



Richard
Neumann
Architect

File No. MD23-011-072(H)

Exhibit H

Date 9.8.23

Initials KP

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931



7 September 2023

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

Re: **LENNOX BUILDING PORCH ENCLOSURE**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed front porch changes at the Lennox Building in the Market and Main 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. Brad Chambers, Mackinac Island Carriage Tours
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

7 September 2023

DESIGN REVIEW

LENNOX BUILDING PORCH ENCLOSURE

7396 Market Street

Market and Main Historic District
City of Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the enclosure of a portion of the existing open front porch of the historic Lennox Hotel building, at 7396 Market Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure to the historic district. The Applicant proposes to enclose the western, now open, portion of the porch for expanded office use. As well, the building entry would be relocated to directly face Market Street, across a front porch, instead of the existing side-facing entry with no floor level porch.

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 a current front photograph, two historic photos of the building, and drawings including existing and proposed floor plans and elevations, from Richard Clements Architect, dated 28 August 2023.

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 would continue in its current use as commercial office on the first floor, and residential on the upper floors, which are appropriate, compatible uses.

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 character of the facade and the larger building would be retained and preserved. No historic materials would be removed. The open porch space that characterized the building historically was altered at some time in the past by removal of the raised porch level deck, columns, and railings, leaving the roof above visually disconnected. The historic open porch space would be lost, and now be completely enclosed, but ironically, by re-establishing the entire front porch floor level across the full width of the building front, an architectural characteristic of the front would be restored to some degree. A portion of the original open front porch would be restored by turning the front door to open toward the street (removing a portion of now enclosed porch space), instead of to the side, and set back at the original front wall of the building, across an open portion of porch.

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 existing porch arrangement is certainly not historic, and does not warrant consideration as a record of its time. The proposed porch enclosure would not create a false sense of historic development as it would appear as a historic porch, later enclosed. And the open, covered center portion would not be conjectural, but would be a partial restoration of the original fully open front porch.

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

The existing covered porch with no porch-level floor is not a change that has acquired historic significance in its own right, and replacement by some more appropriate treatment would be an improvement for the very visible building front.

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

The remaining original and historic distinctive features of the Lennox Building would be preserved.

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."*

This standard does not apply to the proposed project

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 porch enclosure would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed new work would be differentiated from the old by use of slightly different elements, such as vertical wood siding, but not beaded in detail, and lattice of a different pattern. These differences would be compatible with the historic integrity of the property and the surrounding environment.

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 proposed enclosure of the could be removed in the future, preserving the essential form and integrity of the historic 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.*

Although very different than the original fully open front porch, and while recognizing the fact that half of that porch is now already enclosed, the proposed additional enclosed porch and reoriented entry porch would restore some level of integrity to the architectural value and significance of the Lennox Building, and with its relationship to Market Street and the surrounding area. This because the full width of the historic porch floor level would be re-established, and the front entry would be reoriented toward Market Street.

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

As stated above, despite enclosing more of the historically open front porch, the integrity of the front porch's relationship to the larger building would be improved, primarily because the entry door would now open to the front, and be accessible across an open, covered porch.

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

The proposed porch redesign would be compatible with the design, arrangement, texture and materials of the larger building and the neighboring district buildings.

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

The aesthetic value of the building would be positively improved by eliminating the inappropriate west portion of the existing porch, and reorienting the entry toward the front and Market Street.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, the proposed porch enclosure and entry reorientation at the Lennox Building at 7396 Market Street would meet the Standards for review, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b).

END OF REVIEW