



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

4 February 2026

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

Re: **CHIPPEWA HOTEL WINDOWS ADDITION**
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed addition of windows at the Chippewa Hotel at 7221 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. Roy Shryock, Chippewa Hotel
David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard
Neumann
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

4 February 2026

DESIGN REVIEW

CHIPPEWA HOTEL WINDOWS ADDITION

7221 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District
Mackinac Island, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the addition of three new windows in three guest rooms on the first floor balcony of the Chippewa Hotel on the south, or Haldimand Bay, facing side. The hotel is a Contributing structure in the 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 the application and South Elevation drawing, received 12 January 2026.

REVIEW

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."*

While some historic materials (siding) would be removed, it is the addition of the new features (windows) that would alter the historic character of the property and prevent this standard from being met. The proposed windows would be proportionally unlike any on the historic building, and would be placed in locations which would change the existing rhythm of window openings on the south elevation.

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."*

While the addition of three new windows would be differentiated from the rest of the facade in that they would be the only windows of their size and location on the south elevation, these new windows would not be compatible with the other architectural features (windows) of the south elevation and the larger hotel. Their size and placement would be out of synch with the other window openings on the building.

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 addition of three new windows could be undertaken in a manner that if removed in the future, would allow the essential form and integrity of the historic building to be restored.

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 Chippewa Hotel is a very significant historic resource in the district, and the proposed window additions would negatively alter its architectural value by undermining the architectural integrity of this highly visible historic facade facing the Arnold Ferry dock, and at the larger scale, the building's relationship to 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 architectural features proposed to be added (windows) would not be appropriate to the building, as there are no other short double-hung windows on the south elevation or at other guest rooms on other sides.

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

Due to the proportions of the windows and their locations, the proposed work would be incompatible with the design and arrangement of the historic building design.

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

The aesthetic value of the south elevation would be diminished by the alteration of the vertical repetition of the stacked floors, as none of the other floors or bays would correspond with the three altered bays.

CONCLUSION

While the addition of three small windows may seem an insignificant alteration to the building, the effect would be an erosion of historic and architectural integrity - of the building and of the historic district.

But if the HDC concludes the proposed windows addition is compatible with the historic hotel and the environment of the Market and Main Historic District based on consideration of the above standards, then the design would meet the Standards of 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