



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

5 March 2025

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

Re: **PORTER PROPERTY DECK REPLACEMENT**  
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed rear deck replacement at 1396 Church Street in the East End Mission Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

  
Rick Neumann

- c. Roy Shryock, 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

5 March 2025

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **PORTER PROPERTY DECK REPLACEMENT**

1396 Church Street

East End Mission Historic District  
Mackinac Island, Michigan

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project is replacement of an existing rear yard deck at 1396 Church Street, in the East End Mission Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the district. The deck is in deteriorated condition and is proposed to be replaced in the same configuration and dimensions as existing, but using composite deck and railing lumber. New railings would have spaced balusters, rather than being open, as would be required to meet building code requirements of 4 inch maximum openings. As now, lattice skirting would fill the space below.

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 existing conditions, dated 28 January 2025, by Roy Shryock.

## **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 historic character of the property would be retained and preserved, as the existing deck is not historically or architecturally significant. No historic materials would be removed.

**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 work would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as it is not historic. The proposed replacement porch would be compatible with the existing house, in terms of massing, size, and architectural features.

**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 and architectural value of the building, and its 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."*

Being on the rear of the house, the deck is not a primary architectural feature of the resource, or especially important to the surrounding area.

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

The proposed replacement deck would be compatible with the historic building.

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

The aesthetic value of the building would be retained.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed replacement of the rear deck on the house at 1396 Church Street would meet the Standards for review.

**END OF REVIEW**