



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

5 October 2024

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

Re: **JAQUISS COTTAGE RECONSTRUCTED FRONT CHANGES**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

See the attached design review of the proposed changes to the previously approved Jaquiss Cottage in the East End Mission Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick Neumann

- c. Ryan Spencer, Dickinson Homes
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

5 October 2024

DESIGN REVIEW

JAQUISS COTTAGE RECONSTRUCTED FRONT CHANGES

6948 Main Street

East End Mission Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

This review is to assess proposed revisions to the previously approved design for construction of a new residence following the demolition of the existing historic structure at 6948 Main Street. The property is now a Contributing structure in the East End Mission Historic District.

Proposed revisions (dated 9-24-24) to the design approved by the Historic District Commission (9-10-24 meeting) include extensive changes to the exterior of the house, as follows:

Foundation

Change foundation walls from stone veneer to concrete blocks (wall section detail).

Firebox & Chimney

Relocate the firebox and chimney from the west side of the house to the east side.

Roof

Eliminate the step in the roof (as seen from the front and west side) between the smaller recreated front and the larger new rear portion, resulting in one roof plane instead of two.

Front Porch

Reduce the height of the porch floor above grade from nine to five risers.

Eliminate the front porch railings.

Windows

At the third floor corner tower, add two windows to both the south and east sides.

At the west side Living area, add three windows in place of the relocated fireplace, creating a band five windows long.

At the west side Kitchen, add a projecting bay window in lieu of the flat wall windows.

At the east side Dining, change the windows to two small units on either side of the relocated fireplace.

At the north rear Family, substitute a 3-unit wide patio door in lieu of three windows.

At the second floor bedrooms, revise numerous bedroom windows on both sides and rear of the house.

At the third floor, eliminate two windows at the north rear elevation.

At all windows, change muntin glass lite divisions from 2 over 2 glass panes, to 6 over 1 glass panes.

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 drawings of the revised project, dated 24 September 2024, by Dickinson Homes.

REVIEW

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

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 previously approved by the HDC, the front porch and facade of the "Red House" would be accurately reconstructed based on detailed documentation of existing conditions prior to demolition. An essential characteristic of this agreement is to preserve the original architectural character of the reconstructed front both in scale and detail, so that it would stand in contrast to the compatible but not historic rear portion. The approved design helps accomplish this by means of the disconnected roof planes of the front and rear portions, and the different siding treatments.

The second important digression from the previously approved design is the placement of three windows on the third floor south and east walls of the corner tower, instead of the agreed upon one window on each side.

Another aspect of the approved design that lends legitimacy to the reconstructed front is the use of double-hung windows with 2 over 2 divided lites, as documented in the earliest known photograph of the "Red House". The 6 over 1 lite configuration shown on the revised drawings represents a later architectural style period, and is not what the HDC approved.

These departures do not "retain and preserve" the historic character of the property in its reconstructed form.

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 changes would prevent the reconstructed front from appearing compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property in its existing historic form, which had been achieved by the previous HDC approval, and the historic integrity of the property would not be maintained.

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 existing historic facade is of architectural value and significance, and its reconstruction in kind would help maintain its relationship with the historic value of the surrounding district. The proposed changes would detract from this.

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

The reconstructed facade as approved would help preserve its relationship to history of the property and of the surrounding area. This relationship would be broken by the proposed changes.

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

The general compatibility of the proposed changes to the approved reconstructed historic facade would detract, in terms of design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.

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

The aesthetic value of the existing historic facade would be lost if the proposed changes are approved.

CONCLUSION

The proposed changes to the previously approved Jacquiss House front facade reconstruction would not meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW