



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 January 2024

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

Re: **McCARTY COTTAGE WINDOWS REPLACEMENT**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed windows replacement at the McCarty Cottage 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. Matthew McCarty, Applicant
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 January 2024

DESIGN REVIEW

McCARTY COTTAGE WINDOWS REPLACEMENT

7745 Mahoney Avenue

West End Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is replacement of existing windows at the McCarty Cottage, at 7745 Mahoney Avenue, in the West End Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the district. Work would consist of complete window replacement, proposed to be vinyl clad wood windows (ie. wood inside and vinyl outside). Existing aluminum storm / screen windows would be removed to facilitate window replacement. Existing vinyl siding and trim would be maintained.

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 include four sets of window replacement quotations representing three different window manufacturers, and photographs of existing and historic exterior views, undated.

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 building use would remain single-family residential.

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 existing historic character of the property would be retained and preserved. Window replacement would maintain the existing appearance, and removal of non-historic aluminum storm-screen windows would improve the traditional character of the house. Replacement windows would maintain the 2 over 2 lites, with each sash split with a vertical muntin.

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."*

The proposed window replacements would not create a false sense of historic development, and no inappropriate conjectural features would be added.

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

This standard does not apply to the proposed project.

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

Distinctive features, finishes, or craftsmanship that characterize the existing buildings and property would be maintained.

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."*

Replacement of the original windows would constitute a loss of original features of the house, but the existing historic windows are deteriorated and functionally obsolete. The new replacement windows would match the old in type and design, and would maintain the visual character of the house.

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 to the proposed project.

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

This standard does not apply to the proposed project.

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 exterior alterations would destroy historic materials that characterize the property, the original windows, but would be replaced in kind and in design to generally match the historic materials. The new windows would be compatible with the character of the existing house, and would be appropriate.

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.”*

The new window installation would be undertaken in a manner that if removed in the future would not impair the essential form and integrity 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 proposed windows replacement project would not change the significance of the resource, or its relationship to the West End neighborhood.

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

Windows are an integral character element of an historic building; the proposed replacement project would result in an appropriate relationship with the overall building resource, and with the district.

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

The proposed new windows would be compatible in design and arrangement with the property.

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

The aesthetic value of the buildings and site would be maintained by the proposed exterior renovation.

CONCLUSION

Certainly repair of existing historic wood windows is the most authentic preservation approach, but due to their age and original type / quality (not being the roped counter-weighted type), the McCarty house windows are not good candidates for restoration. As such, replacement with new units of the same type, size, and appearance would be an acceptable approach.

Based on the findings above, the proposed windows replacement at the McCarty Cottage at 7745 Mahoney Avenue would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW