

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT
COMMISSION HELD TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2022 AT 1:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL
CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, MACKINAC ISLAND, MICHIGAN**

Chairman Finkel called a regular meeting of the Mackinac Island Historic District Commission to order at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Lee Finkel, Andrew Doud, Alan Sehoan, Lorna Straus, Nancy Porter

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Zoning Administrator, Dennis Dombroski, Architect, Richard Neumann, Attorney, Gary Rentrop, Erin Evashevski (via Zoom)

Motion by Sehoan, seconded by Doud to approve as written, and place on file, the minutes of the regular meeting Tuesday, September 13, 2022. All in favor. Motion carries.

Motion by Doud, seconded by Straus to approve as amended and place on file the Agenda. The amendments were to remove the Steiner Bluff Patio application from *Old Business* and add Steiner Fence to *New Business*. All in favor. Motion carries.

CORRESPONDENCE

- None

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Jennifer Metz – Past Perfect LLC**

Metz updated the Commission on the progress of the study being done by Past Perfect LLC. Metz stated that Phase I is complete. They identified the priorities for intensive study, and the Mission Area was defined as a priority and some other potential areas. A GPS database has been created of all structures. Metz passed out some maps that they had created during the study. Metz stated they are not precise but were used as base maps to conduct the study. Metz stated these maps were not required by the study, but Metz thought the City might like to use them as a tool. Straus pointed out some of the errors on the map. Straus stated the maps are not very impressive for residents paying taxes on the island and Metz is asking for more money. Doud stated he found the maps impressive and helpful. Metz stated the additional money is for unanticipated expenses and she may not need additional expense money. Metz summarized Phase II as a more precise study of the Mission area. Doud asked if there is a percentage of structures in an area that would define it as an historic district. Rentrop stated no, a single structure could be defined as a district. Metz also stated that a new pursuit in historic study is stories. Metz found this as an opportunity for an area like Harrisonville where she could interview long time residents. If you see grants she hopes that the city might consider doing that type of project. Pereny is to share the digital copies with all Commission members. Finkel asked if the digital copies were able to be changed. Corrigan stated you probably need the map software. Straus stated that she feels the areas marked in squares are not accurate. As a tax payer it is difficult to approve more money being spent when these kinds of mistakes are made. Metz stated it was more a constraint of the computer program. It was not for a lack of knowledge.

Corrigan shared the searchable database with everyone on the screen and stated it will be available for anyone to access on the internet.

STAFF REPORTS

- **R122-066-065(H) Callewaert – Cedar Shake Siding**

Dombroski stated the rotted siding is being replaced, like for like on Callewaert's residence.

- **C22-054-066(H) Callewaert – Seabiscuit Rotted Siding Replacement**

Dombroski stated this project started as painting, but some rotted siding was discovered and will be replaced as discovered.

- **MD22-070-067(H) Timmons – Porch and Deck Replacement**

Dombroski stated this is porch decking and steps being replaced, like for like.

- **MD22-005-068(H) Trinity Church – Stair Tread & Porch Decking Replacement**

Dombroski stated this is like for like step replacement on the church.

- **MD22-012-071(H) LaPine – Chimney Repair**

Dombroski stated this is a like for like chimney repair. There is noticeable damage to the chimney.

Motion by Sehoan, second by Doud to approve the Staff Report. All in favor. Motion carries.

OLD BUSINESS

- **C17-055/56-027(H) Benser – Mr. B's Ratification of Sept Approval**

Rentrop stated that when the HDC approved the amendment, they were not aware the application was in fact expired. The application has been renewed and recommends ratifying the original approval. Motion by Sehoan, second by Doud to ratify the approval granted by the HDC for the amendment. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel, Sehoan, Porter. Nays: None. Straus abstained. All in favor. Motion carries.

- **C22-034-062(H) Patrick Doud's Exterior Renovations**

Neumann did a follow up review and added a reference to the pilasters on the buildings. Neumann stated that while they are appropriate to the time period, he does not feel they are appropriate to this building. Neumann recommends a corner board as it is presently. Doud summarized the project. Porter likes the pilasters but Neumann stated it creates a fake history. Doud would prefer to keep the pilasters. After further discussion on the pilasters, there was a motion by Porter, second by Sehoan to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote: Ayes: Finkel, Sehoan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

- **R322-037-064(H) McIntire – New Gutters**

Neumann stated that the gutters are appropriate but the rain chains proposed, are not an authentic historical element. Neumann stated downspouts should be used instead. Motion by Sehoyan, second by Doud to approve the gutters with downspouts rather than rain chains. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel Sehoyan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

- **Proposed HDC Application Amendment**

Rentrop stated Dombroski brought this up to address the concern with every item to be under review. Lawn items not attached to the ground, such as a bird bath or flower box, should not be reviewed by the HDC. Rentrop prepared the draft amendment for approval. Motion by Doud, second by Sehoyan to approve the amendment. Roll call vote: Doud, Finkel, Sehoyan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

- **Draft Study Committee Recommendation on Applications for Work That Comes Before HDC**

Rentrop submitted a recommendation from the study committee that would provide that a person seeking to do work in a proposed historic district, be referred by the City Council, to receive HDC review, with the application fee being waived. Motion by Doud, second by Finkel to reach out to City Council to request that the HDC be allowed to comment before City Council creates any new historic districts. The second part of the recommendation is that a process be created whereby the Planning Commission has an opportunity for input to the HDC on applications for work before the HDC. The third recommendation is that the HDC and Study Committee hold an educational forum on historic districts and the HDC review and approval process. Motion by Sehoyan, second by Doud to waive the fees as requested and to hold the educational forum with the Planning Commission, Study Committee and the HDC. All favor. Motion carries.

- **CD22-003-072(H) Steiner – Fence**

Steiner stated that he was advised by Rentrop to withdraw the patio application and submit a new application for the fence. Steiner stated the patio has been completely removed. Rentrop stated that both the Planning Commission and City Council have been involved and Rentrop recommends that the HDC be consistent with the Planning Commission and City Council. Hills survey shows the hedge removed is in the City right of way, and those need to be replaced per City Council. Rentrop summarized the negotiated design of the fence, based on safety requirements. Steiner is also asking to remove the rest of the hedge and trim and remove certain trees. Rentrop stated that what comes in to play is that SHPO finds the hedges historically significant. The HDC needs to decide if you should approve the removal of the rest of the

hedge, and should the replacement of hedges be required. The removal of the hedge has created a safety hazard. The HDC also needs to decide if the fence should be approved for the entire length of the bluff, or just where Steiner removed hedges, and does the HDC want more information on the trees being trimmed or removed. Porter asked if the rights of the Annex homeowners has been figured out yet as this is kind of a key thing. Rentrop stated it has not. Rentrop stated it is clear that Steiner owns the property that is also considered park area as shown on the original Annex plat. Doud asked for clarification on what Steiner wants on his property. Steiner stated he would like to restore the over grown vegetation. Steiner stated based on Neumann's review, he would like to offer another option of replacing the fence and replant the hedges in front of the fence. Porter asked if the new hedges will be made to look like the old hedges. Dombroski stated you would have to trim the hedges back to the wood, to make the old and new match. Michael Straus stated that the neighbor does not intend to replace their hedges. Neumann stated that living things have a defined life span and will eventually need to be replaced, however I am not an arborist. The presence of a hedge, not the actual existing hedge, is what is historic. Therefore, Neumann is fine with either new or old. He is not opposed to removing all of it and replanting, so it is uniform in appearance. Straus stated there are inconsistencies in the survey submitted October 3, 2022 and does not believe the Commission should count on anything depicted on the survey. Rentrop stated the HDC needs to decide if the hedge should be removed and if a fence should be required. Rentrop does not recommend making any decisions until the survey is done showing where the right of way is. Porter asked if the fence went up first wouldn't it make the hedge installation more difficult. Rentrop stated that is a good point. Motion by Sehojan, second by Doud to table the application until the survey is completed. Finkel asked Dombroski if there is a hazardous condition present now. Dombroski stated yes there is. After further discussion it was determined the present fence installed by Steiner is ok until the survey is done. Sehojan revised his motion to include leaving the existing fence in place until the survey is done. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel, Sehojan, Porter. Nays: Straus. Majority in favor. Motion carries. Motion by Straus to acknowledge that the HDC is aware of the safety issues of the present situation in the western end of lot 2, block 14. With no support the Motion died.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dombroski stated that the Mayors Assistant needed the final answer on the material being used for the police department roof. Dombroski and France believed that Neumann was going to give the alternate materials further consideration. Neumann did not do further research but still recommends the use of cedar shingles.

With no further business there was a Motion by Sehojan, second by Finkel to adjourn the meeting. All in favor. Motion carries. Meeting was adjourned at 2:36 p.m.



Lee Finkel, Chairman



Katie Pereny, Secretary