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: SCHUNK STOREFRONT RENOVATION
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed Schunk Storefront Renovation at 7295 Main 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. 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

6 October 2025

DESIGN REVIEW

SCHUNK STOREFRONT DOOR & WINDOW
7295 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the renovation of the Mackinac Threads portion of the storefront at 7295 Main Street in the Market and Main Historic District. It is proposed to replace the single entry door now set to the right, with a pair of doors located to the left. The existing large display window would be reduced to a smaller width, and moved from left to right.

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 a photo of existing conditions and drawings of existing and proposed plans and elevations, dated 22 September 2025, by Richard Clements Architect.

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 retail use would continue.

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 diminished by removing historic materials, and altering significant architectural features that characterize the historic building.

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 alteration of the storefront would create a false sense of historic development by reconfiguring architectural elements of the historic design. The display window and entry door functions would be reversed, and altered in importance by emphasizing access over merchandise display.

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 is not applicable.

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

Distinctive features that characterize this historic storefront would be changed

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 is not applicable.

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 is not applicable.

Standard 8 - *"Significant archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken."*

This standard is not applicable.

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 alterations would destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

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."*

This standard is not applicable.

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 small center storefront is an integral part of the larger historic storefront, which is of great architectural value and significance in the district. The building is one of increasingly fewer remaining truly historic storefronts along Main Street.

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

The large Threads display window, almost centered in the larger storefront between two other symmetrical arrangements of large display windows punctuated by entry doors, is a primary architectural element of the whole building composition that would be lost with this renovation.

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

While the proposed design is generally compatible with and typical of late-nineteenth century storefronts, it would alter an existing significant historic resource, which is also very typical of historic storefronts of the era.

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

The historic relationship of the large display window and adjacent single entry door is very fitting to the small scale of the Threads storefront, and would be a loss of aesthetic value if changed.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project does not meet Standard 2 - preserving historic character, Standard 3 - false sense of historic development, Standard 5 - distinctive features, or Standard 9 - destroying historic materials, nor any of the standards under Sec. 10-161(b), and therefore does not meet the Standards for review. And if the HDC concurs, the project should not be approved.

END OF REVIEW