.

Straus opened the floor to the public. Andrew Doud, R4 area, was there a study as to how many lots there are? By eyesight the 10k square foot minimum size makes a lot of the lots non-conforming. Doud asked if we could correct that? Doud then asked if Article 5 on page 38, does that comply to all? Or just R3. Young stated it applies to all non-conforming uses and structures across the entire city. Doud personally would like to ask for more time to review the proposed changes.

Angel Callewaert stated she has some concerns on page 38, intent, pointed out areas of confusion. Section 5.01 are we saying current non-conforming uses could be revoked? If so, who decides that? Callewaert is confused by the last sentence in this section. B 5.07 regarding discontinuing use of non-conforming use 5.04 B, conflicts with 5.07 C. What happens to the people that bought property with the knowledge that they could do a special land use. Will they be grandfathered in? Evashevski stated there is no limitation on non-conforming use. But if two years goes by, it is considered abandoned. Between 5.07 c and 5.04 b, Young stated 5.04b non-conforming structure, damaged or destroyed it can't exceed present size when rebuilding. 5.07 c is non-conforming USE and can continue in a repaired structure. This is based on the courts determining that the city must prove that there is intent by the owner to abandon the use. This change establishes a procedure. If a use has been established that is not normally allowed, per state law the use may continue. Callewaert does not believe the draft has been studied enough. Another concern is 5.04 a repair cost only allowed up to 50% of the total cost. Young stated the last sentence was added to help with this. It only applies to single family homes. Evashevski stated the only change in 5.04 was to allow for single family structures not to have to comply with the 50% rule. This is only for modernization or improvements, not based on damage. Straus stated we have been working on this for 10 months and this is the 2nd or 3rd hearing. So to say you have only had 48 hours to review is not accurate. Callewaert stated the delay is not the commission's fault.

James Murray commented on the PUD but feels the size requirement is too high. Murray doesn't know why we would take away that flexibility. Also, in condominium, asking why PUD is added there. Per the Zoning Enabling Act, there is nothing that gives the commission the right to control condos. Murray state the commission should be mindful of what you are doing with condo acts that is beyond the Zoning Enabling Act. Young stated that in regards to PUD and 2 acres, this has been discussed and after a few different changes ended up with that. If the commission is ok with it, he is ok with reducing the lot size. In regards to condo, the only reason that sentence is added is to provide the flexibility if a PUD is proposed. Straus asked if Young thought the wording should be changed. Young does not think so. Steve Moskwa stated in regards to R4, 10k lot size he is not in agreement with. You are changing that residential area to non-conforming. Moskwa would like to see the number of non-conforming structures in R4.

Doud asked if Special land use has been brought to Joe Stakoe to see if land value would be changed. Straus does not think so. Doud would like to have a professional's opinion on the value.

Straus opened up to people on zoom. David Jurcak stated his concern is affordability on housing. If not allowed to build boardinghouse it could drive prices higher and higher if they need to buy the homes. Jurcak wants to know the negative impact on this change. Jurcak then asked what the process is after today. Straus stated it will be voted on at a Planning Commission meeting.

Straus turned it back to the commission. Pettit stated he was not aware of the 10K square foot creating so many non-conforming lots. So maybe this is a change we should discuss before presenting to the Council. Straus asked the commissioners if they have a square footage they would be more comfortable with. Young stated as part of this process minimum lot size was not looked at but this is a valid point and this is a good time to make a change. Young stated he is looking at the GIS and it is clear most lots are less than the 10K. Straus agrees. Limiting the lot size back to what exists makes more sense. Straus asked if 1 acre for PUD is acceptable? Young thinks it is a good start. As far as a professional opinion on value, Straus feels he thinks value will go up, but Doud disagrees and says it could go either way. Callewaert stated we need housing for the businesses as well as full time residents. Martin stated one of our concerns over the past year is business owners taking housing over retail and turning it into hotel rooms and then moving employees up to Village. This isn't fair. Martin does have a hard time with the argument Callewaert is presenting.

Jurcak stated there are issues with the current high density areas, but those spaces are already maxed in density.

Straus asked if the Commission wants to make any more changes for Young. Pettit stated the PUD size and the minimum lot size in Harrisonville of 5000 square feet seems like a pretty good number. Young stated he can do an analysis on the lot sizes in Harrisonville and get to us by December 9. PUD size - Murray recommended no minimum or asking a Planner. You can always deny if you don't like it. Young agrees we would like a number based on practicality and appropriateness. A PUD requires a somewhat larger lot size. Young suggests 15000 square feet. Straus asked if the commission had an opinion on contacting the city assessor for property values. Evashevski doubts it will be a quick turn around and not sure it is necessary.

We have heard differing opinions today on whether it will increase or decrease the value. Straus stated we are trying to follow the master plan. Our job is mostly to do with following the master plan.

Pete, a 16-year resident, has lived in employee housing for 16 years. In your deliberations consider when anyone wants to come in and make improvements to housing it is important to note that with the right management, you aren't even aware employees live there.

Cathy Arbib stated her big objection is that Harrisonville has become a dumping ground for employee housing. The biggest problem is density. Having a project that is 4 times the allowed density is wrong. People would really like to have the opportunity to buy property on the island. Extremely high density is wrong and should not be allowed. Arbib suggested tightening the wording to allow for only employee housing downtown instead of allowing condos.

Young stated he will respond back to the Planning Commission with the additional information talked about today. The process is now the Planning Commission may continue discussion, consider revisions and ultimately make a recommendation to City Council. Once that recommendation is made the draft is sent to City Council for final adoption. Evashevski stated in R3 based on our discussion, we didn't intend to take out the provision about density limitation. Part 3 was in conjunction with part 2. After further discussion item E covered her concern of mixed-use density. Evashevski would like to look further at this. Young stated it mirrors how it is structured in the other sections. He will take a look at it and make sure it is appropriate. Doud stated he would like more time to look at today's changes, in writing, before the Planning Commission makes any recommendations to City Council.

Motion to adjourn at 3:25PM.

Motion made by Pettit, Seconded by Martin.

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

VII. New Business

None

VIII. Public Comment

None

IX. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the Public Hearing at 3:25 PM.

Motion made by Martin, Seconded by Finkel.

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