CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 08, 2025 at 1:00 PM City Hall – Council Chambers, 7358 Market St., Mackinac Island, Michigan

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Pledge of Allegiance
- **IV.** Approval of Minutes
 - a. June 10, 2025
- V. Adoption of Agenda
- VI. Correspondence
- **VII.** Committee Reports
- VIII. Staff Report
 - a. C25-016-046(H) 7279 Main Railing & Gate Replacement
- IX. Old Business
 - a. MD25-067-044(H) Schunk Fence and Railing Replacement

X. New Business

- a. MD25-067-049(H) Schunk Roof
- b. MD25-067-050(H) Schunk Fence Replacement
- c. MD25-069-054(H) Doud Change of Use and Alteration for Home to Hotel
- d. HB25-092-056(H) Mackinac Cycle Doors and Awning
- e. C25-024-019-057(H) MIPD Security Cameras
- XI. Public Comment
- XII. Adjournment

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

MINUTES

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 10, 2025 at 1:00 PM City Hall – Council Chambers, 7358 Market St., Mackinac Island, Michigan

I. Call to Order

Chairman Finkel called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT Lee Finkel Lorna Straus Nancy Porter Peter Olson Shannon Schueller Lindsey White Rick Linn

Staff: David Lipovsky, Dennis Dombroski, Erin Evashevski, Richard Neumann

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve as written.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Finkel. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

V. Approval of Minutes

a. May 13, 2025

Motion to approve as amended. Amendments are to add Chair name in "Call to Order" and clarifying "back side of dock" under "Shepler's Dock Traffic Flow Equipment"

Motion made by Straus, Seconded by Porter. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

VI. Correspondence

None.

VII. Committee Reports

None.

VIII. Staff Report

a. Job Status Report

Finkel stated the additions to Gatehouse marked "not been started", have been done. Motion to place on file.

Motion made by Straus, Seconded by Porter. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

b. MD25-030-038(H) Window Casing Replacement

Lipovsky stated this was for like for like repairs. Motion to approve the Staff Report.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Schueller. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

IX. Old Business

a. MD23-011-072(H) Lenox Handrail Amendment

Lipovsky stated this is a new code compliant white painted metal handrail to blend in with the building. Neumann did a favorable review. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Straus. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

X. New Business

a. C25-027-039(H) Trayser Big Store Flat Roof

Lipovsky stated the roof was leaking in numerous areas. This became a health and safety issue. The roof was replaced with a commercial grade rubber roof. Same color but different material. Neumann gave a favorable review. Dombroski stated normally this would come to the table but due to the safety issue leaking over the electric panel, they deemed it needed to get done sooner rather than later. Straus wants it on the record that yes we follow rules carefully but on occasion there are times that rules need to be bent a little. This is what we count on Dombroski and Lipovsky to do. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Straus. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

b. CD25-027-041(H) Trivisonno Barn Porch Board Replacement

Lee Sauvageau summarized the project as replacing the front and rear porch boards on the deck on upstairs. The wood was not holding paint, rotting, and not safe to walk on. The applicant would like to use a composite material and paint. Schueller asked if boards are the same size. Sauvageau said a 1/4" larger. Motion to approve. Motion made by Schueller, Seconded by Olson. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

Straus commented that it is helpful when we are told exact dimensions. We have to be careful that what the applicant says and what we approve are identical. Straus would like the application to be specific.

c. R325-017-042(H) Mackinac Island Bible Church Porch and Steps

The applicant spoke to Pereny and he has agreed to use the material suggested by Neumann which is Azek tongue and groove. Motion to approve contingent on tongue and groove composite material, as recommended by Neumann, be used.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by White. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

d. MD25-067-044(H) Schunk Fence and Railing Replacement

Lindsey Shunk stated they want to replace the fence and 2nd story balcony. Material is the same. The new style will be straight. They would like to remove the trellis. Neumann did a favorable review on the fence. Lipovsky stated the new rail system will meet current code and does meet the Standards for Review. Olson noted that the railing is not part of the review. Neumann feels the railing is a historic detail that matches something on the front of house but didn't have enough information to make a call on the railing. Motion to approve the fence replacement and addition and table the house railing for further information to then be reviewed. Olson would like to separate the two items. Evashevski stated she believes the Motion on the table accomplishes that. Straus stated the scalloping is significant to the fence is 38 years old. Olson withdrew his motion. Motion to split the discussion into two pieces; the fence and the porch railing.

Motion made by Olson, Seconded by Finkel. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

Motion by Olson, second by Finkel to approve the fence as presented by the applicant. Neumann gave a favorable review. Further discussion before the vote revealed that the Commission members felt strongly that the scalloped design should remain. Removing the scallop would be a departure from what is there. Schunk stated they wanted something a little shorter. They wanted a center gate instead of the trellis. They picked the style from another house in the historic district. Finkel asked if they would consider keeping the scallop design. Schunk stated she would rather not. Straus stated the proposed is more than a "little bit" of change. Porter stated she doesn't think we can force them to do the scallops. Neumann did do a favorable review. It was noted that the Commission members opinion is subjective and not historical. Linn asked how much it would cost to repair while this is debated. Schunk did not know. Several pieces were broken off in the ice storm. Roll call vote: Ayes: White, Porter. Nays: Finkel, Straus, Schueller, Olson, Linn. Motion fails. Motion by Straus, second by Olson to table the railing for further information. Neumann

wants more comprehensive photos that show where it is and shots around the house showing how it fits with other railings around the house. Neumann stated that a layer of plexiglass could be installed on the inside to meet code. Roll call vote: Ayes: Finkel, White, Porter, Straus, Schueller, Olson, Linn. All in favor. Motion carries.

e. RS25-046-045(H) Gilmer Shed

Tamara Burns stated the Gilmers would like some storage space on their lot. The lot is quite small so they found a spot on the building with no windows to attach a 9'x12' shed. The same materials as the house would be used. Schueller asked if there is anything there now. Burns stated no and she thought there was a trellis against the house. Straus asked if it will be more visible from the street. Burns stated no. The owners would like to use the shed for storage of snowmobiles, ladders, etc. Neumann gave a favorable review. It fits in well and there is a wall it can fit in to without altering the resource. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Olson. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

XI. Public Comment

None

XII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 2:07 PM.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Finkel. Voting Yea: Finkel, Straus, Porter, Olson, Schueller, White, Linn

Straus acknowledged the two new HDC members; Rick Linn and Lindsey White.

Lee Finkel, Chairman

Katie Pereny, Secretary

GENERAL APPLICATION FOR WORK LOCATED WITHIN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Section VIII, Itema.

- Minor Work (Complete Section A and refer to General Directions)
- New Construction (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item B)
 - Demolition (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item C)

B	-	63		<u> </u>	V	T
		JUN	- 2	2	025	Commence of the second
					-	

X

Application Deadline: Application and materials must be completed and submitted by 4:00 p.m. ten (10) business days before each Commission Meeting. Late applications will be placed on the agenda for the following month. Decision by the Commission will not necessarily occur at the meeting at which the pplication materials are first received,

MINOR WORK OCATION: (Number) (Street) Property Tax ID # **PROPERTY OWNER** Name: Email Address: Address: nac (Street) (City) (State) (Zip) Telephone: (Home) (Business) (Fax) APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR Name: SMI poat Email Address: Address: (Street (City) Telephone: (Home) (Business) (Fax) acing 19 + gate

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction c

	S MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531
/	SIGNATURES File No. C25. 016.046(H) Signature Signature Signature Exhibit A Please Print Name Berte Print Name 6-2-25
	NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical samples, etc., become the property of the HDC/City of Mackinac Island. These hay be returned to the applicant upon request after they are no longer needed by the Commission/City.
	RETURN THIS FORM AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO: MACKINAC ISLAND BUILDING OFFICIAL 7358 MARKET STREET, MACKINAC ISLAND, MI 49757 PHONE: (906) 847-4035
	File Number: CZS: 0/16-046 (4) Date Received: 6.2.25 Fee: 925- Received By: Alereny Work Completed Date:

6















50			、 、		Section IX, Itema.
		tion A and refer to General Direction			
		e Section B and refer to General Di			
		on B and refer to General Direction		president and the second second second	and the second
Applic	ation Deadline: Application	and materials must be completed a	nd submitted by 4:00 p	.m. ten (10)	M BIVIE
busines	ss days before each Commis	sion Meeting. Late applications v	vill be placed on the ager	nda for the	
followi	ng month. Decision by the Co	ommission will not necessarily occ	ur at the meeting at whic	h the UNY O	7 0005
applica	tion materials are first receive	ed.		MATZ	7 2025
	NOD MODIF				JE
A) ML	NOR WORK			1	K
PROPI	ERTY LOCATION: 77	14 Main St.	051.575.0	67.00	and the fail of the second
	(Nun		(Property Tax		
PROPI	ERTY OWNER				
Name:	Lindsey Sch	UNC Email Address:	Schunk. Indse	y egmail.	com
Addres	JUL Main	st machings.	Island nul	49757	
Addres	(Street)	(City)	(State)	(Zip)	
			(5000)	(<u>—</u> P)	
Telepho			(Fow)		
	(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)		
APPLI	CANT/CONTRACTOR				
Name:	Unknown	Email Address:			
Addres	s:				
	(Street)	(City)	(State)	(Zip)	

(Fax)

14

GENERAL APPLICATION FOR WORK LOCATED WITHIN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Telephone:

(Home)

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

(Business)

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

Hinelay Stu SIGNATURES	3	
Signature	Signature	
Lindsey Schunk		File No. MD25.067.044(4)
Please Print Name	Please Print Name	Exhibit_A
NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical samples, etc.	become the property of the HDO	Date 5.27.25

NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical samples, etc., become the property of the HDC/City of Mackinae Island. These may be returned to the applicant upon request after they are no longer needed by the Commission/City.

RETURN THIS FORM AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO: MACKINAC ISLAND BUILDING OFFICIAL 7358 MARKET STREET, MACKINAC ISLAND, MI 49757 DHONE, (806) 847 4035

Corner Cottage File No. <u>MD25.067.044(H)</u> 7714 LakeShore Blvd Picket Fence Replacement

France	and the standard to standard to a standard part of the standard standard standard standard standard standard st	Section IX, Itema
In	ECEN	
M	MAY 27 2	025
		KR

Date 5 27 25 Steve and Lindsey Schunk

Request to replace existing picket fencing around house and to install fencing around grassy area at the water side to provide privacy.

Removal of: All current picket fencing around side and front of house including 2 trellis walk-through gates in front

NEW FENCING: Dog ear, wood picket fence Painted white Dimensions:

10 ft wide premade panels3.5"x3.5" wooden posts36" high boards4"-5" clearance under for weed whipping

Gates/Entrances:

1. One centered opening at front of house, two 5' gates opening into the yard to create a 10' gate opening centered with the front porch steps leading to house

2. 20ft of removable fencing at Market Street side for dray clearance

3. One centered gate on water side, 5' swinging inward to water

Please see attachments for exact measurement, scope of work, and new fencing style/design



Section IX, Itema.





18







		Section IX, Itema.
File No. MD25.067.044(4) Corner Cottage		
Exhibit <u>E</u> 7714 LakeShore Blvd	MAY 27	2025 U
Date 5.27.25 Second Story Railing Replacement		
InitialsKR		M

Steve and Lindsey Schunk

Request to replace existing balcony railing on second story porch due to rot, deterioration, and safety concerns. We would like something safer and more closed in for our children.

Removal of: All current second story balcony railing as pictured in attachments

NEW Railing: Basic wood railing Painted white Dimensions: 40" high (as current) including small gap at bottom 4-6x6 posts 103" of rail width, 2-112" sections of rail length wise

Please see attachments for exact measurements and new fencing style/design.







File No	HD25.067.044(H)
Exhibit_	G
Date	5.27.25
Initials	FP





Richard Neumann Architect 610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 June 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: SCHUNK COTTAGE FENCE REPLACEMENT & ADDITION Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed fence replacement and addition project at the Schunk Cottage in the West End Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

hick numan

Rick Neumann

c. Lindsey Schunk, Owner and Applicant Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



6 June 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

SCHUNK COTTAGE FENCE REPLACEMENT & ADDITION 7714 Main Street

West End Historic District City of Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

This design review is for the replacement and addition of fences at the Schunk / Corner Cottage, 7714 Main Street, in the West End Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the historic district. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing wood picket fences along Main Street and Market Street with new wood picket fences, and install a new portion having a gate across Main Street along the lake. A removable section for cart passage would be built along Market Street. The new fences would appear generally similar to the existing, with 36 inch tall pointed boards painted white. There would be some differences, including elimination of the two overhead trellis gates, with consolidation of the entry to a single pair of gates centered on the front walk. Also the curving wave-edge top would be eliminated in favor of a level top edge.

A requested balcony railing replacement on the house is not included in this Design Review.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67, as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of a Scope of Work description and photographs of the existing conditions, dated 27 May 2025.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

Standard 2 - "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a building shall be avoided."

Schunk Cottage Fence Replacement Design Review 6 June 2025 Page 2

The character of the property would be retained and preserved. No historic materials or alteration of features and spaces would occur.

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The exterior alteration (replacement) of the existing fences would not destroy materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property.

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The architectural value of the building and yard, and their relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district would be maintained.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

The new fences would maintain their relationships with the house and yards.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The replacement white painted wood picket fences would be, compatible with the design, arrangement, and materials of the building. In saying this, It should be noted that as shown in the submitted photo of the "Proposed New Style", the alignment of fence panels relative to posts is different than what exists now, in that the public sides of posts are not behind the plane of the fence panels, but stand proud of the picket line, resulting in a less traditional fence character.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

The existing aesthetic value of the fences would continue to blend with the character of the house and yard.

Schunk Cottage Fence Replacement Design Review 6 June 2025 Page 3

CONCLUSION

The proposed replacement of wood picket fences, along with the proposed new section across Main Street, at the Schunk Cottage, 7714 Main Street, meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW

File No.	MD25.067.044(H)
Exhibit_	J
Date	6.23.25
Initials_	4P

Corner Cottage 7714 LakeShore Blvd Front Porch and Second Story Railing Replacement



Steve and Lindsey Schunk

Request to replace existing balcony railing on second story porch and existing front porch railing due to rot, deterioration, and safety concerns. We would like something safer and more closed in for our children.

Removal of: All current second story balcony railing and all front porch railing as pictured in attachments (Estimated install 1985?)

NEW Balcony Railing:

To match the proposed new fencing style surrounding the house Basic wood railing with square spindles Painted white

Dimensions:

40" high (as current) including small gap at bottom 4-6x6 posts 103" of rail width, 2-112" sections of rail length wise

NEW Front Porch Barrier:

Removable/seasonal flower boxes around perimeter of the front porch, mimicking the style prior to 1985 (see photos) and mimicking the style also currently on Grand Hotel front porch. 3 Boxes per rail section

Box Dimensions:

40" W x 24" H x 12-14" D

Please see attachments for exact measurements and new style/ design.



File No	MD25.067.044(++)
Exhibit	1
Date	6.23.25
Initials_	KP







JUN 23 2025 Proposed Flower Box Style

Section IX, Itema.


IAN IE		EI	V		
K	MAY	27	2025	5	(a) A set of the observation of the set o
				LS LS	

File No	MD25.067.044(H)	
Exhibit_	G	,
Date	5.27.25	
Initials	KP	





GENERAL APPLICATION FOR WORK LOCATED WITHIN A HISTORIC DI Section X, Itema.

- Minor Work (Complete Section A and refer to General Directions)
- New Construction (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item B)
- □ Demolition (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item C)

Application Deadline: Application and materials must be completed and submitted by 4:00 p.m. ten (10) business days before each Commission Meeting. Late applications will be placed on the agenda for the following month. Decision by the Commission will not necessarily occur at the meeting at which the application materials are first received.

JUN 23

2025

A) MINOR	WORK		(Corner	Cottage)	
PROPERTY	LOCATION: 7714 (Number)	Main St. (Street)	(251.575.0 (Property Tax	
PROPERTY	OWNER				
Name: Li	dsey Schunk	Email Addr	ress: <u>Schun</u>	k. Lindsey (2 gmail.com
Address:	(Street) Main St.	Mackinac (City)	Island	M (State)	<u>49757</u> (Zip)
Telephone:	989-621-6401	· · ·			
	(Home)	(Business)	File No.	(Fax) MD25.06-	7.049(4)
APPLICAN	T/CONTRACTOR	5 GOM	and a second		
Name:	Chane David	Koo Email Add	ress: Date	6.23.25	
Address:		Cheboygan	Initials_	MIKP	
Telephone:	(Street) 231-227-483	(City)		(State)	(Zip)
	(Home)	(Business)		(Fax)	

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

Lincher	Schunk signatures			
Signature	9	Signature		
Lindsey	Schunk,			39
Please Print Name	MD25.067.049(#)	Please Print Name	#100-	

File No. MDas. 067.	049(4) Corner Cottage
Exhibit B	7714 LakeShore Blvd
Date 6.23.25	Asphalt Shingle Installation
Initials KP	Steve and Lindsev Schunk



Request to remove deteriorating cedar shake roof and replace with low profile asphalt shingles.

Major leaking in kennel house occurred during last storm on 6/21/25. Currently using a tarp over the top of the kennel house to keep water out (see photo).

Removal of: All current cedar shake shingles on both main Corner Cottage house and back building (kennel house).

NEW ROOFING: Low Profile Residential Landmark: Colonial Slate UL 2218

Please see attachments for photos of current roof condition, new proposed new style

	Currer	X Port Section X, Itema.
File No. MD25.047.049 (H)	DECEIVED -BO	Section X, Itema. Kervner Building
Exhibit C	JUN 2 3 2025	-
Date 6:23-25		
InitialsKP	Ker I	



Section X, Itema.

Current Roof



Current Roof





Richard Neumann Architect 610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

7 July 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: SCHUNK COTTAGE ROOF REPLACEMENT Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed roofing replacement project at the Schunk Cottage in the West End Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick Neumann

c. Lindsey Schunk, Owner and Applicant Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office Richard Neumann Architect 610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

7 July 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

SCHUNK COTTAGE ROOF REPLACEMENT 7714 Main Street

West End Historic District City of Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The project is the replacement of roofing on the Schunk / Corner Cottage, 7714 Main Street, in the West End Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the historic district. The project would replace the existing wood shingle roofing on the residence and on the kennel house outbuilding with architectural asphalt shingle roofing.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67, as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of a Scope of Work description and photographs of the existing conditions, dated 23 June 2025.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

Standard 2 - "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a building shall be avoided."

The character of the property would be retained and preserved. No historic materials or alteration of features and spaces would occur. While wood shingle roofing is most appropriate historically for a house of this vintage, architectural asphalt shingles reasonably duplicate the appearance of a wood shingle roof, and have been approved previously by the HDC for replacement roofing. Schunk Cottage Roof Replacement Design Review 6 June 2025 Page 2

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The exterior alteration (replacement) of the existing roofing would not destroy materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property.

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The architectural value of the buildings and their relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district would be maintained.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

New layered asphalt shingle roofing would maintain an appropriate relationship to both the house and the outbuilding.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The replacement roofing would be compatible with the design, arrangement, and materials of the buildings.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

The existing aesthetic value of the buildings would be maintained

CONCLUSION

The proposed replacement of wood shingle roofing with architectural asphalt shingle roofing at the Schunk Cottage and outbuilding, 7714 Main Street, meets the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW

GENERAL APPLICATION I	FOR WORK LOCAT	FED WITHIN A HISTOP	Section X, Itemb.
Minor Work (Complete Section			
 New Construction (Complete Demolition (Complete Section 			ECELVER
Application Deadline: Application a business days before each Commiss following month. Decision by the Con application materials are first received	ion Meeting. Late appli nmission will not necess	cations will be placed on the a	genda for the
A) MINOR WORK		(norner Hage)	
PROPERTY LOCATION: 771	1 Main St.	Concorrection	.067.00
(Numb		(Property	
PROPERTY OWNER			
Name: Lindey Schunk	Email Ad	dress: Schunk. Lind	ey @ gmail com
Address: 7714 Main	Mackinac	Island MI	49757
(Street)	(City)	(State)	(Zip)
Telephone: 989-621-640			
(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)	
APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR			
Name: (Inknown	Email Ad	dressle No. MD25. 04	7.050(+)
Address:		Exhibit_A	
(Street)	(City)	Date 6.24. 5(State)	(Zip)
Telephone:		Initials KP	
(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)	
Attach a brief description of the	e nature of the minor wor	k proposed and the materials f	o be used.

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

Lindrey Schunk sic	GNATURES	
Signature	Signature	
(MDasa Bint Name 7.050(H)	6. 2 Plage Print Name \$ /00 -	48

File No.	MD25.067.050(H)
Exhibit_	
Date	6.24.25
Initials	KP

Corner Cottage 7714 LakeShore Blvd Picket Fence Replacement

M	eci	Section X, Itemb.
M	JUN 2	2 3 2025
		KP

Steve and Lindsey Schunk

Request to replace existing picket fencing around house and to install fencing around grassy area at the water side to provide privacy.

Removal of: All current scalloped picket fencing around side and front of house including 2 trellis walk-through gates in front

NEW FENCING:

Straight Across

Pyramid top pickets (Replicating the older style from pre-1985) (See attached photos)

Painted white

Dimensions:

10 ft wide premade panels3.5"x3.5" wooden posts36" high pickets4"-5" clearance under for weed whipping

Gates/Entrances:

1. One centered opening at front of house, two 5' gates opening into the yard to create a 10' gate opening centered with the front porch steps leading to house

2. 20ft of removable fencing at Market Street side for dray clearance and potential driveway in the future.

3. One centered gate on water side, 5' swinging inward to water

Please see attachments for exact measurement, scope of work, and new fencing style/design



Section X, Itemb. Historical photos of Fenericy for replication MEGEIVE JUN 2 3 2025 WOODFILL HOUSE °C WINTER 1948 File No. MD35-D67.050 (#) 25 seted 2 Exhibit **V** Initials_ Date 111 18

Still intact on





Proposed Style











7 July 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: SCHUNK COTTAGE FENCE REPLACEMENT & ADDITION Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed fence replacement and addition project at the Schunk Cottage in the West End Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

- Kick Neumann

Rick Neumann

 Lindsey Schunk, Owner and Applicant Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



7 July 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

SCHUNK COTTAGE FENCE REPLACEMENT & ADDITION 7714 Main Street

West End Historic District City of Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

This design review is for the replacement and addition of fences at the Schunk / Corner Cottage, 7714 Main Street, in the West End Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the historic district. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing wood picket fences along Main Street and Market Street with new wood picket fences, and install a new portion having a gate across Main Street along the lake. A removable section for cart passage would be built along Market Street.

The new fences would be different than the existing fence, but would match an existing earlier fence style still on the west side of the property, apparently remaining from the Woodfill era of ownership. The new fencing would be level along the top (unlike the existing wave-topped design) with 36 inch tall pointed pickets painted white. Two overhead trellis gates spaced along Main Street would be eliminated in favor of a single double-wide gate, centered on the front walk, again, as from an earlier era in the cottage's history.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67. as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of a Scope of Work description and photographs of historic and existing conditions, dated 24 June 2025.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

Schunk Cottage Fence Replacement Design Review 7 July 2025 Page 2

Standard 2 - "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a building shall be avoided."

The character of the property would be retained and preserved. No historic materials or alteration of features and spaces would occur.

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

Replacement of the existing fences would not destroy materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property.

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The architectural value of the building and yard, and their relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district would be maintained.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

The new fences would maintain their relationships with the house and yards.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The replacement white painted wood picket fences would be, compatible with the design, arrangement, and materials of the building.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

The aesthetic value of the new fences would blend with the character of the house and yard.

CONCLUSION

The proposed replacement of wood picket fences, along with the proposed new section across Main Street, at the Schunk Cottage, 7714 Main Street, would meet the Standards for review. END OF REVIEW

B) NEW CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION OR MOVING OF STRUCTURES
PROPERTY LOCATION: 1395 Cadotte 051-575-069-01 (Number) (Street) (Property Tax ID #) JUN 2 4 2025
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Legal Description In Attachance tes
ESTIMATED PROJECT COST: 3 Million
APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR (Applicant's interest in the project if not the fee-simple owner):〇ゅへをへ
Name: Andrew Douch Email Address: douchstep 2000 & yahoo.com
Address: 7587 Market Street, Mackinac IS, MI 49757 (Street) (City) (State) (Zip)
Telephone: 231 392 6456 (Home) (Business) (Fax)
I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief.
Signature: D. aucher Deug Date 6-23-25
includes mortgagees, easement holders, and lien holders. You may be asked to provide a title search of the property and if the estimated is in excess of \$250,000 you are required to do so. Attach additional pages listing the person(s) or entity(ies) with legal interest(s) in the property and the nature of the legal interest(s). Name: <u>Anchew Doucl</u> Email Address: <u>douckstop 2000</u> By how Com
Address: <u>TS87 Market</u> Macking <u>Souch</u> <u>King</u> <u>Com</u> (Street) (City) (State) (Zip) Telephone: <u>231</u> 392 10450
(Street) (City) (State) (Zip)
Telephone: 231 392 6456 (Home) (Business) (Fax)
 The undersigned certify(ies) and represent(s) That he/she, it or they is (are) all of the fee title owner(s) of all of the property involved in the application; and That he/she, it or they has (have) attached a list which identifies all parties with a legal interest in the property at issue other than the undersigned owner(s) and has (have) identified the nature of each legal interest; and That the answers and statements herein attached and materials provided are in all respects true and correct to the best of his, her, its or their information, knowledge and belief. The undersigned hereby further certify(ies) and represent(s) that he/she, it or they has (have) read the foregoing and understand(s) the same. That the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531.
<u>D-ander Dond</u> SIGNATURES File No. HD25.069.054(A)
Signature Signature Exhibit A Stephen Andrew Doud Date 6:24:25
Please Print Name Please Print Name
Signed and sworn to before me on the 23rd day of June ,2025 itials K
Jill A. Chapman NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MICHIGAN COUNTY OF Mackinac My Commission Expires May 24, 2031 Acting in the County of Mackinac My commission expires: 5/24/2031

¹ The decision by the Historic District Commission may be in the form of Restrictions to which such Parties may be required to agree. (revised 04/17)

GENERAL APPLICATION FOR WORK LOCATED WITHIN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

- □ Minor Work (Complete Section A and refer to General Directions)
- V New Construction (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item B)
- Demolition (Complete Section B and refer to General Directions and Item C)

Application Deadline: Application and materials must be completed and submitted by 4:00 p.m. ten (10) business days before each Commission Meeting. Late applications will be placed on the agenda for the following month. Decision by the Commission will not necessarily occur at the meeting at which the application materials are first received.

A) MINOR WORK

PROPERTY LOCATION:			051-575-069-01		
	(Number)	(Street)	(Property Tax		
PROPERTY OWNER					
Name: Andrew K	Douch	Email Addres	s: doucletep 200	De yahoo . com	
Address: 7587 W (Street)	non-Ket	(City)	Kinac Island (State)	<u> </u>	
Telephone: 231 39. (Home)	2 645	(Business)	(Fax)		
APPLICANT/CONTRACT	OR				
Name:		Email Addres	s:		
Address:					
(Street)		(City)	(State)	(Zip)	
Telephone:(Home)		(Business)	(Fax)		

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

SIGNATURES	
Signature	Signature
Please Print Name	Please Print Name
NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical s may be returned to the applicant upon reque	samples, etc., become the property of the HDC/City of Mackinac Island. These est after they are no longer needed by the Commission/City.
	FORM AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO:
	NAC ISLAND BUILDING OFFICIAL
7358 MARKET	۲ STREET, MACKINAC ISLAND, MI 49757

PHONE: (906) 847-4035

File Number: 1025 069 059(4	Date Received: 6.24.25 Fee: 600 -
Received By: KPereny	Work Completed Date:
0	







65





67






























Section X, Itemc.

3 July 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: DOUD MAY HOUSE HOTEL Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed Doud May House Hotel in the West End Historic District.

Find attached the Design Review for the above referenced proposed project.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick Neumann

c. Andrew Doud, Applicant Rich Clements, Richard Clements Architect Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office

3 July 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

DOUD MAY HOUSE HOTEL

1395 Cadotte Street

West End Historic District Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the renovation of, and addition to, the old May House, 1395 Cadotte Street, in the West End Historic District. The May House is a Contributing structure in the historic district. The previous single family residence is proposed to be renovated and added to for the purpose of creating a boutique hotel, consisting of 17 rooms on three floors, and including a manager's living unit and employee living facilities at the basement level.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67, as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of photographs of the existing house and drawings comprising site plan, floor plans, and elevations of the Existing house and Proposed hotel, by Richard Clements Architect, dated 23 June 2025.

REVIEW

The Standards for review are the following:

Standard 1 - "A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment."

The May House property would be changed from a single-family use to a hotel use. The new use would require major exterior and interior changes to the house, and would involve extensive change to the defining characteristic of the site - that of a low-density single-family use

Doud May House Hotel Design Review 3 July 2025 Page 2

characterized by generous open space, replaced by a significantly higher density transient occupancy, characterized by more dense site development. Thus, the new use would cause significant alteration to the defining characteristics of the site and the property's environment. The large building addition would more than double, in fact almost triple, the mass of development on the property, significantly changing the property's sense of exterior space.

Standard 2 - "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a building shall be avoided."

The historic character of the house would generally be retained and preserved. The significantly increased density on the site would be accomplished with relatively minimal change to the defining characteristics of the house. The primary east / front elevation would be almost unchanged. The south / side elevation would have a substantial addition made to it, but the defining characteristics of the primary gable end would be retained.

The historic character of the house would be largely retained, thanks to the addition connecting at the rear and not overly affecting the most significant features of the architecture. While parts of the original house would be obscured by the new additions, and some historic materials would be removed at points of additions, minimal alteration of significant historic features of the old house would happen.

On the positive side, the mass and scale of the primary addition would be similar to the original house, and the link to the annex narrower, to help set off the historic house from the primary annex addition. On the negative side, the connector portion between existing and new would be so tall as to not provide the step-down in height needed for compatible separation of the new from the historic.

Standard 3 - "Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."

While the size and scale of the new addition would be similar to the existing house, it would not create a false sense of historic development, since it would appear as a later addition to an historic building, due to differences in roof slope and architectural features.

Standard 4 - "Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved."

No exterior changes made over the years to the May House have acquired historic significance in their own right, needing to to be retained and preserved. Doud May House Hotel Design Review 3 July 2025 Page 3

Standard 5 - "Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved."

The distinctive exterior features that characterize the old May House would largely be preserved.

Standard 6 - "Deteriorated historical features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence, or structures."

This standard does not apply.

Standard 7 - "Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible."

This standard does not apply.

Standard 8 - "Significant archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken."

No archaeological resources are currently known to exist on the site, but vigilance should be exercised during excavation for any new addition on the property.

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The proposed addition and alterations would destroy some historic materials, but enough that characterize the property would remain. The new work would be somewhat differentiated from the old house by being separated and connected by a narrower, if not shorter, addition. However because of its height, the connector is not compatible with the massing and size of the old house, jeopardizing the historic integrity of the property. Ideally, the connector would be shorter in height to better set off both the historic house and the primary annex addition.

Standard 10 - "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

While the proposed new additions and related new construction could be removed in the future, returning the essential form and integrity of the existing historic house, such would be highly unlikely to happen, given the proposed scope of work.

Doud May House Hotel Design Review 3 July 2025 Page 4

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The historic value of the surrounding area is great, given neighboring historic resources in the district. The old May House is located on a very busy high-traffic location, and is especially visible as a corner property. Thus, its importance as a Contributing structure in the district is made more significant; and the height of the proposed connector would jeopardize the architectural value of the historic house.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

The extent of the proposed site development would alter the structure's relationship to the existing sense of generous open space. The proposed height of the connector presents an incompatible relationship with the historic May House.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The new additions are proposed to have contrasting materials and textures, helping the new be differentiated from the appearance of the old, and maintaining the integrity of the historic house.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

Except for the connector, the aesthetic value of the proposed annex addition, although somewhat different, would be sympathetic with the historic May House. The connector's height would detract from the aesthetic value of the overall redevelopment.

CONCLUSION

If the HDC concludes the proposed renovation and additions are compatible with the historic environment of the West End Historic District based on consideration of the above standards, then the design would meet the Standards for review, and should be approved. If it is determined the project is not compatible, then the application would not meet the Standards for review, and should not be approved.

END OF REVIEW

, a , a	GENERAL APPLICATION FO	OR WORK LOCATED WI	THIN A HISTOR	IC DISTRICT
a l	Minor Work (Complete Section			
	New Construction (Complete Sea	ction B and refer to General Dire	actions and Itam. Dr	Section X, Itemd.
File No. HBas. ga.	056 Demolition (Complete Section B	and refer to General Directions	and tens)	
Exhibit A	Application Deadline: Application and	materials must be completed and	submitted by 4.00	
Date (:)	Dusiness days before each Commission	Meeting. Late applications will	hand on the as	and the state of t
Dale 6:26:25	following month. Decision by the Comm	ission will not necessarily occur	at the meeting at wh	ichahe5
Initials ka	application materials are first received.			
	A) MINOR WORK			48
	PROPERTY LOCATION:3	69 HOBAN	STREAT	<u>a</u> !·]
	(Number)	(Street)	En (Property T	ax JD #)
	PROPERTY OWNER	1. 1. 1. 1.	Durate air	
		Madenko Is land	Roperted)	
	Name: Ind Grear	Email Address:	A & TRAM	GREAN COM
	Address:	Front MT	101	400-7
	(Street)	(City)	(State)	(7in)
	Telephone: 30/1133 906	42240001	(State)	(Zip)
	(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)	
	APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR	P		
		(aBarles)		
	Name: TRA GREEN	Email Address:		
	Address:			
	(Street)	(City)	(State)	(7in)
	Telephone:	· · ·	(build)	(Zip)
	(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)	
	Attach a brief description of	-		
	Attach a brief description of the nature Attach one or more photograph(s) of	re of the minor work proposed as	nd the materials to be	used.
	Attach one or more photograph(s) of showing the area, item or feature proposed	to be renaired or replaced. The F	Building Official on II	the toptics
	Commission may require additional information	ation necessary to determine the	work to be Minor W	ork.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

chul	SIG
Signature	510
Ter	Cul
Plance Drint Man	ORUP

SIGNATURES

Please Print Name

Signature

Please Print Name

NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical samples, etc., become the property of the HDC/City of Mackinac Island. These may be returned to the applicant upon request after they are no longer needed by the Commission/City.

RETURN THIS FORM AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO: MACKINAC ISLAND BUILDING OFFICIAL 7358 MARKET STREET, MACKINAC ISLAND, MI 49757 PHONE: (906) 847-4035

File Number: HB25 · 092 ·056() Date	Received: 6.26.25 Fee: 106 -
Received By: Received	Work Completed Date:
0	

	File No. 4825.092.056(4)	
STCILL RIENIS	Exhibit_B	Section X, Itemd.
MACKINAC ISLAND	Date 6:26-25	DECEIVEN
THE REAL	Initials EP	JUN 2 6 2025
STATE CES	Mackinac Island Mobility and Bicycle Rental	
	1369 Hoban Street Mackinac Island, Michigan 49757	KD

Mackinac Island Historic District Commission,

To reduce congestion at the Hoban Street Alley entrance (across from the Pontiac Lodge) Mackinac Island Mobility intends to move our setup and equipment return area inside our 1,600sf Lake View storage area. The current access to this area is from the two exterior 3ft. Lake View alley doors (photos attached).

- 1) Indoor operations do require greater access to the store area. To accomplish this, we propose to change both 3ft. exterior doors on the alley side to "like" 6ft. double doors.
- 2) Additionally, due to the rainwater pouring off the non-guttered Lake View roof in that location, we propose adding two 8 ft. awnings over the 6ft doors. The new awnings would be similar to the pitch and size of the awning over the French Lane side of the building (photos attached).

Because the proposed doors and awnings are bracketed by the mechanical and trash enclosures the improvements will not be visible to bicyclists or pedestrians on French Lane or Hoban Street .

Thank you,

in.

81 za Ira Green

Ira Green Mackinac Island Mobility









7 July 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: MACKINAC ISLAND MOBILITY DOOR CHANGES & AWNING ADDITIONS Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed door changes and awning additions in the back alley behind the Lake View Hotel in the Market and Main Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick neuman

Rick Neumann

c. Ira Green, Mackinac Island Mobility Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

7 July 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

MACKINAC ISLAND MOBILITY DOOR CHANGES & AWNING ADDITIONS 1369 Hoban Street

Market and Main Historic District Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The work of this application is replacement of two 3 feet wide doors with two 6 feet wide doors, and addition of two 8 feet long awnings above the two sets of doors, at Mackinac Island Mobility, 1369 Hoban Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The business is located at the rear of the Lake View Hotel, which is a Contributing structure in the district.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67, as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of photographs of the proposed locations of the doors and awnings at the back of the Lake View Hotel, and examples of similar door openings and awnings, dated 26 June 2025, by owner Ira Green.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The proposed door changes and awning additions would not destroy historic materials that characterize the historic hotel property, and would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the existing building. Mackinac Island Mobility Doors and Awnings Design Review 7 July 2025 Page 2

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The proposed wider double door openings and awning additions above would maintain the historic and architectural value of the property, and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

The wider door openings and new awnings would have an appropriate relationship with the surrounding area.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The proposed changes would be compatible, in terms of design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

Although largely out of sight from public streets of Hoban and French Lanes on either side, the proposed awning additions would enhance the aesthetic value of the building, which is now pretty bland along the alley side.

CONCLUSION

The widening of two door openings and the addition of two shed roof awnings above them, at the Lake View Hotel alley off 1369 Hoban Street, would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW

GENERAL APP	LICATION FOR WORK LOCATED	WITHIN A HISTORIC DISTRICT	
Minor Work (Complete Section A and refer to General Dir ion (Complete Section B and refer to Genera complete Section B and refer to General Direc	al Directions and Item B) Section X, Iteme.]
Application Deadline business days before	: Application and materials must be complete each Commission Meeting. Late application sion by the Commission will not necessarily	ed and submitted by 4:00 p.m. ten (10)	***
A) MINOR WORK			
PROPERTY LOCAT	ION: Various locations St and 7435 Name	(Description II)	019. _a
PROPERTY OWNER Ryba Pro	perties PO 516, Mack IS/		
Name: <u>MITB</u>	451, Mack Ts/ Email Address:		
Address:			
(Street)	(City)	(State) (Zip)	
Telephone:(Home)	(Business)	(Fax)	
APPLICANT/CONTR			
Name: City of MC	Gruits ICV MAC TELOW Finail Address:	mgruits@mipd.org	
	Email Address.	OVI	
Address: <u>1374</u> (Street)	Market St Mackinac.	Island, MI 49757	
		Island, MI 49757 (State) (Zip)	

Attach a brief description of the nature of the minor work proposed and the materials to be used. Attach one or more photograph(s) of the whole building including façade and any relevant elevations showing the area, item or feature proposed to be repaired or replaced. The Building Official or Historic District Commission may require additional information necessary to determine the work to be Minor Work.

If the Building Official determines that the proposed work is not Minor Work, the Building Official shall direct the applicant to complete an Application for New Work and/ or Application for Demolition or Moving work which will then be referred to the HDC.

I certify that the information provided in this Application and the documents submitted with this Application are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief; and that the property where work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed project completion date, a fire alarm system or a smoke alarm complying with the recomments of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MLC 125.1501 to 125.1531

General laure	
Signature SIGN	ATURES Signature Cast 024-119.05-1/11
Enviry Mayrs	Exhibit A
Please Print Name	Please Print Name
NOTE: All photos, drawings and physical sam	ples, etc., Haiting in property of the HDC/City of Making Island The

may be returned to the applicant upon request after they are no longer needed by the Commission/City.

RETURN THIS FORM AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO: MACKINAC ISLAND BUILDING OFFICIAL 7358 MARKET STREET, MACKINAC ISLAND, MI 49757 PHONE: (906) 847-4035

File Number: 625. 024.019.05	TBite Received: 4.30.25 Fee: Ware
Received By: Merery	Work Completed Date:
0	

Install Cameras

File No.	C25.024.019.057(4)
Exhibit_	B
Date	6:30.25
Initials_	KP

٢

0

6			Section >	(, Iteme.
ID)	EC			M
	JUN	30	2025	U
,	_			KR

4.17" x 3.69" 1.04165.

	X, Iteme
File No. C25.024.08.057(#) Deceive Exhibit C Date 4.30.25 Initials M	D
INTERNET AND	
ISLAND INFORMATION	The second se



3 July 2025

Katie Pereny, Secretary Historic District Commission City of Mackinac Island P.O. Box 455 Mackinac Island, MI 49757

Re: CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed addition of three surveillance cameras on two Main Street buildings by the City Police Department in the Market and Main Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Miman

Rick Neumann

c. Emiley Mays, City of Mackinac Island Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



3 July 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS

7274 & 7435 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the installation of two surveillance cameras by the Mackinac Island Police Department on the front facades of two Main Street buildings, one being the Mackinac Island Tourist Bureau and the other the Pontiac Lodge building. The small 4+ inch diameter cameras would be placed in inconspicuous locations under a roof eave (overhang), on the Tourist Bureau, and in the center of the upper cornice on the Pontiac Lodge.

This design review is based on City Code Sec. 10-161 "Design Review Standards and Guidelines", of Article V. "Historic District", of the City of Mackinac Island Ordinance No. 443, adopted October 21, 2009. The review standards are those of the Department of the Interior entitled "The United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" and "Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings", as set forth in 36 CFR, part 67, as well as the factors set forth in City Code Sec. 10-161(b).

Materials submitted for Review consist of two photographs of the proposed locations and a manufacturer's cut sheet of the camera, dated 30 June 2025, by M.I. Police Department.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

Standard 9 - "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The proposed camera additions would not destroy materials that characterize the properties, would be differentiated as a non-historic features, and would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property.

Police Surveillance Cameras Design Review 3 July 2025 Page 2

Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b)

In reviewing applications, the Commission shall also consider all of the following:

(1) - "The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area."

The proposed surveillance camera installations would maintain the historic and architectural value of the properties, and their relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district.

(2) - "The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area."

Placement of surveillance cameras may be considered necessary utility features in our current age of increasing surveillance of public places, and appropriate with the surrounding often crowded public areas they would monitor.

(3) - "The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used."

The proposed cameras would be located so as to minimize their visual presence, being put under roof overhangs, in locations sometimes having decorative detailing, and as such would be compatible, in terms of design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.

(4) - "Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the Commission finds relevant."

The cameras would detract minimally from the aesthetic value of the buildings.

CONCLUSION

The addition of two surveillance cameras on the Mackinac Island Tourist Bureau and the Pontiac Lodge building proposed by the City of Mackinac Island Police Department would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW