Richard
Neumann
Architect
610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

22 November 2023

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

Re: **ROSE GAZEBO BUILDING RENOVATION**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed renovations at the former Rose Gazebo 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. Richard Clements, Richard Clements Architect
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison

Richard
Neumann
Architect
610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

22 November 2023

DESIGN REVIEW

ROSE GAZEBO BUILDING RENOVATION
7407 Market Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is renovation work on the former Rose Gazebo retail building, at 7407 Market Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure in the district. On the interior, work would convert the retail shop to a residential apartment. On the exterior, work would be minimal, removing the commercial sign and replacing windows on the front, and enlarging the deck and removing a portion of the shed at the rear, and with other minor changes.

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 site plan, floor plans, elevations, and photographs of the existing building, dated 23 October 2023, by Richard Clements Architect.

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 be changed, from its current commercial retail use to a residential apartment.

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 property as seen from the front would be retained. Alterations would largely take place at the rear, where a portion (12 feet) of the existing shed would be removed, and a new gable end constructed. The wood deck, with wood railing, would be enlarged. Taken together, these changes would improve the rear appearance. No historic materials or features would be removed, or spaces altered.

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 rear shed and deck changes would not create a false sense of historic development as the building is not historic. And the alterations would be appropriate.

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

Nothing of this non-historic building has achieved historic significance in its own right.

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 building would be maintained. On the front, the ill-fitting business sign would be removed, improving the appearance of the building.

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 exterior alterations would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work would not be differentiated from the character of the original building, but as the resource is non-contributing, the changes would be appropriate. The proposed new work would be compatible with the architectural character of the building, and actually improve its rear appearance.

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 changes could be removed in the future without impairing 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 renovation would not change the significance of the resource, or its relationship to the Market Street neighborhood.

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

The proposed project changes would result in a more appropriate relationship to the larger resource, and to the district.

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

The proposed renovations would be compatible with the building, and enhance its character.

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

The aesthetic value of the former Rose Gazebo building would be positively enhanced by the proposed exterior renovations.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, the proposed exterior renovations of the Rose Gazebo building at 7407 Market Street would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW