



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

12 May 2025

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

Re: **MACKINAC ISLAND COOKIE CO. AWNING ADDITION**  
Design Review

Dear Ms. Pereny:

I have reviewed the proposed new awning addition to the Arnold Transit Co. building in the Market and Main Historic District.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NEUMANN ARCHITECT

Rick Neumann

- c. Kate Conlon, Mackinac Island Cookie Co.  
Dennis Dombroski, City of Mackinac Island  
David Lipovsky, City of Mackinac Island  
Erin Evashevski, Evashevski Law Office



Richard  
Neumann  
Architect

610 Grand Avenue, Petoskey, Michigan 49770, 231.347.0931

12 May 2025

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

### **MACKINAC ISLAND COOKIE CO. AWNING ADDITION** 7271 Main Street

Market and Main Historic District  
City of Mackinac Island, Michigan

## **INTRODUCTION**

This design review is the addition of an awning on the Arnold Transit Co. building, at 7271 Main Street, in the Market and Main Historic District. The building is a Contributing structure to the historic district. The Applicant proposes to add / replace an awning that once existed above the north-facing window on the ferry terminal building. The old awning was a painted wood shed-style awning, however the replacement is proposed to be canvas covered. The canvas would have vertical blue and white stripes, and include a cookie, matching their brand logo.

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 description of project work, and photographs of the window location and the old wood awning, by the Applicant, dated 28 April 2025.

## **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 awning would not destroy materials that characterize the property, and would be compatible with the massing, size and architectural features of the property.

**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 new awning could be removed in the future, preserving the essential form and integrity of the historic 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 of the building, and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding historic district would be maintained.

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

The proposed use of a simple, shed-style awning would have an appropriate relationship with the historic building.

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

The proposed awning would be compatible with the design, arrangement, and materials of the historic building.

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

The traditional character of a canvas awning would blend well with the aesthetic value of the building.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed shed-style awning addition on the Arnold Transit Co. building would meet the Standards for review.

END OF REVIEW