



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

6 November 2024

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

Re: **MACKINAC PLACE CONDOMINIUM RENOVATION**  
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposal to replace exterior trim at the Mackinac Place Condominium in the East End Mission 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. Steve Rilenge, UP North Construction  
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

6 November 2024

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **MACKINAC PLACE CONDOMINIUM RENOVATION**

6743 Main Street, Units 1 - 4

East End Mission Historic District  
Mackinac Island, Michigan

## **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed project is replacement of deteriorating exterior woodwork at Mackinac Place Condominium, 6743 Main Street, Units 1 - 4, in the East End Mission Historic District. The building is a Non-contributing structure in the district. Previous work began this project before the historic district was created, and now the remainder of the work is proposed. Proposed work would replace rotting medium-density fiber board trim at numbers locations on the building. Substitute wood, cellular PVC, was used, and is proposed to be continued with this work.

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 existing conditions with notes showing areas of proposed work, dated 29 October 2024, by UP North Construction.

## **REVIEW**

Of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Standards Under Sec. 10-161(b), the applicable Standards for review are the following:

**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 new construction would not destroy historic materials as the building is not historic. The new work would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the rest of the building 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 exterior renovations would not detract from the architectural value of the resource, or the surrounding area.

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

The renovation would appropriately support the architectural features of the resource.

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

The proposed renovations would be compatible with the design, arrangement, texture and materials of the building.

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

The aesthetic value of the trim replacement would be enhanced by placing the "smooth" surface of the cellular PVC trim out, and not use the "rough-sawn cedar" side of the lumber. This would be most compatible with the historic environment as traditionally wood trim was smooth finished. Cellular PVC siding and trim in the historic districts is required to be finished with paint.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings above, the proposed trim replacement at Mackinac Place Condominium at 6743 Main Street would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW