



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

2 April 2026

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

Re: **RENDEZVOUS CENTRE RENOVATION**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have completed a revised design review of the proposed Rendezvous Centre Renovation on Huron Street 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. Anthony Trayser, Owner
Devan Anderson, Quinn Evans Architects
David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

2 April 2026

DESIGN REVIEW

RENDEZVOUS CENTRE RENOVATION

7347, 7351, & 7355 Huron Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the renovation of four buildings known as the Trading Post, May's Fudge, Baxter's, and a rear storage building, owned by the Trayser family, at 7347, 7351, and 7355 Huron Street in the Market and Main Historic District. The historic building facing Huron is a Contributing structure in the district. Proposed work on these three storefronts would be to first remove them in order to access and rebuild the front foundation wall underneath them, as well as other basement structural renovations. The three storefronts would then be rebuilt, largely with new materials and retaining the western-most pier. The Trading Post storefront would be rebuilt maintaining its historic 1948 appearance (not its original Victorian design), while the May's Fudge and Baxter's storefronts would be rebuilt to a more original c. 1900's appearance, including rebuilt lower bulkheads, and new storefront windows and doors. Upper floor surfaces would be retained and restored. Major renovation of the rear storage building would repurpose it as a cafe venue, with indoor and outdoor patio seating overlooking Haldimand Bay.

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 historic and existing photos, drawings including existing demolition floor plans, proposed floor plans, and exterior elevations, by Quinn Evans Architects, dated 20 February 2026.

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 Huron Street storefronts would continue to be used for commercial retail, and the rear existing storage building would change to become a commercial restaurant use. The change of use of the storage building would involve change to the defining character of the building in that more and larger windows, and outdoor seating, would better portray the water-oriented cafe use than the current storage use. So as a result of the proposed use change, the building's and site's appearance would become less utilitarian and more architecturally developed.

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 properties on Huron Street would be retained and preserved, and actually enhanced by restoring elements of two of the storefronts to a more original appearance. This would include replacing the inappropriate concrete block bulkheads under the display windows on May's Fudge, and narrowing the non-original double-door opening on Baxter's down to a single door, centered, with display windows on both sides.

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."*

No changes that would create a false sense of historic development would occur.

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

One could argue the non-original Trading Post log storefront treatment, completely at odds with the late nineteenth century Victorian Italianate design of the original structure, is now historic in its own right, as it dates from 1948, and is now well over 50 years old (a major criterion for being listed on the National Register of Historic Places). One could also argue the log treatment is totally at odds with the building's period of greatest significance - its original construction and initial commercial usage. And as such, it is not historically significant as a change that has acquired significance in its own right, because it is so glaringly different. As proposed, the renovation work would remove and reinstall it, preserving its existing appearance.

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

The distinctive features of the historic Victorian Italianate building would be preserved, and certainly enhanced, by the proposed restoration of the May's and Baxter's storefronts.

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."*

Deteriorated historical features on the second floor such as siding, window sills, and trim are proposed to be preserved and restored. First floor storefront work would replace all existing materials, reconstructing them to match more original detailing. Overall, proposed work would maintain the building's distinctive features and architectural integrity.

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."*

Surface cleaning would take place as part of proposed repainting, and should be done in an appropriate manner that preserves the integrity of the underlying wood substrate.

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.

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 rehabilitation of the exterior of the Main Street building (the three storefronts) would destroy some historic materials that characterize the building, but not much original materials remain. The renovation of the rear storage building would not destroy historic materials, as this building is not historic. And this work would be differentiated from the old by its physical separation and location behind the historic storefronts, and by the use of new decks and railings of non-historic but plain / neutral 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."*

No additions or new construction would be undertaken relative to the three historic storefronts. Since the rear storage building is not historic, and it is physically separated to the rear, its renovation and deck additions would not harm the essential form and integrity of the historic street-front 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 Main Street buildings are very important to the historic value of the surrounding historic district, and these would be maintained, and even enhanced, by the proposed project.

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

The proposed scope of work would restore significant architectural elements of two of the storefronts, which would enhance their historicity, as well as that of the district. The rear storage building renovation would enhance the bay side of the property, and reinforce the current desire / trend for greater people use of downtown's water frontage.

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

If not so much the Trading Post storefront, the proposed design, arrangement, and materials of the May's and Baxter's portions of the building would be compatible with other historic storefronts on Huron Street, if all ground floor street-facing siding and trim are of wood, as noted in the City "Design Guidelines". Second floor historic materials are proposed to be largely retained, and selectively replaced to match, where now deteriorated. And the renovated rear storage building, proposed to be a new cafe on the waterfront, would be very compatible with character of the historic district and downtown.

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

The aesthetic value of renovated and restored storefronts on Main Street, and a new cafe along Haldimand Bay would be positive improvements to the historic district.

CONCLUSION

If the HDC concludes the proposed renovation, including restored storefronts on Huron Street and a new cafe along Haldimand Bay, is compatible with the historic environment of the Market and Main Historic District based on consideration of the above review, then the Project would meet the Standards for review, and should be approved. If it is determined the Project is not compatible, then the application would not meet the Standards for review, and should not be approved.

END OF REVIEW