



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

30 July 2026

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

Re: **LUMBREZER HOUSE**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed new Lumbezer cottage in the Hubbard's Annex 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. Daniel Lumbrezer, Applicant
David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

30 July 2026

DESIGN REVIEW

LUMBREZER HOUSE & CARRIAGE BARN

8200 Lakeview Road

Hubbard's Annex Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the construction of a new residence at the intersection of Grand Avenue and Valley Road, Block 9, Lots 1 & 2, in the Hubbard's Annex Historic 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 a survey, site plan, floor plans and exterior elevations drawings, and photos of surrounding conditions, dated 30 October 2025, by Arch Design, LLC.

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 existing vacant property would become a residential use. Certainly the defining characteristics of the site (unbuilt with a couple of old low stone walls) would change, but would remain in keeping with the surrounding Hubbard's Annex Historic District.

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."*

As a vacant property, there is no historic character to be retained and preserved. Existing open space would be altered by the addition of a new structure, but due to the distances and spatial relationship of site elements to surrounding properties, it would be altered in an appropriate way that would fit into the ambiance of the district.

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 design of the proposed house is different enough from actual historic cottages that the new house would not create a false sense of historic development. It would appear as later construction, differentiated from others. New construction in the context of an historic district should not create a false sense of appearing historic, but rather have its own presence, while still fitting in, and the proposed new house does this.

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."*

This standard does not apply to the proposed project.

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."*

At this time it is not known if archaeological resources exist on the site that might be disturbed by construction of a new foundation. Historically, any location on Mackinac Island could contain significant archaeological resources. As such, care should be taken during excavation.

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."*

Being new, the proposed house will not destroy historic materials. As an addition to a historic district, a new house should appear background to the historic houses, so as not to upstage them. This proposed design is a strong architectural statement, but would be a background structure. And as a new addition to the district, the proposed new house would be compatible with the massing and size of the those in the district.

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 house could be removed in the future without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic district, but certainly never would be.

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 architectural character of the proposed new house would be an appropriate addition to the surrounding historic district.

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

As is recommended for new construction in a historic context, the proposed new house would distinguish itself from neighboring old houses with some architectural character and features that set it apart from old houses of the Hubbard's Annex period. The proposed first floor height in relation to surrounding grade would be considerably less than typical historic houses, which were usually elevated several steps above ground. Another differing architectural feature is that most historic cottages in the district have larger front porches than that proposed for this new house. Also, the long rectangular footprint of the proposed house plan is a more modern one, with most of the historic houses having "T" or "L" shaped floor plans. These differences help distinguish the new from the old, but may also result in the new not blending enough with the those in the district.

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

In its massing arrangement, its use of texture and materials, and its details, the proposed design would be generally compatible with neighboring properties and the surrounding district.

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

The aesthetic value of the proposed structure would be an appropriate addition to the property and to the district.

CONCLUSION

The Historic District Commission should consider whether the differences of the proposed new house relative to others in the district would be extensive enough to make the new seem out of place, and not blend enough with its neighbors. If the HDC concludes that the differences do not disqualify the proposed design, and are appropriate to the Hubbards Annex Historic District, then the design would meet the Standards for review, including the Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b), and should be approved. If the HDC determines the project is not compatible, then the application would not meet the Standards for review and should not be approved.

END OF REVIEW