



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

8 July 2024

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

Re: **BEECK BUILDING FREIGHT LIFT ADDITION**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposal to add an exterior freight lift at the Beeck 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. Craig Beeck, Applicant
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

8 July 2024

DESIGN REVIEW

BEECK BUILDING FREIGHT LIFT ADDITION

7541 Market Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is addition of an exterior freight lift on the Beeck retail and residential building, at 7541 Market Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. A rear yard outdoor freight lift is proposed to be installed adjacent to an existing second floor deck and stair. The building is listed as a Contributing structure in the 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 photographs of the existing building, a rendered photo with elevator added, and manufacturer specification data, dated 13 June 2024.

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 retail on the first floor and residential on the second floor, although the Applicant did not state the purpose of the proposed lift. Is it to move house-hold goods or to store retail inventory?

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 negatively affected by the addition of an outdoor lift. The installation would alter an exterior feature and space in a way which would be inappropriate to the property's historic character.

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 exterior lift addition would not create a false sense of historic development, as it would certainly be seen as a non-historic element, but one that would be inappropriate.

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 of the property would not be removed or altered.

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 lift addition would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and it would be differentiated from the old. But an exterior lift would be incompatible with the architectural character of the resource, and would detract from the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

While the lift is proposed to be installed in the rear yard, away from public view, the location of which seems presently pretty well visually screened, there is no guarantee that existing vegetation would continue to hide the lift from view in the future.

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 lift addition 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 freight lift would detract from the historic resource, and its relationship to the Market Street and French Lane neighborhood.

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

An outdoor freight lift would result in an inappropriate relationship to the historic resource, and to the district. And as proposed it seems unclear whether the manufacturer would approve of the illustrated installation, as the lift vertical steel carrying beams are not shown to be secured to a wall. If it were required to be attached to a wall of the building, it would more directly affect the historic resource.

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

The proposed freight lift would be incompatible with the building, and detract from its character.

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

The aesthetic value of the Beeck Building would be negatively affected by the installation of an outdoor freight lift in the backyard, as would the district.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, the proposed installation of an outdoor backyard freight lift on the Beeck Building at 7541 Market Street would not meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW