



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

3 July 2025

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

Re: **DOUD MAY HOUSE HOTEL**  
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed Doud May House Hotel in the West End 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  
Rich Clements, Richard Clements Architect  
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

3 July 2025

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **DOUD MAY HOUSE HOTEL**

1395 Cadotte Street

West End Historic District  
Mackinac Island, Michigan

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project is the renovation of, and addition to, the old May House, 1395 Cadotte Street, in the West End Historic District. The May House is a Contributing structure in the historic district. The previous single family residence is proposed to be renovated and added to for the purpose of creating a boutique hotel, consisting of 17 rooms on three floors, and including a manager's living unit and employee living facilities at the basement level.

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 photographs of the existing house and drawings comprising site plan, floor plans, and elevations of the Existing house and Proposed hotel, by Richard Clements Architect, dated 23 June 2025.

## **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 May House property would be changed from a single-family use to a hotel use. The new use would require major exterior and interior changes to the house, and would involve extensive change to the defining characteristic of the site - that of a low-density single-family use

characterized by generous open space, replaced by a significantly higher density transient occupancy, characterized by more dense site development. Thus, the new use would cause significant alteration to the defining characteristics of the site and the property's environment. The large building addition would more than double, in fact almost triple, the mass of development on the property, significantly changing the property's sense of exterior space.

**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 house would generally be retained and preserved. The significantly increased density on the site would be accomplished with relatively minimal change to the defining characteristics of the house. The primary east / front elevation would be almost unchanged. The south / side elevation would have a substantial addition made to it, but the defining characteristics of the primary gable end would be retained.

The historic character of the house would be largely retained, thanks to the addition connecting at the rear and not overly affecting the most significant features of the architecture. While parts of the original house would be obscured by the new additions, and some historic materials would be removed at points of additions, minimal alteration of significant historic features of the old house would happen.

On the positive side, the mass and scale of the primary addition would be similar to the original house, and the link to the annex narrower, to help set off the historic house from the primary annex addition. On the negative side, the connector portion between existing and new would be so tall as to not provide the step-down in height needed for compatible separation of the new from the historic.

**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."*

While the size and scale of the new addition would be similar to the existing house, it would not create a false sense of historic development, since it would appear as a later addition to an historic building, due to differences in roof slope and architectural features.

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

No exterior changes made over the years to the May House have acquired historic significance in their own right, needing to be retained and preserved.

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

The distinctive exterior features that characterize the old May House would largely be preserved.

**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.

**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.

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

No archaeological resources are currently known to exist on the site, but vigilance should be exercised during excavation for any new addition on the property.

**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 addition and alterations would destroy some historic materials, but enough that characterize the property would remain. The new work would be somewhat differentiated from the old house by being separated and connected by a narrower, if not shorter, addition. However because of its height, the connector is not compatible with the massing and size of the old house, jeopardizing the historic integrity of the property. Ideally, the connector would be shorter in height to better set off both the historic house and the primary annex addition.

**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."*

While the proposed new additions and related new construction could be removed in the future, returning the essential form and integrity of the existing historic house, such would be highly unlikely to happen, given the proposed scope of work.

### **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 of the surrounding area is great, given neighboring historic resources in the district. The old May House is located on a very busy high-traffic location, and is especially visible as a corner property. Thus, its importance as a Contributing structure in the district is made more significant; and the height of the proposed connector would jeopardize the architectural value of the historic house.

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

The extent of the proposed site development would alter the structure's relationship to the existing sense of generous open space. The proposed height of the connector presents an incompatible relationship with the historic May House.

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

The new additions are proposed to have contrasting materials and textures, helping the new be differentiated from the appearance of the old, and maintaining the integrity of the historic house.

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

Except for the connector, the aesthetic value of the proposed annex addition, although somewhat different, would be sympathetic with the historic May House. The connector's height would detract from the aesthetic value of the overall redevelopment.

### **CONCLUSION**

If the HDC concludes the proposed renovation and additions are compatible with the historic environment of the West End Historic District based on consideration of the above standards, then the design 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**