

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT
COMMISSION HELD TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2022 AT 10:00 A.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 10:03 a.m.

PRESENT: Lee Finkel, Andrew Doud, Alan Sehoan (10:06 am), Lorna Straus, Nancy Porter

ABSENT: None

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

Motion by Doud, seconded by Finkel to approve as amended, and place on file the minutes of the regular meeting Tuesday, February 8, 2022. Amendment to add "no action taken" on page 1. All in favor. Motion carries.

Motion by Straus, seconded by Finkel to approve as amended and place on file the Agenda. The amendments were to add "Contributing vs Non-Contributing" and "Guidelines" to *New Business*. All in favor. Motion carries.

CORRESPONDENCE

- **Letter from MHPN re: HR 6589**

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Job Status Report – Pereny**

No changes were requested or reported.

- **Study Committee Update**

Rentrop stated he had received the proposal from Past Perfect. Rentrop summarized the proposal and stated the completion is estimated to be June of 2023. The summary completion date is September 2022. Sehoan asked about using interns for the study. Rentrop stated he did discuss this with Past Perfect, and they are open to working with the interns. Doud asked if Past Perfect would follow any changes to the Guidelines, made by the HDC, when doing the study. Rentrop stated as long as the changes follow the State Statute and SHPO guidelines. The HDC is permitted to set stricter guidelines, but not more lenient. Porter asked what the criteria is for contributing and non-contributing. Neumann stated it was the significance or integrity of the property, the history of the property or the architectural character of the property. Therefore, structures less than 50 years old could be classified as contributing if one of the other criteria was applicable. Doud stated he thought the definition of contributing was 50 years old or greater. Neumann stated that the 50 years is a baseline. Rentrop stated that a renovation could be reversed to make it once again historical. Neumann stated there is a National Park Service publication that goes in to the rational in determining significance. Neumann will provide the publication for the members. Doud asked if

the determination is made when presented to the Commission? Will Past Perfect determine what is contributing? Neumann stated that Past Perfect, based on their research, determine if a resource is contributing or non-contributing. Dombroski stated he thought that once a district was formed, that all resources in the district were considered contributing. Rentrop confirmed that is correct. Rentrop quoted the SHPO handbook regarding classifying resources. Doud stated that the only time he sees contributing and non-contributing being used correctly is when creating borders. Rentrop stated that when a non-contributing resource is making changes, the impact on the surrounding buildings is taken in to consideration. Neumann stated that changes to non-contributing structures have more latitude because it is considered less significant. Dombroski stated that Neumann's explanation is inconsistent. Neumann is stating there is a distinction between contributing and non-contributing, but Rentrop stated that all resources should be considered as contributing. Both Doud and Dombroski found the issue confusing. Dombroski stated based on this information, a survey should be done every year because structures may now fall in the greater than 50-year-old criteria. Neumann stated that is a reasonable statement. Doud would like the HDC to come up with contributing and non-contributing definitions for borders only. After further discussion on the topic, Rentrop suggested that the Commission review the Past Perfect inventory, before they begin the intensive survey. Straus would like to have the previous survey looked at. Rentrop stated he has the National Landmark submission and report, from 1986. The original nomination happened in 1960. Andrew McGreevy asked if it is determined that less than 50% of the island is historic, would the island lose their National Landmark status? Rentrop stated that it is only resources within a historic district. Rentrop will email the Main Street District intensive survey to the Commission members.

STAFF REPORTS

- **MD22-074-009(H) Beeck – London Square Repairs**

Dombroski stated this is a like for like repair of rotted siding, the roof shingles, and the carpet on the front steps. Dombroski is to make a note on the description of work regarding the bottom wood paneling being a flat panel. Motion by Doud, second by Lee to approve the report. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel, Sehoan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Arches Budget**

Sehoan stated the 2022-2023 budget was set at \$10,000.00 based on last years expenses and what they will be doing going forward. Straus requested the budget year be noted on the request to the Mayor's Assistant. Motion by Sehoan, second by Straus to accept the budget. All in favor. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS**• C22-0169-010(H) City of Mackinac Island/MITA – Coal Dock Repairs**

McGreevy stated that the TA has an approved RFP and 5 bids have been received. The MITA has not opened the bids yet as they are waiting on MDOT to give the go-ahead. The repairs include fixing the section of the dock that is still wood, by the hardware store, to the warehouse. The rotted pilings are being replaced with new wood pilings and 12 x 12 beams. A concrete slab will be poured to match the rest of the dock. The old hardware store building is to be demolished in the spring, and then replaced after the slab is poured. The new building design has not yet been decided, but will be similar to the existing building. The MITA will work with the HDC in the design of the building. The existing lumber shed will remain as it is not in the current scope of this application. Doud asked what the reason for the demolition is. It was determined it is “for the greater good”. Army Corp of Engineers and Section 106 approval is needed. An archeologist must do a study since work will be done in the bottom lands. Motion by Doud, second by Porter to approve the demolition for the greater good of the Island, contingent on the Army Corp of Engineers and Section 106 approvals for the structural repairs on the dock. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel, Sehoan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

• CD22-003-012(H) Steiner – Landscape Improvements

Jeff Steiner summarized the project as replacing the cedar hedge and adding a white decorative fence and gate, building a composite deck on the west side of the house, 9” off the ground at its highest point, adding stone walkways with an entertainment patio, replacing the rubber flat roof, like for like, and replace the old deck out front which will have 36” spindles to match the existing. Straus commented that the opening in the hedge is not in line with the front door. Steiner stated that the gate is centered on the property, not the house. Straus stated he may regret this decision when it comes to unloading groceries, luggage, etc. Steiner stated that entry for these types of things will be on the back side of the house. Sehoan confirmed with Neumann that the composite decking is OK to use. Porter asked what material the arbor will be made of. Steiner stated it is wood. Motion by Doud, second by Sehoan to approve the application. Roll call vote: Ayes: Doud, Finkel, Sehoan, Straus, Porter. Nays: None. All in favor. Motion carries.

• Reconstruction Discussion – Doud

Doud wanted to discuss how the HDC would like to see reconstruction done. Can an applicant replicate a structure, or build something modern? Doud prefers replication. Dombroski stated that per the Zoning Ordinance, a structure can be built back as it was. Dombroski read Section 5.03 aloud. Neumann stated that there is no requirement by the HDC to build something different or replicate. The Ordinance requires the structure to be compatible and appropriate to the district. Any new building has to be architecturally compatible with the area, per the Secretary of Interior Standards. It is the role of the HDC to determine what can be done architecturally. The HDC has the authority to make the guidelines more defining than the Secretary of Interior Standards, but not

less so. Doud asked if there is a formula for reconstruction. Neumann stated there are different levels of reconstruction. Straus stated it is easier on the property owner to have guidelines to follow. Straus would like to have a few guidelines on record, realizing guidelines are not black and white. After further discussion it was decided that maybe a section should be developed in the Guidelines regarding reconstruction.

- **Contributing vs Non-Contributing**

Doud stated he believes the HDC history of determinations should be documented. Doud would also like to have a Motion to define contributing and non-contributing. Rentrop will develop some language for the Commission to review in the April meeting.


- **Guidelines**

Guidelines must be consistent. The Guidelines can be stricter than the Secretary of Interior Standards, but not less. Straus would like to see case by case guidelines. Neumann will send the SHPO Guidelines to Pereny to provide to the Commission members, and then discuss again in the April meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Straus commented that the HDC, when talking about contributing and non-contributing, is skirting the issue of mass affect when building a new building. The mass affect should be taken in to consideration when making a decision.

With no further business there was a Motion by Sehoan, second by Doud to adjourn the meeting. All in favor. Motion carries. Meeting was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.



Lee Finkel, Chairman



Katie Pereny, Secretary