



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

7 November 2024

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

Re: **JAQUISS COTTAGE RECONSTRUCTED FRONT CHANGES**  
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

See the attached new design review of the proposed changes to the previously approved Jaquiss Cottage in the East End Mission Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick Neumann

- c. Ryan Spencer, Dickinson Homes  
Jim Murray, Plunkett Cooney  
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

7 November 2024

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **JAQUISS COTTAGE RECONSTRUCTED FRONT CHANGES**

6948 Main Street

East End Mission Historic District  
Mackinac Island, Michigan

## **INTRODUCTION**

This review is of revisions to the previously approved design for construction of a new residence following the demolition of the existing historic structure at 6948 Main Street. The property is now a Contributing structure in the East End Mission 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 drawings of the revised project, dated 7 November 2024, by Dickinson Homes.

## **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 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."*

Current proposed revisions (dated 11-7-24) to the erroneous design presented at the October HDC meeting have essentially returned the design to that approved by the Historic District Commission at the 9-10-24 meeting, along with other changes proposed by the Applicant. The latter include relocating the fireplace and chimney to the east side, adding an exterior woodbox, changing side and rear windows, and adding a bay window at the kitchen.

**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 side and rear changes to the new addition behind the recreated historic front would not destroy materials of the front, and would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the front, protecting its historic integrity as a recreated artifact.

#### **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 existing historic facade is of architectural value and significance, and its reconstruction in kind would help maintain its relationship with the historic value of the surrounding district.

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

The reconstructed facade as previously approved would help preserve its relationship to history of the property and of the surrounding area.

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

The general compatibility of the proposed changes to the approved reconstructed historic facade would be in keeping, in terms of design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.

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

The existing historic facade as reconstructed would be of aesthetic value to the Mackinac Island community.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The proposed changes to the previously approved Jacquiss House front facade reconstruction would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW