



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

8 June 2023

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

Re: **CHIPPEWA HOTEL AT&T ANTENNAS REPLACEMENT**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the revised proposed new antennas and equipment installation on the Chippewa Hotel 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. Kara Hansen, Black & Veatch
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

8 June 2023

DESIGN REVIEW

CHIPPEWA HOTEL AT&T MOBILITY ANTENNAS REPLACEMENT 7221 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is replacement of communications antennas and related equipment by AT&T Mobility on the roof of the Chippewa Hotel, 7221 Main Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The Chippewa Hotel is listed as a Contributing structure in the district.

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, drawings including roof plan and elevations portraying proposed conditions, and digital simulations of proposed photographic views by Black & Veatch, dated 19 May 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 historic and long-time current use as hotel and retail.

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 improved by replacement of the antennas in new locations on the end walls of the building, instead of at the ends of the roof where they are now located. While the two end walls would now have antenna arrays visible on the walls, the rooftop silhouette would be greatly improved from many viewpoints. As views to the Bay and Straits are significant historic assets of the historic district and the larger Mackinac Island National Historic Landmark, less intrusions into these views would be an improvement.

No historic materials or features would be removed, but the end walls as features of the building would be altered by the addition of this equipment. Although no rationale for adding more, there already are mechanical and HVAC components on the two end walls. Also, both end walls are partially hidden by adjoining buildings, and are not nearly as important to the historic character of the Hotel as the longer front and rear elevations along Main Street and Haldimand Bay.

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."*

Being utility features, the antennas would certainly not create a false sense of historic development as elements on the building, as no one would mistake them as being old. But they would continue to distract from the historic architectural character of the building.

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

No changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right would be affected.

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

Distinctive attributes of the building, the four exterior elevations with their historic features and finishes, would be preserved. The replacement antennas would be located on the two end walls, near their tops, and close to additional roof mounted equipment. These related pieces of equipment would be mounted on the back (roof side) of nearby parapet walls, out of sight. Power wiring from the ground to the antennas would be placed in conduit located with a cluster of existing conduits on the northeast wall.

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."*

As exterior alterations, the proposed new replacement antennas with related equipment and conduit, would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. And as modern equipment they certainly would be differentiated from the old building. While no location on the building would completely eliminate the antennas visible presence, their placement on the end walls would minimize their negative impact for most viewers of the hotel and of views beyond.

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 replacement antennas and related equipment could be removed in the future without impairing the 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 historic and architectural value and significance of the Chippewa Hotel would continue to be impaired by the proposed relocated new antennas, but their impact would be reduced, enhancing the significance of the resource and its relationship to the surrounding area.

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

The relationship of the proposed antennas to the rest of the resource, and to the surrounding area, would be more positive if relocated off the rooftop edges, and onto the end walls.

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

As utility features, antennas are generally not compatible with historic structures and environments, but as modern necessities, and mounted on the end walls, would be about as compatibly located as possible.

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

The negative impact on the aesthetic value of the building would be reduced by replacement antennas being located on the end walls of the Hotel.

CONCLUSION

As utility features, the proposed replacement antennas and related equipment can be thought of as technology infrastructure necessary to update historic environments to serve modern needs. And in this case of communications antennas, serving not just the building, but the larger historic district and the entire island. Based on the findings above, the proposed antennas replaced in the new end wall locations on the Chippewa Hotel, rather than on the roof, would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW