



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 October 2025

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

Re: VERDE'S TAQUERIA ADDITION
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed building addition to Verde's Taqueria 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. Melanie Libby, Mackinac Cycle
Barry Polzin, Barry J. Polzin Architects
David Lipovski, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 October 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

VERDE'S TAQUERIA ADDITION 7263 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the construction of an addition to the Verde's Taqueria cafe building at the head of the Arnold Dock, at 7263 Main Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is a Non-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 plan and elevation drawings, dated 23 September 2025, by Barry J. Polzin Architects.

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 commercial / restaurant use would continue, but the proposed addition would alter the impact of the use, changing it from an outdoor use to an indoor use, and in so doing, making more than minimal change to the defining characteristics of both the building and its site. Although not a historic building, its appearance would be significantly changed by the altered use, as well as the sense of the open space on the site and on the larger environment.

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 building is not historic, and no historic materials or features would be removed. However, the current patio open space that characterizes the property would be altered by being enclosed by a building addition.

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 addition would not create a false sense of historic development.

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

Past changes to the property have not yet acquired historic significance in their own right.

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

There are no distinctive features, finishes, or construction techniques or craftsmanship that currently warrant preservation.

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 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 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 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."*

As proposed, the new addition would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed new addition would be differentiated architecturally from the existing, and would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the existing.

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 addition could be removed in the future, preserving the essential form and integrity of the existing 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 value and significance of the property is as part of the open space at the head of the historic Arnold Ferry Dock. A previous proposal to construct a building on the Main Street parcel at the head of the Dock generated much controversy and discussion by the HDC that revolved around preserving the historic open space at the head of the Dock. A compromise with that applicant approved a bike rental business there (size and scale defined by deed), and an agreement no further construction could take place on the site.

While the Verde's Taqueria project is on a different parcel, it has a very direct and important visual relationship with the preserved open space at the head of the historic Arnold Ferry Dock. Particularly in the zone between Mackinac Cycle and the Arnold Building views between the two would be narrowed.

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

As proposed, the new addition would have an appropriate relationship to its progenitor, but add limits on views in the surrounding area.

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

When adding to a historic building it is generally deemed most appropriate to provide some type of contrast with the old. While not an old building, the proposed addition does this to achieve general compatibility by providing some architectural contrast in the form of the large double-hung windows.

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

The concerns of aesthetic value revolve around the sense of open space and compatibility. The existing deck dining space is not completely open, having a pergola-style overhead plane with covering, railings, and flower boxes. So the potential loss of open space is mostly about the mass and scale of the enclosure.

CONCLUSION

The HDC should consider the value and importance of the dining deck open space that would be lost near the head of the historic Arnold Ferry Dock.

If the HDC concludes the proposed addition is compatible with the historic environment of the Market and Main Historic District based on consideration of the above standards, then the design would meet the Standards of 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