



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

31 March 2026

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

Re: **PATRICK DOUD PUB GARDEN**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed exterior renovations for the Patrick Doud Pub Garden 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. Andrew Doud, Applicant
Richard Clements, Richard Clements Architect
David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

31 March 2026

DESIGN REVIEW

PATRICK DOUD PUB GARDEN

1500 Astor Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the renovation of the existing building at 1500 Astor Street, now to be Patrick Doud Pub Garden, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is listed as a Contributing structure to the historic district, and is part of the Lilac House property. The applicant proposes to renovate the building as a small restaurant/bar, and develop the front yard as outdoor seating serving this hospitality use. Virtually no exterior building changes are proposed other than a new wood entry door and sign. The interior would get a new accessible restroom. The immediate area of the yard along Astor is proposed to be fenced with planters, paved with gravel, and tables with chairs added for garden seating. Site work would also include removing earth around the structure lowering the exterior grade, to facilitate floor framing repairs.

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 three current photographs and two historic photos of the building and design drawings including proposed front elevation, angle views, and details, by Richard Clements Architect, dated 24 February 2025, sic 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 building apparently was constructed and first used as a dwelling. However, it is empty now, and having served several commercial uses over the years, including as the "Buggy Drive Inn" in the 1960's, and most recently as a retail T-Shirt shop. Certainly the biggest impact on the property of the new use would be conversion of the unoccupied front yard to an outdoor seating area. The new use would require little alteration to the defining characteristics of the building, but would significantly alter the defining characteristics of the site. The outdoor seating would give the property a more intensive commercial use, but which seems appropriate given its location in the heart of downtown, and not adjoining a residential neighborhood.

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 building would remain largely as is, but the character of the yard would change to be more intensively used, including perimeter planters, gravel paving, and outdoor furniture, sometimes filled with people.

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 changes to the building and site would not create a false sense of historic development, as it would be evident that a small house had become a hospitality establishment. And no conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings are proposed to be added to appear historical.

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

Likely some of the architectural changes to the small house in being converted to commercial uses over time, have become historic in their own right, but the proposed project would retain and preserve such features.

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

The building's most distinctive feature of small-scale vernacular character would remain.

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 minor renovation would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed new work would be compatible with the historic integrity of the property and the surrounding environment.

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 new additions of planters, gravel paving, and furniture could be removed in the future, preserving the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment.

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 and new outdoor use would be appropriate and compatible with the historic resource, and with the building’s value as part of the surrounding historic area.

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

The relationship of the building to its site would be significantly altered, but still be appropriate as a historic resource, in its surrounding area.

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

The proposed site design would be compatible with the design, arrangement, texture and materials of the building and of neighboring district buildings.

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

The aesthetic value of the resource (building and site) would be a positive component of the historic district and downtown Mackinac Island.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, the changes proposed for the new Patrick Doud Pub Garden at 1500 Astor Street would meet the Standards for review, including the Standards Under Code Sec. 10-161(b).

END OF REVIEW