

CITY OF MACKINAC ISLAND

MINUTES

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Tuesday, August 08, 2023 at 1:00 PM

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

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 PM.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT

Lee Finkel

Alan Sehoyan

Lorna Straus

Nancy Porter

ABSENT

Andrew Doud

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Approval of Minutes

a. July 11, 2023 Minutes

Motion to approve minutes as written.

Motion made by Sehoyan, Seconded by Finkel.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Sehoyan, Straus, Porter

V. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve Agenda as written.

Motion made by Finkel, Seconded by Porter.

Voting Yea: Finkel, Sehoyan, Straus, Porter

VI. Correspondence

- a. Rentrop Statements April 10 and May 10 2023

Rentrop reviewed his April and May Statements.

Finkel asked where we are with AT&T. Rentrop confirmed they are all paid. Verizon was pre escrow and has nothing pending.

VII. Committee Reports

None

VIII. Staff Report

- a. Education Segment - Additions in Historic Districts

Neumann went over pictures of buildings in historic areas with new additions.

*Ireland row house in a historic district. All units are the same height. Materials are slightly different. Windows are pretty much the same size and proportion and are in the same place on building. This is an example of a very cohesive blockscape.

*Historic Chelsea section. The building on the left is the original row house. A more modern one is next to it. Example of a new building in a historic blockscape with the use of brick as being consistent with the other building. The steps and height are similar as well. The windows, however, are different. Basically nothing else relates to the character of the blockscape. This should not have been approved.

*New York City "monstrosity". There are color compatibilities but not much else. Cornice line does not match other buildings.

*Bubble windows. Insertion in a historic blockscape. The use of brick is only thing compatible. Height is same. Center spacing of windows is the same but clearly incompatible.

*London townhouses. Two brick buildings, one painted white. No chimney and possible solar cells on the roof of the white building. Neumann stated its a gable facing the street. Older building has a bay window and the white has a flat window somewhat proportionately similar. Thought provoking example

*New York roof top addition. Addition is set back on all sides because it is a corner building. Probably not visible from street. Believes this is a compatible way to add a roof top addition.

*Bubble top in New York. Would be invisible from down below. Innovative way to add another level. Dombroski noted it does not set back from edge.

IX. Old Business

None

X. New Business

a. CD23-036-050(H) Valentic Door Replacement

Finkel noted the negative review by Neumann. Dombroski spoke with the applicant. The door is not wood and the window pattern and bottom rail don't match original door. So Neumann struck it as inappropriate. The applicant has the new door but it has not been installed. Neumann apologized for getting the review so late. Neumann suggested giving them more time. Straus spoke with his cousin but was not asked to speak. The thought process was that it was a wood door that has rotted out in 10 years. It does not face the street. The applicant thought the new material would last longer. Finkel noted that Neumann's review had more problem with the difference in glass and design. Straus gave the example that the Schueller's had to have a custom made windows to match what was there. Porter asked if the door looked like wood when not painted. Neumann stated if it was painted it would look more like wood. Neumann did not have a problem with fiberglass but rather the difference from what was being replaced. The new door is not as historic looking. Dombroski went to the manufacturers website and stated they have several different styles available that would work better. Sehoyan asked if the door could be repaired. Dombroski stated it has been done before. Straus stated that since rereading the previous meeting for working without a permit if that is the situation here we should take the same action. It was determined that is not the case because they did not start any work. Motion to deny based on Neumann's review and they should attempt to repair the door. The replacement looks much more modern. Porter believes if you paint as much as you should, with the right paint it would help with rot.

Motion made by Sehoyan, Seconded by Finkel.
Voting Yea: Finkel, Sehoyan, Porter
Voting Abstaining: Straus

b. CD23-025-053(H) Sulkowski Siding and Window Replacement

Dombroski stated the siding is like for like. Straus stated based on the application she has no idea what house it is. If an application is submitted by a new owner she suggested that the previous owners name should be included on the application for at least a year. Neumann commented that in terms of reviewing he was out of context as well. He suggested photos of the house from the street.

The windows, siding and trim need to be replaced. Dombroski stated the windows are not like for like. The new windows are the Anderson 400 vinyl clad windows. The exterior is a composite material. Neumann recommended to approve as they are appropriate. Finkel asked if the windows come white, would he insist on painting? Neumann stated for windows the factory finish is acceptable. Motion to approve.

Motion made by Porter, Seconded by Sehoyan.
Voting Yea: Finkel, Sehoyan, Porter
Voting Abstaining: Straus

XI. Public Comment

No public comment

XII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 1:56.

Motion made by Sehoan, Seconded by Finkel.
Voting Yea: Finkel, Sehoan, Straus, Porter

Lee Finkel, Chair

Katie Pereny, Secretary