



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

26 September 2023

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

Re: **MAUER TOWN CRIER BUILDING WEB CAMERA**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed exterior installation of a web camera at the Mauer Town Crier Building 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. Kim Ruley, Mackinac Island Town Crier
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island
Gary Rentrop, Rentrop & Morrison



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

26 September 2023.

DESIGN REVIEW

MAUER TOWN CRIER BUILDING WEB CAMERA

7523 Market Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the installation of fixed-view camera on the front exterior wall of the Mauer Town Crier commercial building, at 7523 Market Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is listed as a Contributing structure in the historic district. A web view camera is proposed to be mounted at the second floor level, with the view directed along Market Street looking to the northeast.

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 written project description and four photographs of the existing building and camera view, dated 16 August 2023.

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 building would continue in its current use as retail on the first floor and residential on the second floor.

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 character of the property would be retained. No historic materials or features would be removed, or spaces altered.

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 camera placement would not create a false sense of historic development as it would be seen as an obvious contemporary utility addition.

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 does not apply to the proposed project.

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

Distinctive features, finishes, or craftsmanship would not be removed or altered.

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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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.”*

The proposed exterior camera installation would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed new work would be differentiated from the old, appearing as a new utility feature, in contrast with the architectural character of the resource.

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 camera addition could be easily removed in the future without impairing the essential form and integrity of the 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 and architectural value and significance of the historic resource, and its relationship to the Market Street neighborhood would be preserved.

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

The proposed camera addition would certainly be in contrast to the architectural features of the resource, and to the district, but as an obvious modern amenity providing a service valued by society, its presence would not be offensive.

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

Although not particularly compatible with a historic building, necessary and desired utility features like solar panels or a web camera provide necessary resilient amenities that overall do enhance the preservation of an historic building.

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

The aesthetic value of the Mauer Town Crier Building would not be devalued by the installation of a web camera on the building. As suggested by Dennis Dombroski, I concur that the northeast side of the second floor bay window would be the best location as the camera would be a bit further into the street space (to maybe provide a better view) and more importantly for the historic building, would largely be invisible by people approaching from the southwest.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, the proposed web camera installation on the Mauer Town Crier Building at 7523 Market Street would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW