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Chapter One
Introduction and Background

General Introduction

Charlevoix, Michigan, lies on the banks of Lake Michigan, Round Lake, and Lake Charlevoix. Settled between 1854 and 1857, the city’s development had its origins in fishing and trading. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Charlevoix’s proximity to the water also made it a popular vacation destination, leading to the development of exclusive summer resorts. Today the small lakeside city is inhabited by approximately 3,000 year-round residents, but in the busy summer months, when tourism is at its peak, the population is estimated to reach 30,000.

Earl Young’s stone architecture has been a source of tourism in Charlevoix since the 1950s. He designed and built residential structures in three locations around the city: a small triangular block bounded by Park Avenue, Clinton, and Grant Streets; Boulder Park, a lakeside subdivision that he designed in the 1920s; and Thistle Down, a secluded residential development along Round Lake’s north shore. All of Young’s commercial structures are located in downtown Charlevoix. Tours of Young’s architecture continue to be offered by the Charlevoix Historical Society and other local organizations. The Chamber of Commerce also provides flyers for self-guided tours of Young’s structures.

Young, who was never formally trained in architecture, designed and constructed a total of thirty buildings throughout the course of his fifty-year building career. Today it would likely be impossible to replicate Young’s achievements as a builder and designer. Present requirements for certification as a licensed architect or builder are clearly defined
and require years of study. In addition, building codes, zoning regulations, and planning commissions all have specific requirements that must be adhered to in the design and construction of homes and commercial buildings.

While stone architecture abounds throughout Michigan, Earl Young’s application of stone masonry is quite different from that of other regional builders, past and present. Young’s architecture is characterized by the frequent use of massive granite boulders, many of which he collected from the surrounding countryside and the rocky shores of Lake Michigan. Although Young built several structures using limestone from a quarry in Onaway, Michigan, those that employed boulders in their construction have an almost elephantine, bulbous appearance. It is this characteristic that has lent Young’s homes the name “Mushroom Houses,” although only two have any resemblance to a mushroom. Of his thirty stone structures only one was constructed outside Charlevoix, a home for a close friend in Alma, Michigan. Today twenty-eight of Young’s structures remain: two have been razed, although one, the Apple Tree, has been replicated using new stone. Several others have undergone significant renovations.

Biography of Earl Young

The details of Earl Young’s life have been recorded primarily through newspaper articles and local publications written while the eccentric builder was alive. An interview with Virginia Olsen, his youngest daughter, verified much of the published information and provided additional facts about his life, design philosophy, and career.
Earl Young was a resident of Charlevoix for over seventy years. Born on March 31, 1889, in Mancelona, Michigan—a small town thirty miles south of Charlevoix—Earl was the son of Myrtie and Adolphus Young, an insurance salesman by trade. In 1900 the family moved to Charlevoix where Adolphus Young set up an insurance agency in a small downtown office. After graduating from Charlevoix High School in 1908, Earl Young went to Ann Arbor to attend the University of Michigan, seeking a degree in architecture. However, he soon found himself at odds with conservative university professors; he returned to Charlevoix and entered into the insurance sales business.

In 1915 Earl Young married his high school sweetheart, Irene Harsha. The daughter of prominent Charlevoix businessman Horace Harsha, Irene was a soft-spoken artist and poet. Her gentle demeanor was a perfect compliment to Earl’s lively and peppery attitude. They were married for more than sixty years. Irene Young is most well-known for designing and painting the popular historic landmark maps of the Grand Traverse Region, Mackinaw Island, and the Little Traverse Region. Together, Earl and Irene Young had four children: Drew, Louise, Marguerite, and Virginia. The Youngs were a close family and lived within close proximity of each other for most of their lives.

Around the same time he married Irene, Earl Young obtained his real estate broker’s license which he held for more than sixty years. Not long after receiving his license, Young became a member of the Charlevoix-Antrim Board of Realtors and opened his own real estate agency in a small building at 224 Bridge Street, which he later remodeled and faced with limestone and decorative half-timbering. His real estate business flourished as he
bought and sold land and buildings in and around Charlevoix. By 1921 Young completed the construction of his first home, designed and built especially for his growing family. Several of the subsequent structures he erected over fifty years were used by the Young family as a source of rental income; others were designed for specific individuals. All of the buildings had a whimsical nature and were characterized by the creative use of stone.

A feisty and opinionated man, Young was not afraid to ruffle the feathers of Charlevoix residents. In 1964, when the Medusa Cement Company released plans to build a 1400-foot dock on the east side of South Point on Charlevoix’s Lake Michigan coast, there was much discourse among local residents concerning development of the coastline and industrialization of the area. Many of Charlevoix’s community members strongly opposed construction of a dock and plant at South Point, believing they would ruin the shoreline scenery. Young, however, expressed his support in several letters to the local newspaper, stating, “I would rather not see the dock there…I would rather see it around the point where it would be out of view from town. But, in all fairness, the dock is not going to cut off very much beauty or ruin the sunsets.”
response to residents’ claims that the dock would spoil the coastline and the view from Boulder Park, Young stated in another letter to the *Charlevoix Courier* that he believed the entire plant was a “prime example of beauty in functional architecture,” likening it to a huge Christmas tree at night.\(^{14}\) Despite complaints from local residents, Medusa officially opened the South Point plant in 1967.\(^{15}\)

As he aged, Earl Young’s fiery nature and love for Charlevoix did not subside. Although he became very hard of hearing and nearly blind, Young continued to throw himself into projects to beautify and develop the city and the surrounding area. Residents recall him working passionately to raise money for the development of East Park on the shore of Round Lake in downtown Charlevoix. Young also helped raise money for Charlevoix’s new hospital throughout the 1950s and ‘60s by offering a deal on lots he was hired to sell. Purchasers were encouraged to buy two fifty-foot lots at $50 each, with the cost of the second lot going into the Hospital Building Fund.\(^{16}\) After his death on May 24, 1975, *Charlevoix Courier* writer Fran Martin said of her longtime friend: “[Earl Young] was probably one of the earliest and greatest promoters of Charlevoix as a summer resort community. Charlevoix was his love. He did a great deal for the community.”\(^{17}\)

Today Earl Young’s legacy is preserved in his remaining stone structures. His influence on local architecture and enthusiasm in promoting the area was instrumental in making Charlevoix one of the most popular and unique cities in northern Lower Michigan. In an interview a few years before his death Young said of his creations: “detail, that’s my success. I build each house as you paint a picture…something you can enjoy…something that will live after you that others can enjoy.”\(^{18}\)
Young’s Creative Philosophy

Earl Young designed and erected his stone buildings for one purpose—personal enjoyment. He built not solely for financial gain or recognition; his fascination with stone and love for Charlevoix were mainly what drove him to create twenty-five unique stone structures and remodel four others in and near the city. Earl Young’s architecture did earn him fame. It also raised a few eyebrows. He came to be known as a productive developer in northern Lower Michigan, earning significant profits from his architecture. Yet he also fell into serious debt. Despite his relative financial success he continued to create stone structures for personal gratification. Young “...was an artist, but he wasn't always practical. He didn’t build [his buildings] for other people. He built them for himself.”19 Although Young’s unique creations earned him invitations to build in other areas, he adamantly refused. “He loved the area and...he stayed [in Charlevoix] to make his statement.”20 The only house Young built outside Charlevoix was constructed in Alma, Michigan, for friends of the family.

In designing his unique architecture, Earl Young sought inspiration from his passions—nature and stone. He tailored each structure to conform sensitively to its site so that it appeared to have grown there organically. Young also designed buildings around specific stones, letting them dictate the overall design of the house. His methods of design and construction culminated in the creation of thirty stone structures that are truly “organic” in their use of indigenous materials and are a prime example of twentieth century vernacular architecture.

With no formal education in architecture, Young designed his buildings without plans or specifications, only jottings on scraps of paper he carried in his pocket. He believed that “every house [should] be designed for its site.”21 Like his contemporary Frank Lloyd
Wright, Young sought to construct buildings composed of indigenous materials that complemented their topography. His fascination with nature was a life-long love affair. On Sundays he would take his children on nature walks through the forest so they could experience nature at its best. Young “…believed in tucking the house into the landscape… Trees weren’t torn down to make room for the house. He built according to the lot because it wasn’t just a house to him. It was a work of art. Every part of it had to go together.”

Earl Young’s belief that buildings should co-exist with nature led him to be painstakingly meticulous and controlling throughout all construction. Because he used no formal plans, Young had to tell masons and contractors where he wanted each stone, window, and door. “He would create the houses as he went along, just pacing off the rooms to the builder.” Occasionally Young would change his mind about how the building should look after it was partially completed, thus doorways and windows would have to be replaced with stonework and rebuilt in other locations at Young’s whim. To facilitate the construction process, it is rumored that Irene Young often provided the patient masons and carpenters with drawings of her husband’s “vision” on the sly.

Paralleling Earl Young’s fascination with nature was his love of stone. Young found inspiration in stone, often allowing specific boulders to dictate the design of a building. He selected boulders for their size, shape, color, and texture, and they often had to be held in place by a crane for several days until the mortar had hardened enough to hold them. “Stones have their own personalities,” Young said of his favorite building material. “People say I’m crazy when I say so, but they really do.”

The northern Michigan terrain is awash with glacial boulders left behind by the Wisconsinan-period glacier that covered the area more than ten thousand years ago. Granite and igneous boulders were deposited throughout the peninsula when the glacier retreated.
Limestone deposits were also formed by the stratification of the soil under the tremendous weight of the ice. Young took advantage of this wealth of boulders and limestone. In fact, he is credited with being one of the first to build with stone from the Onaway quarry near Petoskey, Michigan, a practice that later became widespread throughout northern Michigan.26

The shores of Lake Michigan also provided an ample supply of rocks and boulders. Earl was known for driving around the region and spotting boulders in fields that he thought would be good to use. If necessary, Young would purchase the boulder from the landowner, often paying extra to have it buried on site until he had a use for it.27 He occasionally purchased stone in bulk. When a canal on the St. Mary’s River in the Upper Peninsula was being constructed near Sault Ste. Marie, Young purchased red sandstone from the site, loading as much of it into his car as possible and having more delivered shortly thereafter.28 “I get rocks from many places…We have our own quarry here, and I gather them from the places I go,” Young said in a 1962 interview.29 Although he was never trained as a mason, his love of stone inspired him to use it as his primary building material. “I hired a mason and asked him to work with me to teach me how to break and set stone. I’ve never built anything but stone buildings,” he said.30

Aside from the boulders and fieldstone collected and/or purchased from around the northern Michigan region, Young also used driftwood and recycled lumber. While some of the scrap materials were hidden under cedar shingles in order to emphasize a roof’s undulating effect, others were proudly displayed. The Weathervane Inn Restaurant is a good example of Young’s use of recycled materials. The original framing members of the mill that had been on the site were used for decorative half-timbering and exposed framing throughout the main dining room. In addition, driftwood was fashioned into tables and fireplace mantels, giving the building an “old world” feel. Young also used other salvaged
materials like one-hundred-year-old street lamps rewired for electricity and leaded glass windows in many of his buildings.

In direct contrast to his use of recycled materials, Young had an intense fascination with new products. Plastic is one such material. 31 Always frugal in his expenses, Young likely used plastic for its affordability and durability. When he installed four hundred-year-old Copenhagen street lanterns at the entrance to the Weathervane Inn Restaurant, Young removed the fixtures’ original glass and replaced it with yellow-tinted plastic that he believed would be more resilient. He also used thermo-pane windows—a relatively new product in the early 1950s—in the Weathervane Inn Restaurant, ordering them a full three years before he officially purchased the property. 32

General Characteristics of Young’s Architecture

Young sought to design durable structures that would blend with the environment and last for hundreds of years. His architecture does not conform to a particular style. Instead, his buildings incorporate design elements from a number of different styles such as Arts and Crafts, Prairie, and even Swiss Chalet. While each of Young’s structures has its own distinct character, they are unified by a number of key elements, including exterior stonework, massive stone fireplaces, and generally low-lying (often cedar shingle) roofs.

The most significant characteristic of Earl Young’s architecture is his use of stone masonry, the majority of which is structural. Twenty of his thirty original structures are constructed of structural masonry. Many of the buildings of this type typically appear massive and bulbous in appearance; only their window and door openings are wood framed. 33 The remaining ten structures are of frame construction, with quarried or cut stone applied to the exterior. Most of his interiors have plaster walls; stonework is exposed inside
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only a few buildings. In the homes built of structural masonry, the interiors were framed out after the exterior stonework was in place; insulation was added to the cavity between the stonework and the interior wall.\(^{34}\)

Stone was also used in the construction of massive fireplaces. These were Earl Young’s favorite feature to design because he believed their flickering light best displayed the intricacies of stonework.\(^{35}\) All of Young’s buildings have at least one fireplace; many have two or more. To show them off, Young designed rooms to be centered around a fireplace.

Another distinguishing feature are cedar shingle roofs. Some of the houses in the triangular Park Avenue block have roofs that appear to undulate. In contrast, the roofs of the homes in Boulder Park are more conservative; typically gabled or hipped in form, they are dominated by straight lines with deeply overhanging eaves and decorative exposed rafter tails. Young’s low-lying undulating cedar shake roofs function in harmony with the landscape, helping to blend each home into its environment. To create these roofs, Young first framed them in a wave-like form; he then applied three to four layers of cedar shakes on top of the rafters, laying them to accentuate the

\(\text{Figure 4: }\) At “Boulder Manor” the stonework was constructed first, with the interior walls built within them. Photo Credit: Charlevoix Historical Society

\(\text{Figure 5: }\) Framing the roof of “Boulder Manor” in 1928. Notice the carved exposed rafter ends. Photo Credit: Charlevoix Historical Society

\(\text{Figure 6: }\) Framing an “undulating” roof. As in Young’s architecture, the roof here takes on a serpentine form; the shingles are then layered atop lath or sheathing to accentuate the motion of the framing. Photo Credit: Lloyd Kahn, \textit{Homework} Bolinas, CA: Shelter Publications, Inc., 2004), 4.
motion. In some cases, like the famous “Mushroom House,” Young used scrap lumber to heighten portions of the roof.

Several of Young's structures are characterized by hidden or sheltered front entries. A characteristic of Frank Lloyd Wright's architecture, a hidden doorway protects the inhabitants of a house, adding a sense of privacy and seclusion from the world. Young's front doors are either concealed from view by a deep covered porch or sheltered by a small overhang, or in some cases, the roof's deep overhanging eaves.

Unfortunately, a common interior feature is small, inadequate kitchens and dining rooms. Young’s lack of interest in cooking led him to neglect the design of these rooms. His kitchens were tiny, often requiring renovations by the owners in order to be used comfortably. Most of his homes also had small dining rooms, or lacked them altogether.

There are also a number of features that appear in many, but not all, of Young’s structures. Mullioned and leaded glass windows are common. Squat chimneys that resemble partially melted candles are noticeable in several structures. The short stone chimneys are liberally frosted with cement, which gives them a whimsical appearance. Young's architecture is also frequently complemented by creative landscaping accented by the use of small boulders or stone walls, which assist in unifying the homes with their environment. Through the use of indigenous materials, careful siting, and effective landscaping, Earl Young’s architecture blends structure and setting, resulting in buildings that are truly organic. It is unusual ever to find any of his buildings for sale for any length of time.

Earl Young’s architecture has helped define Charlevoix as a city unlike any other in Michigan. His buildings are one of the most popular attractions in northern Michigan and a living tribute to his love for nature, stone, and the community. “Some will tell you Earl Young…waged a lifelong contest with nature, to prove he [could] create something equal to
the beauty she gave Charlevoix. And some of the same people sometimes admit he may have won.”38

Problem Statement

To date, there is little information available for people interested in learning more about Earl Young and the history of his extraordinary work. Not only have Young’s “mushroom” houses had an aesthetic influence on architecture in the Charlevoix area, they have been a magnet of tourism for over fifty years. Yet, surprisingly, little effort has been made to document these extraordinary structures.

Research Question

Assessing the importance of the work of Earl Young: Should Earl Young be considered a significant designer and should his buildings be considered of historic significance?
Purpose of the Study

The focus of the study is multifaceted, ranging from an examination of construction materials and methods to an analysis of Earl Young’s architectural influences throughout his fifty-year building career. Never formally trained in architecture, Young allowed factors such as personal taste and current architectural trends to inspire his creations. The primary building materials used, specifically structural stone, local wood, and cedar shingles, will be assessed in terms of their physical features and conservation needs. In addition, recommendations concerning proper conservation methods for the structures will be provided. As a whole, the study seeks to document the history of Earl Young’s architecture, its influence and importance in the Charlevoix region, and to provide a context in which to determine their potential historical and architectural significance.

Significance of the Study

Undoubtedly, Earl Young’s stone buildings have had a profound effect upon Charlevoix. Characteristics of his style are reflected in both commercial and residential architecture throughout the local area. Yet surprisingly little effort had been made to document these extraordinary structures. The study is intended to be not only a source of accurate information about each of Young’s structures, but an illustration of their influence on architecture in and around the Charlevoix community. Presently, not one of these structures is covered by national, state, or local protective legislation, such as historic listings or easements. The ultimate goals of the study are to create an awareness of the significance of Earl Young’s creations and to inform any movement towards their preservation.
Definition of Terms

**Conservation** – The “physical intervention in the actual fabric of the building to ensure its continued structural integrity.”

**Preservation** – The “maintenance of the artifact [or building] in the same physical condition as when it was received…Nothing is added to or subtracted from the aesthetic corpus…Any interventions necessary to preserve its physical integrity are to be cosmetically unobtrusive.”

**Reconstruction** – The “re-creation of vanished buildings on their original site.”

**Restoration** – The “process of returning the artifact to the physical condition in which it would have been at some previous stage of its morphological development.”

**Vernacular** – “Not only a style but a category of building. It generally designates ‘ordinary’ building, the commonplace fabric of architectural forms that evolve within a context of local needs and conditions. The term encompasses not only the design features of built form…but also that form’s methods of construction, materials, spatial organization, and functions.”
Limitations of the Study

In conducting historical research, it can never be assumed that all the information needed will be readily available. Although interviews with Young’s daughter Virginia Olsen and owners of some of the homes have been helpful, a person’s memory can not be relied upon as the sole source of data. Therefore, it is necessary to attempt to validate recollections concerning Young’s structures (especially in terms of their construction dates) using historical data. Unfortunately, some of the historical information needed for research on Earl Young did not exist, leaving a few minor gaps in information. While this presented some obstacles, it is typical when conducting historical research and has not adversely affected the study as a whole.
Chapter Two
Review of Related Literature

A variety of sources were consulted to determine elements of styles and movements such as the Arts and Crafts style, the Storybook style, and Frank Lloyd Wright. Leland Roth’s *American Architecture: A History* (2001) provided a basic description of the Arts and Crafts style and Frank Lloyd Wright’s Prairie style. Arrol Gellner’s *Storybook Style* (2001) was consulted for contextual information on the Storybook style. Virginia and Lee McAlester’s *A Field Guide to American Houses* (2003) was used to obtain basic architectural terms and building forms. Marcus Whiffen and Frederick Koeper’s *American Architecture: 1607-1976* (1981) provided information on the Arts and Crafts movement, and Frank Lloyd Wright’s theory of organic architecture. Organic architecture was also explored in depth through sources such as Wright’s *The Natural House* (1954) and Carole Bolon, Robert Nelson, and Linda Seidel’s *The Nature of Frank Lloyd Wright* (1988).

Research on vernacular architecture involved a number of sources, including James Marston Fitch’s *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World* (1990), which was also used as a source for basic knowledge of historic preservation. In addition, global vernacular architecture was explored through Shelter Publications’ *Shelter* (1973) and Lloyd Kahn’s *Homework: Handbuilt Shelter* (2004). These texts provided not only definitions of vernacular architecture but basic information about the significance of vernacular, or folk, buildings and provided examples throughout the world. Allen G. Noble’s *To Build in a New Land: Ethnic Landscapes in North America* (1992) provided contextual information about vernacular architecture in the United States, specifically the Midwest. Information
concerning the proper documentation of vernacular building forms was derived from the National Park Service’s *Recording Historic Structures* (2004).

Facts on the glacial geography and history of Michigan were obtained from John Dorr, Jr., and Donald Eschman’s *Geology of Michigan* (1998). This information was applied to research on glacial building materials, like granite, limestone, and sandstone. Stones and stone masonry were studied using Harley J. McKee’s *Introduction to Early American Masonry: Stone, Brick, Mortar, and Plaster* (1973) and Charles McRaven’s *Stonework* (1997). Additional sources such as Charles McRaven’s *Building with Stone* (1989) and Nigel Hutchins’ *Restoring Houses of Brick and Stone* (1998) were also used to derive information on the particular properties of stones relating to building construction. The National Park Service’s *Preservation Briefs* 1, 2, 19, and 39 were consulted for information on conserving stone as well as cedar shingle roofs.

The history of Charlevoix, Michigan, was obtained from the Charlevoix Historical Society’s *Bob Miles’ Charlevoix II* (2002) and Diane Foster’s *Charlevoix* (1998), as well as archival documents at the Charlevoix Historical Society and Charlevoix Public Library. Little information about Earl Young and his architecture has been published. Articles about Young and his buildings have appeared in publications that discuss regional history and architecture. Books like Kathryn Eckert’s *Buildings of Michigan* (1998) and the Charlevoix Historical Society’s *Bob Miles’ Charlevoix II* (2002) dedicated two pages to Young and his creations, but gave only a factual overview. While these sources provide well-researched and accurate information, they do not discuss Earl Young and the history of his architecture in detail, nor do they examine the impact his architecture has had on the community. For example, the 1988 brochure by the Charlevoix Chamber of Commerce entitled “Charlevoix the Beautiful: An Earl Young Tour of Charlevoix,” is a brochure that can be found at rest
stops, hotels, and travel agencies throughout northern Michigan. It briefly tells the story of Earl Young and provides a map of Charlevoix with the location of each of his surviving structures. While the brochure is a useful source of information on Charlevoix’s “mushroom” houses, it provides only a surface-level glimpse into the life and work of Earl Young.

Local and regional newspapers and magazines began publishing articles about Earl Young and his creations in the 1930s. These articles, while numerous, are not sufficient sources of information as they are often rife with personal opinion and riddled with errors. Only a handful of articles featuring interviews with Young and/or his children can be relied on as sources of information for the study, as they provide direct quotes from Young and his family members and are less likely to be influenced by the author’s personal beliefs, opinions, and local rumors.

In addition to these articles, city, township, and county tax records, property deeds, directories, building permits, and surveys were consulted for historical data on each of the buildings. These public sources provided quantifiable information on building’s construction dates, occupants, and renovations over time. Because there was little published information on Earl Young’s buildings, it was necessary to use mostly primary sources in the research.
Chapter Three
Research Design and Methodology

Study Design

The study is entirely quantitative in design. Information and research will be compiled with both historic and present-day photographs and images collected throughout the study. Due to the limited supply of accurate information on Earl Young’s architecture, it was necessary to use mostly primary sources to determine most of the data. These sources are discussed in the ‘Data Gathering Procedures’ section of the proposal. Additionally, a number of historic preservation and architectural history texts have been consulted.

Methodology

Data gathering procedures

Information will be collected from a variety of primary sources, including but not limited to archival documents; popular historic architectural trade journals; property deeds; property tax assessment records; Sanborn Fire Insurance and plat maps; United States Census records; historic photographs; local newspaper and magazine articles; city building permits; city council meeting minutes; and oral interviews with residents of the homes; Virginia Olsen, Earl Young’s daughter and building assistant; and community members.

Secondary sources, like architectural history texts, will be used to determine style characteristics and architectural movements throughout the early twentieth century. In
addition, the National Park Service’s *Preservation Briefs* will be cited in terms of conservation recommendations for cedar shingles, masonry construction, and colored mortar.

**Data Analysis**

Information from U.S. Census records, property deeds, property tax assessment records, and interviews with Young’s family members and local residents will be analyzed to provide a reasonable estimate for the date of construction of each of Young’s buildings. Popular historic architectural journals and an interview with Virginia Olsen will be used to derive an understanding of Young’s building techniques and influences.

**Timeline**

Research on Earl Young and his stone architecture commenced in February of 2004 and was completed in February of 2005.
The Park Avenue Triangle

From the 1920s to the 1960s, Earl Young constructed seven houses and remodeled three homes in a triangular block bounded by Park Avenue, Clinton Street, and Grant Street. Despite its ten structures, the block itself is relatively small; the 1917 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows only five homes on the block at the time, all but one with frontage on Clinton Street. Earl Young purchased part of Lots One and Four in October of 1919 with the intention of constructing a home for himself and his wife of four years, Irene. At this time the block was composed of six evenly spaced lots that contained five homes. When Young purchased portions of Lots One and Four, he not only created a seventh lot but later added a second house with frontage on Park Avenue.

Over the next thirty years Earl Young slowly acquired all of the triangle, carving it into nine oddly shaped lots that now contain ten homes. Today the block remains largely as Young left it—despite a few repairs and cosmetic modifications. Of the ten homes, six are oriented towards Park Avenue where they share a retaining wall composed of roughly stacked limestone. The wall, in its rugged simplicity, unifies the six different houses and seems to instill a sense of order and purpose in this eclectic enclave. Earl Young’s Park

Figure 7: The 1917 Sanborn Map depicting five homes and six lots on Park Avenue’s Block 12. Photo Credit: Sanborn Map Collection, Charlevoix Historical Society.
Avenue block structures are among his most photographed and well-known creations. Although each has its own distinct design and character, the collection appears to be huddled together in a haphazard, organic manner, as if they were put there by nature itself.

Figure 8: 1990 Plat of Block 12. Because he ultimately owned a majority of the block, Young managed to carve it into ten lots of irregular shapes and sizes. Photo Credit: 1990 Plat Book of Charlevoix County, Charlevoix County Equalization Department.
Erected in 1921, this was the first house designed and built by Earl Young. In 1919 Young purchased a portion of Lot Four on the triangular block; in 1921 he acquired the remainder of the lot. Tax records show a significant increase in the value of the property between 1920 and 1921, implying that the house was constructed at that time. By late 1921 Young had created a unique two-and-a-half-story stone home for himself and his wife, Irene. On December 29, 1921, the couple sent cards inviting family and friends to join them for an evening at their new home, which stated: “There will be a fire on the hearth and a light in the window for you.” Earl and Irene Young raised their family here, only moving next door in
the late 1940s after their children had grown. The house is presently owned and occupied by Robert Gill, Earl Young’s son-in-law.

The house itself is conservative when compared to many of Young’s later creations. Arts and Crafts influences like exposed rafter beams, wide eaves, and an overall horizontality in form predominate. It appears to be a variation on the bungalow form, an architectural style that became popular throughout the country in the early twentieth century. The home is composed almost entirely of granite boulders and local fieldstone. Small shed roof dormers on each side of the house are finished with white stucco and wood accenting. The stonework is structural; only the roof and window and door openings are wood framed. As in many of Young’s structures, the main entrance to the house is sheltered by a deep front porch. The roof as it is seen today is covered with asphalt shingles. It may, at one time, have been covered with cedar shingles. Two squat stone chimneys and plate glass windows with wooden trim add character and detail.
“Abide Cottage”
310 Park Avenue
Built circa 1938

“Abide Cottage” retains the name given to it by Earl Young, who purchased the triangular portion of land on which it sits in December of 1937. Deeds research does not clearly indicate the date of construction for the cottage. According to Virginia Olsen the property was built in 1938. The modestly increased tax value of the property between 1937 and 1938 suggests that the cottage was likely constructed during those years. Tax records indicate that in the late 1940s
and early 1950s Young may have made some renovations. The family used the house as a source of rental income until it was sold by Irene Young in September of 1978.

Nestled within a cluster of pine trees on the narrow triangular corner of the Park Avenue block, “Abide Cottage” appears to have grown from the earth. It is constructed entirely of fieldstone and limestone rubble from the Onaway quarry in Petoskey, Michigan. Initially the stonework appears ragged and disorganized; upon closer inspection it is actually quite detailed. Intricate stonework over the doorways and at the house’s corners shows Young’s attention to detail. The one story cottage is random in form, taking on a rambling organic appearance. Rounded windows and doorways add a touch of character. The undulating cedar shingled roof and stone retaining wall covered with moss and vegetation help blend the house into its environment.

“Abide Cottage” is presently privately owned, yet it continues to be used as a rental property. Visitors to Charlevoix looking for a unique experience can rent the cottage for $1000 per week. In the summer of 2004 an electrical fire broke out within the house, damaging much of its interior and a portion of the roof. The house is currently undergoing renovations to repair the damage.
Deeds research does not clearly indicate a date of construction for “Betide Cottage.” However, according to Virginia Olsen the cottage was constructed circa 1943. 56 Young purchased the triangular portion of land at the west tip of the Park Avenue block in December of 1937. 57 A modest increase in the value of the land from 1942 to 1943 implies that the cottage was likely built between those years. 58 After completing the cottage, the Youngs used it primarily as rental income. Tax records also suggest that in the late 1940s and early 1950s Earl may have made some renovations. 59 The cottage was owned by the Young family until Irene sold it in September of 1978. 60
The façade appears almost round, with setbacks on either side of a central ribbon window. It is constructed almost entirely of quarried Onaway limestone, laid in an intricate pattern with a smooth texture. Dark wood is used as an accent on the projecting portion of the façade to create the illusion of exposed framing members. The narrow, glass-paned front door is sheltered from view and the elements by a deep overhanging eave which also extends over the plate glass ribbon window. The cedar shingled hipped roof is topped with a squat, cement-frosted chimney. The roof does not appear to undulate, but its edges do have an irregular rippled effect. Like 306 Park Avenue, the south elevation of the house is visible from Clinton Street. It is quite unlike the façade. The south elevation is dominated both by stonework on the lower level and a cantilevered main level faced with irregular wood siding, which provides much-needed space for the tiny house.

In July of 1999 the present owner modified the home’s roof and replaced the existing asphalt shingles with cedar shingles. Previously, the shallow slope of the roof and one- to two-inch eave overhangs caused water to run off the surface at a very low velocity. This allowed an excess of moisture to penetrate the window sills and frames and seep into the stonework. Prolonged exposure to moisture caused damage to the sills and frames; it also caused spalling of some of the limestone in freeze-and-thaw conditions during the winter months. To remedy the problem, the owner increased the roof overhang so that it is one foot deep on the north, east, and west elevations. The house has not had any problems relating to moisture since.
Intended to be a home for himself and Irene, Earl Young designed and built this house between 1946 and 1947. Young purchased Lots Five and Six in December of 1937, but he did not construct a house on the site until almost ten years later. Tax records from the late 1940s show a dramatic increase in the value of the land from 1946 to 1947, indicating that the structure was built at that time. No longer in need of the two-and-a-half story house in which they had raised their children, the Youngs began renting out 304 Park Avenue in 1947 after they moved into the new house next door. Earl and Irene lived at 306
Park Avenue until Irene sold it to her daughter and son-in-law in September of 1976. Today, the house remains privately owned but is no longer in the Young family.

The home has a rambling low-lying appearance and blends gracefully into the landscape. It is composed entirely of cut limestone from the Onaway quarry near Petoskey, stacked horizontally in stratified layers. Large floor-to-ceiling plate glass windows with simple trim provide a view of Lake Michigan. While the main doorway is not hidden within a deep porch, a small overhang with decorative brackets shelters the entrance. Again the cedar shingled roof is framed to give an undulating appearance; the shingles are laid in a pattern that further accentuates this movement. Two squat, “cement-frosted” chimneys, characteristic in Young’s architecture, sit atop the low-lying roof.

A portion of the south elevation of the house is visible from Clinton Street. Its primary feature is a tiered wall also made of stacked Onaway limestone. The street-side garage, which appears to have been built into the hillside, is believed to have been added in 1962 and can be accessed from within the house. The similar color and motion of the roof and tiered wall give the illusion of the two blending into one another as if they jointly form part of the hillside.
Named the “Half House” because of its peculiar shape, this home is one of Earl Young’s most distinctive creations. Deeds research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, according to Virginia Olsen, the cottage was built in 1947. Young purchased the property on June 1, 1946, from Mary Hamilton. Tax records suggest that by 1947 the unusual cottage had been constructed. The house remained in the Young family
until the 1970s and was used primarily as rental income. Today, it is a privately owned vacation cottage.

The small one-and-a-half story cottage is situated on the site of the carriage house for the former farmhouse (“Pines Cottage”) at 300 Park Avenue. The cottage is semi-circular in shape and appears to be snuggled into the landscape. The house is composed of solid masonry, with only the roof and window and door openings framed with wood supports. Both the front door and window appear to be recessed into the house, sheltered by the low roof and rough boulders that form the exterior walls. The “Half House” is constructed almost entirely of granite boulders and local fieldstone. However, the flat east elevation, made of concrete and faced in white stucco, presents a sharp contrast to the rest of the house’s rounded and uneven appearance. It rises from a pile of boulders at its base in a perfect vertical line and extends above the sloped roof to form a small chimney. The south elevation contains a shed-roof dormer with wood siding to add space to the small half story. Its cedar shingled roof, which rises at an angle from the boulder walls in a wavy, organic fashion, appears to be more a part of the hillside than the house. The rippling form is primarily due to careful framing; cedar shingles laid atop the undulating rafters emphasize the form and suggest motion.

The “Half House” is Young’s smallest cottage. It appears to have sprouted from the ground. Its unusual form and organic character have made it one of his most recognized creations.
Tax records imply that the house was first constructed by A. J. and Mary Hamilton between 1910 and 1912. In August of 1951 Drew Young purchased it from longtime resident Mary Hamilton. It is unknown if the house was used as a source of rental income; however, the Youngs appear to have made several renovations beginning in 1952. In January of 1954 Drew sold the rights to the property to his father, who then sold the property to his son-in-law Robert Gill. At this time the value of the property increased significantly, indicating that more work may have been done. In 1962 the Youngs made yet...
another set of renovations. The improvements made between 1952 and 1962 were similar to those made at 305 Clinton Street—Young added smooth-faced irregularly patterned limestone to both the first level and the chimney at the rear of the house, topping the squat chimney with his signature excess cement. It is unknown whether he added the irregular shingles on the second story.

The building is a simple version of a Michigan upright-and-wing house. The front-gabled upright portion is accentuated with irregular shingles on the second story. The side-gabled wing portion harbors a narrow covered porch that shields the main entry. The house is presently privately owned.
The “Mushroom House” may be Earl Young’s most well known and photographed creation. The house derives its name from its unusual oval form, thick stone walls, and low-lying cedar shingle roof. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, Virginia Olsen and Jeannine Wallace—the home’s current owner—believe it was built in the early 1950s. Tax records indicate that there was a dramatic increase in the value of the land from 1954 to 1955, which suggests that the house was constructed at that time. Minnie Cooper, a seamstress, had owned a farmhouse on the lot for over forty years until 1950 when it became the property of her estate. By the time it was purchased by Earl Young in 1954, the house had fallen into severe disrepair.
The “Mushroom House” was built on the site of the two-story, century-old upright-and-wing farmhouse at the corner of Clinton and Grant Streets. It is constructed entirely of structural masonry consisting of large granite boulders and local fieldstone. The unusual round house is one and a half stories in height and resembles a massive button mushroom. It was built on the foundation of the former farmhouse, some of whose beams were saved and used in the construction of the new house. The main entrance is sheltered and partially shielded from view by the home’s stone walls and deep overhanging eaves. Leaded glass windows are nestled into the three-and-a-half-foot thick walls. The interior is rambling, with a random traffic pattern and oddly shaped rooms. The living room is paneled in Cyprus and contains large leaded glass windows and a massive fireplace composed of cut Onaway limestone laid diagonally. The home’s cedar-shingled roof is one of Young’s most distinctive; round in form, it rises and falls as if floating upon water. The roof’s undulating form is
due to a number of factors, primarily careful framing. Multiple layers of cedar shingles were laid atop the rafters to accentuate the rolling motion. In addition, Young used scrap lumber, even old screen doors with brass doorknobs still attached, to prop up portions of the roof for added definition. In the early 1980s Wallace replaced the home’s original cedar shingle roof which had begun rotting due to prolonged exposure to moisture. During this process the roofers uncovered a number of pieces of scrap lumber used to accentuate the roof’s motion. This scrap lumber generated the same effect as eighteen layers of shingles; the roof is now protected by three to four layers.

Jeannine Wallace purchased the property in 1964, although she had moved into the house two years earlier. In the early 1970s the Wallaces remodeled the painfully small kitchen to make it more accommodating. With the addition of two doors, an office space, and a sizeable bathroom off the west side, the kitchen now feels more comfortable. The new bathroom’s most interesting feature is the east wall, which was formerly the exterior of the house. The exposed stonework in the bathroom provides an up-close and personal view of the boulders and fieldstone Young used in the construction of the house.

The “Mushroom House” has been one of Charlevoix’s most photographed and famous homes since it was constructed roughly fifty years ago.
This hillside house sits perched on the site of what was once an outbuilding for the farmhouse at 301 Clinton Street. At first glance the small cottage appears to be more a garage than a house. However, the second story contains a sizeable living space. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. According to Virginia Olsen and Jeannine Wallace—the home’s current owner—it was built in 1954 when Earl Young acquired the lot that also contained the century-old farmhouse. Tax records show a significant increase in the value of the land from 1953 to 1954, indicating that the structure was likely built at the same time as the “Mushroom House.” Jeannine Wallace presently uses the home as a source of rental income.

101 Grant Street
Built circa 1954-1955

Figure 31: View of the façade and east elevation of the house as it is seen today. Note the limestone wall that continues to wind up the hillside. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
The cottage has a Swiss chalet appearance with its steeply pitched gable roof and flared eaves. The first story is constructed of horizontally stacked Onaway limestone which blends seamlessly into an attached limestone retaining wall that climbs sinuously up the hillside. The small arched entryway on the east elevation is sheltered by a rectangular bay window on the second level. The wooden door appears almost to have been carved into the limestone itself. Dividing the first floor from the second are decorative wooden joist ends which give the cottage a rustic appearance. The second story, which houses the majority of the living space, is faced with dark irregular wood siding on the east elevation. Two shed dormers punctuate the steep roof, which extends steeply toward the ground, on the south elevation. A glass block window on the west elevation demonstrates Young’s fascination with new materials. An enclosed porch on the less visible north elevation adds additional living space to the second story.

In the fall of 2004 the home’s asphalt shingled roof was replaced with cedar shingles reminiscent of Young’s initial design.\textsuperscript{91} The original cedar shingles had been removed decades before and were replaced with cheaper, and more durable, asphalt shingles that were both designed and laid to emulate the original wooden shakes.\textsuperscript{92}
Dubbed the “Pines Cottage” by Young in the 1940s, the former farmhouse was constructed by Harvey Lee and Nellie Iddings. Harvey Lee Iddings was Charlevoix’s first mayor, from 1905 to 1907; he died in 1910. Historic tax records show an increase in the value of the land from 1911 to 1912, suggesting that the structure was remodeled on or shortly after Harvey Lee’s death. In November of 1944 Young acquired the property, most likely for use as a source of rental income. City directories indicate the house was rented to
several tenants throughout the 1940s and ‘50s. In the 1960s it came to be occupied by Young’s daughter Marguerite. Between 1961 and 1962 Earl remodeled the house, adding stonework and an impressive fireplace. On the first story of the façade he added smooth-faced quarried limestone with raised mortar joints. He extended the limestone to the porch posts and rear chimney; inside, he created a dramatic limestone fireplace.

The house is a variation on the Michigan gabled-ell type house, a popular rural housing form characterized by a dominant two-story upright section with a front-facing gable and a one or two-story wing with side-facing gable. Like many of Young’s houses, the entrance is shielded from view by the deep porch which extends the length of the wing. The windows, characteristic of many in Young’s homes, are leaded glass accented by colorful wooden trim. The second story is finished in cream-colored stucco with semi-circular shingles under the gable. The steep roof is covered with asphalt shingles and is pierced by a bay window with a pointed roof. Today the house is privately owned and used as a vacation home.
Tax records suggest the house was constructed between 1910 and 1911 by M. J. Parmelee. It was later owned by Hugh E. Vandewalker, a life insurance salesman residing in Ann Arbor, who used it as a vacation home from 1925 until 1940 when it was sold to the state. Deeds records do not indicate when Drew Young, the son of Earl and Irene Young, purchased the home. He is listed as taxpayer on the property from 1944 until 1973.

An increase in the value of the home from 1961 to 1962 as indicated by historic tax records implies that the house was remodeled by Earl Young at that time. Young added quarried Onaway limestone laid in a smooth pattern which extended approximately three-
quarters of the height of the house; the rest was finished with wood siding. He also adorned the chimney with limestone and added stonework to the fireplace indoors.

The house itself is rather simple in form and is dominated by a side-facing gable roof. A shed roof dormer on the west elevation and a covered entry on the east elevation add interest. Its distinguishing feature is the limestone stonework. Today the house is privately owned.

Figure 36: South and west elevation of 305 Clinton Street. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
The Park Avenue Corridor

At the same time that he was developing the triangular Park Avenue block, Earl Young was also constructing homes a few blocks west on Park Avenue. The residential street winds along the shore of Lake Michigan on the west side of Charlevoix. In the 1940s and 1950s, Young constructed three unique homes along Park Avenue: one on the shore of Lake Michigan, one constructed of red sandstone, and one that originally had a thatch roof. Although two of the homes were constructed on commission, they all contain the distinctive stonework characteristic of Earl Young’s architecture.

Figure 37: View of Park Avenue corridor looking west.
Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
316 Park Avenue

Built circa 1945

Just west of the Park Avenue triangular block is one of Earl Young’s most unique creations. The house was constructed on the site of a home previously owned by Emma Buss.\textsuperscript{101} Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, according to Virginia Olsen, the home was built circa 1945.\textsuperscript{102} Tax records indicate that Drew Young acquired the property in 1943; from 1943 to 1945 the value of the land increased significantly, which suggests that the home was built at that time.\textsuperscript{103}

Compared to Earl Young’s other structures, of which the dominant feature is unusual stonework, this house is different. Although composed entirely of structural stone,
the house was originally whitewashed and accented by dark wooden beams that emulated half-timbering. A thatch roof, which Young shipped in pieces from Great Britain to Charlevoix, was its crowning feature. As a whole the home was originally designed to have the look and feel of an English country cottage rather than an organic stone dwelling. Young’s departure from his usual design philosophy suggests he may have been influenced by European architecture during his travels abroad.

In January of 1947 Drew Young sold the house to Lawrence E. Towe, who lived in it until 1950, when he sold it to C. H. Flomsbee. It is believed that Flomsbee made a number of modifications between 1950 and 1951, including removal of the thatch roof and replacing it with more manageable asphalt shingles. In addition, the whitewash was removed at an unknown time to expose the colorful stonework. Today the shape of the roof is reminiscent of the original thatch roof. A small stone wall, its design clearly influenced by Young’s characteristic use of multi-shaped stone and excess cement, was recently constructed along the front yard by the present owners.
Nestled beneath the towering trees along the shore of Lake Michigan is one of Earl Young’s most spacious homes. The 2,300-square-foot one-story house was constructed in 1948 and features dramatic views of the lake.\(^{108}\) According to Virginia Olsen, this is one of several homes that Young constructed on commission. He designed and built the house for the Sucher family in 1948.\(^{109}\) Deed research and tax records verify that Young never owned the property.

The house has a rambling elongated shape that echoes the nearby shoreline. It is wood framed and faced with stacked cut limestone from the Onaway quarry.\(^{110}\) Numerous

\(\text{Figure 40: View of the south elevation of 711 Park Avenue today. Note the cut stone wall that Young created along the property line. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson}\)
plate glass windows with wooden trim provide a wide array of views from inside the house. Like many of Young’s homes, it has a low-pitched undulating roof with rafter beams exposed under the eaves. Cedar shingles accentuate the flowing form of the roof. Perhaps the most notable feature is the three-part chimney, which is composed of stacked cut Onaway limestone. The home’s original property line, which has since been divided into three lots, is delineated by a cut and stacked limestone wall designed by Young.

The interior is spacious. Its central feature is the living room’s limestone fireplace. Young designed the fireplace so that the cut limestone was laid in a dramatic sunburst pattern; decorative exposed ceiling beams also follow this pattern, extending through the outer wall to form a trellis over the small patio. Especially unique are the yellow neon lights that Young hid behind the beams, which at night make the ceiling appear as if it is glowing.\(^{111}\)

Few known renovations have been made to the house other than the garage added by the owners in 1972.\(^{112}\) This garage blends tastefully into the original structure and is faced with stacked cut limestone of a similar color. The house remains privately owned and is one of Young’s most recognizable buildings. Its location along the lakeshore is unparalleled.
712 Park Avenue
Built 1954

Earl Young’s only remaining structure that incorporates red sandstone, this house was designed and built in 1954. According to Virginia Olsen, it was constructed on commission for the Rountree family. Deed research and tax records indicate that Young never owned the property. The house’s most distinctive feature is the red sandstone Young obtained from the St. Mary’s River in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula. He was so enthralled by the unique red rock that he loaded as much of it as he could into his car to take back to
Charlevoix. The stone gets its red hue from the high concentration of iron oxides in the soil around the St. Mary’s River near Sault Ste. Marie.

The house appears to be somewhat round in form. A large wing faced with wooden siding and red sandstone extends from the south elevation. The façade is dominated by a large round room faced with the red sandstone and accented by floor-to-ceiling plate glass windows, which provide views of Lake Michigan. Prior to 1990, the hipped roof was covered with Young’s trademark cedar shingles. Today it is covered with asphalt shingles. Atop the round hipped roof sits a large squat chimney also composed of red sandstone. The house is privately owned and continues to be a distinctive home in Charlevoix due to its unique color and design.

Figure 45: View of the west elevation of the house. The long wing that extends out from the south elevation can also been seen from this elevation. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
Bartholomew’s Boulder Park

In 1881 the Bartholomew family purchased thirty-seven and a half acres just west of Charlevoix. The topography of the land was picturesque—situated along the banks of Lake Michigan, it contained rolling hills, groves of deciduous and evergreen trees, and lush vegetation. The Bartholomew family owned the land for over forty-two years until the recently widowed Mary Bartholomew decided to sell it. In the summer of 1923 she worked with Earl Young to subdivide the land; together they named it “Bartholomew’s Boulder Park.”

On August 17, 1923, Mary Bartholomew officially recognized that the plat of the subdivision and the unpaved “streets and alleys as shown on said plat … [were] dedicated to the use of the public.”

Boulder Park was designed to contain eighty-five lots. The land was ideal for vacation homes and cottages. It went undeveloped until the following year when, on July 22, 1924, Earl Young purchased “Bartholomew’s Boulder Park” from Albert Bridge, the Attorney of Mary Bartholomew. Within only a year, Young had sold
several lots in Boulder Park to people from near and far. An ad in the August 6, 1924, edition of the *Charlevoix Courier* described “Bartholomew’s Boulder Park” as “Charlevoix’s new subdivision” in a “beautiful spot of nature.” A corresponding article further described the subdivision as one that would “without a doubt…become the nucleus of Charlevoix’s most extensive and popular resort colony.”

Throughout the late 1920s and 1930s Young distributed numerous advertisements for Boulder Park, often claiming that “an attractive stone cottage in Boulder Park will cost you less than a frame cottage in many locations.”

“Bartholomew’s Boulder Park” as it was conceived by Young was to be a secluded development with narrow streets winding in and out of towering pines and groves of deciduous trees. The entire neighborhood, a natural and peaceful retreat, was only minutes from downtown Charlevoix. The distinguishing feature of the development was that all of the homes and cottages would be unified by the use of the same building materials. With each lot sold, Young provided a warranty deed to the new owner with the same building specifications: “…no building is to be erected on said lot of which the outside of the first story constructed of any other material than stone, brick, or stucco, excepting by special approval of the parties of the first part or three cottage owners in the same Boulder Park subdivision.”
While Earl Young himself may have bristled at similar building restrictions imposed by others on him, Boulder Park’s early building specifications helped to shape it into one of the most unique housing developments in Michigan. Today Boulder Park is home to more than fifty cottages, ranging from big to small. Despite the allowance made for the use of brick and stucco, the neighborhood is composed primarily of stone homes, each with its own style and character. Earl Young designed and constructed nine of them—eight on commission—from the late 1920s to mid-1930s.

To mark the two main streets that run through the neighborhood Young constructed four large stone pillars: two at the intersection of Lake Shore Drive and Eastern Road and two at the intersection of Lake Shore Drive and Western Road.
Named “Boulder Manor” due to Young’s use of massive boulders in its design and construction, this house is one of Charlevoix’s most well-known and photographed homes. It sits on a small rise at the entrance to Boulder Park and features sweeping views of Lake Michigan. According to Virginia Olsen, Young began construction of the house in 1928. But financial hardships due to the onset of the Great
Depression forced him to leave it unfinished for more than ten years. The wood-sided half story under the gables marks the portion left unfinished after 1929. Deed research indicates that Young did not regain possession of the property until December 9, 1937. The WPA property assessment card of 1938 describes the house as being in “poor condition” and “not finished,” which included “no [finished] rooms, no plumbing, [and] unfinished roofing.”

The exact date that the house was completed is not documented.

The one-and-a-half-story “Boulder Manor” is composed of granite boulders and fieldstone collected by Young from the northern Michigan countryside. Young always intended for the house to be used as a summer home; it has remained as such to this day. The gable roofed house is rather simple in form and design, but Young’s use of so many multi-colored boulders and fieldstone gives it a one-of-a-kind character. The façade is dominated by a few distinctive features: the enormous chimney, the large rounded arch window, and the tiny porch on the northwest corner, the overhang of which is supported by a gigantic five-foot granite boulder. As in other Young homes, the front door to “Boulder Manor” is
concealed from view within a small cave-like entry porch.

Wood-paneled ceilings accent the interior. The living room’s dominant feature is the massive stone fireplace situated beside the arched window that has a perfect view of the lake. Exposed stonework characterizes most of the interior walls of the first story, while the second story walls are a more traditional plaster.

The bulbous stonework technique that makes up a majority of the house is a feat of its own. Small windows appear to be carved into the walls. The stone masonry is entirely structural, with only windows and doorways framed with wood for support. Stones and boulders are laid so they appear to fit perfectly amongst one another. Young was so
meticulous as a builder that he would often dictate exactly where each stone should be placed. Boulders are also planted throughout the surrounding landscape like shrubs in more conventional yards.

A small playhouse constructed of similar granite boulders and local fieldstone sits behind the house. Young constructed it, complete with a working fireplace, for his children and their friends to enjoy while he worked on the main house.

“Boulder Manor” is perhaps the best representation of Earl Young’s imaginative, yet meticulous, use of nature in building design and construction.
Nestled within a grove of deciduous trees, with picturesque views of Lake Michigan, this house sits just west of “Boulder Manor.” Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, according to Virginia Olsen, the home was built between 1927 and 1930. The house was commissioned by Frank and Grace Williams, a railroad conductor and his wife, who purchased the lot from Earl Young on July 13, 1927. By 1938, when the township conducted the WPA local property assessment, the “summer cottage” was listed as having a slate roof and being in “good condition.” The slate roof was replaced with asphalt shingles at an unrecorded time.

The one-story house is constructed of granite boulders and local fieldstone. Like many of Young’s houses, the stonework is structural, with only the windows and doors...
framed in wood. The façade has a distinctive Arts and Crafts feel, with exposed rafter beams, a low-pitched gable roof, and a pronounced horizontality. Plate glass windows with decorative wooden frames punctuate the stonework and provide a direct view of the lake.

A wooden deck extends from the house, perched above a bank of boulders that appear as if they were deposited by the glaciers that moved through the area thousands of years ago. The main entry is off the wooden deck and is almost entirely concealed from view. The interior features hardwood floors, exposed beams, and a sizeable stone fireplace composed of local fieldstone.

In 1989 the present owner undertook a series of renovations in order to make the small house more livable. It needed substantial cosmetic and structural repairs primarily due to a leaky roof. The gable roof was replaced and the ceiling vaulted to provide a greater sense of space. In addition the kitchen was gutted and redesigned to be more accommodating. The present deck was added at that time as well.
Dubbed the “Norman Panama House” after its first and most well-known owners, this cottage features distinctive cobblestone stonework. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. According to Virginia Olsen, the property was commissioned by Herman Panama circa 1930. His son, Norman, was a prominent Hollywood screenwriter, producer, and director who worked with Cary Grant, Bob Hope, Bing Crosby, and Fred Astaire. The Panamas used the one-and-a-half story house as a summer home. It is believed that Norman Panama was inspired by the view from this house, writing screenplays
later in life that incorporated aspects of the house and community. The 1938 WPA property assessment card indicates the Panamas constructed the detached stone garage with hipped roof in 1936.\textsuperscript{132}

The 2,263-square-foot home appears to be a variation on a Michigan upright-and-wing house, with patterned stonework composed of local fieldstone.\textsuperscript{133} The home is one of Young’s larger structures and includes a detached guest house/garage. A stone wall encircles the property. The main house’s cross-gabled roof is protected by asphalt shingles similar to those originally used. Many of the stones Young used here are smaller than those of his other houses, giving this house a unique cobblestone-like appearance. A large stone chimney dominates the front gabled wing. The east elevation contains a bay window. The main entryway is not concealed, only sheltered by a small arched overhang. A shingled addition was recently added to the second story. While new in appearance, it blends well with the original design of the house.
17 Boulder Avenue

_Built 1927-1930_

Known for its green-tinted mortar, this house is one of two Young built with colored mortar to accent the stonework. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, Virginia Olsen believes it was built between 1927 and 1930. On September 7, 1927, Young sold the lot to Emmett Morgan, manager of a rubber business in Ohio, for whom he built the home. The 1938 WPA property assessment card lists the home owner as E. S. Morgan, who used it as a summer cottage. It was said to have had an asphalt shingle roof at the time, a feature it still retains.
The hipped roof structure has a plain box-like form. It is constructed of limestone laid in a smooth pattern. Green trim around the windows and three doors on the façade accentuates the color of the mortar. The three doors open onto a long patio running the length of the façade. A small eyebrow dormer in front and a stone chimney at the rear of the house add character to the steeply pitched roof. Like many of Young’s homes, the main entry is sheltered by a small square entry porch, with rounded arch openings on the north and west elevations.

In 1982 the owner added a two-story wood frame detached addition, painted green to match the original window trim and mortar.\(^{138}\) The addition has a gable roof with asphalt shingles; it houses a two-car garage on the first level and a small living area on the second.
This Swiss chalet-inspired cottage was commissioned by Robert and Louisa Mae Berman.\textsuperscript{139} Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, according to Virginia Olsen, the cottage was built between 1929 and 1930.\textsuperscript{140} The Bermans purchased the property from Earl Young on September 10, 1928. Within a year he had designed and constructed a unique one-and-a-half-story cottage for them.\textsuperscript{141} The 1938 WPA
property assessment card lists the Bermans as the owners of the “summer cottage,” and describes the house as having “six rooms and an asphalt shingle roof.” It continues to be used as a summer home.

The cottage is clearly inspired by European chalets. It has a prominent front-facing gable roof with belcast eaves. The first story is faced in multi-colored granite and local fieldstone. The second story has a stuccoed finish with dark wood half-timbering and a decorative oriel window. Five vertical leaded glass windows with decorative painted trim pierce the stonework on the first floor. The main entrance is sheltered by the deep overhang of a steeply pitched gable roof which covers a narrow entry porch. A small wing faced entirely in multi-colored granite and local fieldstone extends from the rear of the cottage. The home has one stone chimney on the south elevation.
23 Boulder Avenue
*Built 1929-1930*

This is the second of Young’s homes that incorporates colored mortar. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. On October 10, 1928, Agnes Mac Schelling purchased the lot from Young. Virginia Olsen believes that Schelling commissioned the house between 1929 and 1931. It was one of the first structures Young built in Boulder Park. The
1938 WPA property assessment card lists the owner of the two story “summer cottage” as A. M. Schelling. The home was described as being of stone construction with a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles.

Perhaps its most distinguishing feature is its red mortar. The house is constructed almost entirely of limestone, with stucco on the second level. The red of the mortar stands out from the pale limestone. The simple structure has a side gabled roof with a smaller gable just above the entryway. Immediately under this gable is tan-colored stucco with small stones inset into the otherwise smooth finish; this feature is repeated on the second level of the west elevation. White half-timbering on the second level and white window trim offset the neutral color palette. In addition, exposed rafter tails appear under the eaves, giving it a craftsman-like feel. The squat limestone chimney is the dominant feature of the west elevation. This is the only one of Young’s homes in which the main entrance is not shielded or covered. The house continues to be used only as a summer home.

Figure 75: Detail image of the red mortar used in the construction of the house. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
This one-story stone cottage is dominated by two double arched windows that overlook Boulder Avenue. Although deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction, Virginia Olsen believes the house was constructed between 1930 and 1931. On October 8, 1930, Emma Buss purchased the lot from Young and

Figure 76: Façade and north elevation of the cottage as visible from Boulder Avenue. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson

24 Boulder Avenue

*Built 1930-1931*

On October 8, 1930, Emma Buss purchased the lot from Young and

Figure 77: Construction of the arched windows circa 1930. Photo Credit: Charlevoix Historical Society
commissioned the construction of a stone cottage.\textsuperscript{147} The 1938 WPA property assessment card lists Buss as the owner. It featured “hardwood floors,” a “pine interior finish,” and an “asphalt shingle roof.”\textsuperscript{148}

The cottage is composed of geometric box-like shapes and has a front-facing gable roof with wide cave overhangs. Under the eaves are decorative exposed rafter beams, a frequent feature in Young’s architecture. The one-story house has five rooms and is constructed entirely of granite boulders and local fieldstone. A squat stone chimney rises from the middle of the asphalt shingle roof. Like in many of Young’s homes, the main entrance is shielded from view by deep overhanging eaves. A portion of the east elevation juts out a few feet and has a slightly higher roof line, adding character and dimension. Off the rear of the house is a small wing that at one time housed a garage.
This is the third of Young’s homes with a Swiss influence. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction for the house. According to Virginia Olsen, the property was built between 1933 and 1935. In September of 1932 Young sold the lot to Robert and Anna McIntosh, who commissioned him to build a distinctive stone home. The 1938 WPA
property assessment lists the McIntoshes as the owners of the “summer cottage,” which was complete with “hardwood floors” and a “pine interior finish.” The home continues to be used as a summer home.

The unique one-and-a-half-story pyramid-shaped house is constructed entirely of cut, stacked limestone from the Onaway quarry. The north elevation is dominated by a gable roof and a wide gothic picture window one-and-a-half-stories high. This tall Gothic window provides excellent views of Lake Michigan from the living room and is near a large stone fireplace placed on the east wall. Mimicking the shape of the house, the limestone chimney rises from the ground in a slender pyramid-like form. The hipped roof with belcast eaves is protected by asphalt shingles. On the west elevation, the roof is punctuated by a gable dormer with a white stucco finish and decorative half-timbering. The main entryway, as in many of Young’s houses, is protected and shielded from view by overhanging eaves.
This small stone house was one of the first to be erected in Boulder Park. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, Virginia Olsen believes it was constructed in 1929. William Lewis commissioned Earl Young to build a unique stone cottage after he purchased the lot on October 2, 1928. As of the 1938 WPA property assessment,
Lewis remained the owner of the cottage, which was listed as having “hardwood floors” and an “asphalt shingled roof.”

The small one-and-a-half-story house is constructed of limestone laid with a raised mortar joint. The façade is dominated by the chimney, which rises well above the side-gabled roof. Two small sash windows on either side of the chimney and a pair of sash windows next to the front door penetrate the heavy limestone exterior. A rounded overhang with distinctive rolled ends shelters the main entryway. The simple roof and rounded overhang are covered with pale green asphalt shingles. The roof’s rolled eaves, reminiscent of American Thatch Style roofs, makes it unlike any of Young’s other structures.

The north elevation is dominated by two large picture windows surrounded by wooden siding. These windows are sheltered by a narrow overhang supported by decorative brackets. The small half story above is faced with tan-colored stucco punctuated by a group of four narrow windows. The west elevation contains a shed roof dormer, also with rolled eaves. The cottage is occupied year-round and is privately owned.
On August 13, 1959, Earl Young purchased property on the northwest shore of Charlevoix’s Round Lake. The land had been used as a lumber yard by the Charlevoix Lumber Company since the 19th century. The ever imaginative Young saw it as the perfect location for an exclusive development. The small neighborhood had room for only one road, which Young’s daughter, Virginia Olsen, named “Thistle Down.” By the late 1960s Young had designed and constructed three homes on the site, marking his final efforts in building design and construction.
Today the development contains four residences: an A-frame type home designed by Young that still appears largely as he intended; the “Castle House,” originally designed by Young but which has since undergone multiple, dramatic renovations; a craftsman-style home situated on the site of what had been the second of Young’s homes that utilized red sandstone; and an English cottage-inspired home designed by Virginia Olsen. Despite the many changes that Thistle Down has seen, Earl Young’s spirit endures on the narrow street. Stone pillars reminiscent of those at Boulder Park still mark the entrance to the neighborhood.
The A-Frame house was the first structure Earl Young built in the Round Lake development.¹⁵⁸ Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction for the house. According to Virginia Olsen and Richard Donaldson—the home’s first owner—it was constructed in 1967.¹⁵⁹ Tax records from the late 1960s show a significant increase in the value of the property from 1967 to 1968, indicating that a structure likely was constructed on the site at that time.¹⁶⁰ The distinctive A-frame is perhaps Young’s most atypical creation, differing dramatically in both form and design from his stone structures.
The main portion has an A-frame design, with a one-and-a-half-story wing off the north elevation. The house is oriented towards the lake, with the main entrance on Thistle Down. The house appears to be nestled into the hillside and, like many of Young’s structures, the main entry is somewhat hidden from view. The south elevation, facing the lake, contains multiple windows that take advantage of the view of downtown Charlevoix and Round Lake. A large deck extending the width of the central A-framed portion dominates the first story; a second, smaller deck provides a view from the second story. A stone chimney protruding from the center of the steeply pitched asphalt shingled roof and the slight undulation to the roofline on the east wing are features reminiscent of Young’s previous homes. Interestingly, the house is faced with wood siding, not Young’s trademark stone, making it truly unique in terms of his designs. The lakefront yard is beautifully landscaped and provides access to a dock along the lakeshore.

Richard Donaldson, a Charlevoix resident and the home’s first owner, purchased the 3,300-square-foot structure just before it was completed in 1967. On a whim, Donaldson decided to check out the house and there ran into Young who bluntly said, “You should buy this house.” Knowing that the price tag for an Earl Young home on a lakefront lot would be expensive, Donaldson refused. But Young, a persistent salesman, insisted. He promised Donaldson he would sell the home to him for the cost of materials only, which he claimed amounted to approximately $48,000. Donaldson discovered that Young’s materials expense was well over $70,000. Knowing that he had two more homes to construct in the neighborhood, Young, nearing the end of his life, had decided to generously sell one of his most unusual structures at an unbelievable discount. The house remains privately owned.
4 Thistle Down

This is the second of Young’s homes built of red sandstone from the St. Mary’s River in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula. Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, Virginia Olsen and Richard Donaldson believe it was constructed in 1969, two years after the A-frame.\(^{165}\) Tax records show a substantial increase in the value of the property between 1969 and 1970, suggesting that the house was indeed constructed at that time.\(^{166}\)
The home featured a circular great room with floor-to-ceiling windows that provided exceptional views of Round Lake. A large wing extended from the west elevation, likely containing the living quarters. A 1990s real estate advertisement boasted “lake views from every room” of the house.\textsuperscript{167} The structure appears to have been low-lying and linear; its form was further emphasized by its low-pitched hipped roof faced with asphalt shingles. Unfortunately little record remains of the home; it was purchased and razed by its new owners on September 29, 1994.\textsuperscript{168} Today its site is occupied by a large craftsman-style home.

Figure 94: This house now sits on the site of Earl Young’s red stone house.
Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
Believed to be the last of Earl Young’s architectural creations, this home is often referred to as the “Castle House.” Deed research does not clearly indicate a date of construction. However, according to Virginia Olsen and Richard Donaldson, it was built in the early 1970s. Tax records indicate a dramatic increase in the property value between 1970 and 1973, suggesting that the home was likely constructed during those years.

“Castle House”
3 Thistle Down
*Built 1970-1973*

Figure 95: View of the south elevation of the “Castle House” today. Its undulating cedar shingle roof and bulbous stonework at the ground level are reminiscent of Young. However, renovations have been extensive, leaving little of Young’s original design. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson

Figure 96: View of the facade of the “Castle House” before renovations. The only visible similarity now is the stone turret. Photo Credit: Swaim, John. “Charlevoix’s Gnome Houses.” Traverse. July 1982, Charlevoix Public Library
Number 3 Thistle Down as Young envisioned it was drastically different from the imposing structure one sees today. The home featured Young’s traditional stonework and undulating cedar shingle roof. Like his other structures on Round Lake, the house was oriented towards the water. To take advantage of the extraordinary views, the main entrance was placed on Thistle Down.

In the winter of 1997 the home was purchased by designer and architect Pat Barry who proceeded to make numerous renovations. He raised the roof, added several rooms, and re-designed the interior. Today little is left of Young’s vision other than the use of boulders and an undulating cedar shingle roof. The house is not listed on the Charlevoix Chamber of Commerce’s self-guided tour of Young’s homes due to its many renovations.
Chapter Five

Commercial Architecture

One of Earl Young’s lifelong aspirations was to create a waterfront complex along the east end of the Pine River channel and the northwest shore of Round Lake on the edge of downtown Charlevoix. In the summer of 1941, just months before the beginning of the United States’ involvement in World War II, Young and one of Charlevoix’s prominent bankers, Robert Bridge, developed elaborate plans and a scale model for just such a complex. The plans incorporated a sixty-unit hotel, a marina, and a restaurant. At that time the land in question was owned by the Charlevoix Lumber Company. The company agreed to sell it to Young and Bridge, with much of the financing for the project coming from wealthy summer residents. Construction was set to begin in conjunction with construction of a new drawbridge over the Pine River channel in the spring of 1942. However, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, put a halt to Young’s plans. With the United States’ entry into the war, the use of steel for building was strictly limited. Consequently both the construction of a new bridge as well as Young and Bridge’s plans for a new hotel, marina, and restaurant were put on hold until steel would again become available.
The time didn’t come until almost five years later after the war came to an end. Unfortunately, by this time the Charlevoix Lumber Company was no longer interested in selling its property. It took an additional seven years for Young to negotiate the purchase of the vacant Argo Mill, which hinged on his ability to sell the mill’s remaining coal business. While the property occupied by the mill was only a portion of the land that Young and Bridge originally wished to purchase, it was still a prime piece of real estate. The mill sat on the north bank of the Pine River channel beside a newly constructed drawbridge. It was a perfect spot for a restaurant – one which Young had been designing in his mind for over ten years. In 1953 when final negotiations for the sale of the property were almost complete, Young began demolition of the vacant mill. On June 30, 1954, after selling the Argo Mill’s coal business to the Charlevoix Co-op, he finally obtained the warranty deed to the property. While Earl Young’s dream of developing a waterfront complex was never fully realized, the land he was able to purchase gave him enough space to construct one restaurant and two motels in the proximity of Round Lake and the Pine River channel: The Weathervane Inn Restaurant, The Weathervane Terrace Hotel, and The Lodge Motel.
The Weathervane Inn Restaurant
106 Pine River Lane
_Built 1953-1954_

The Weathervane Inn was Earl Young’s first commercial venture, his largest project, his most prized career achievement. The building is a remarkable example of organic design using indigenous materials in conjunction with wood framing members from the historic mill that was on the site. In 1871 the Charlevoix Roller Mills Company constructed a large grain mill along
the north shore of the Pine River channel. The mill was a fixture in downtown Charlevoix for more than eighty years. In the summer of 1953, almost a full year before he obtained the rights to the property, Earl Young began demolition. The entire three-story, metal-sided building was razed, but the original stone foundation was largely retained. On June 30, 1954, only a matter of days before construction of the restaurant was completed, Young finally obtained full rights to the property.

The rambling, low-lying stone structure rises from the bank of the Pine River channel as if a part of the landscape itself. Its cedar shingle roof undulates in unison with the nearby water; deep overhanging eaves shelter the restaurant’s main entry, a typical characteristic of Young’s architecture. The two-story building is constructed entirely of glacial boulders, fieldstone, and Onaway limestone.

In addition to preserving the original foundation, Young also used many of the mill’s sturdy, weathered 12x12 inch maple timbers as framing members. Every material used in the design and construction of the Weathervane Inn Restaurant was meticulously chosen.
The mill’s wooden grain chutes, turned inside out to expose their interior finish perfectly polished by decades of cascading grain, were used as paneling on the lower level. They were removed, however, during a remodeling and expansion. The bar just inside the main entrance is constructed of driftwood salvaged from the shores of Lake Michigan. Much of the interior is framed by beams from the mill, a feature especially noticeable throughout the length of the main dining room. The walls of the reception lobby by the bar are faced with wood from an old barn that was demolished from the area.

One of the most interesting features in the restaurant is the translite, or plastic image lighted from behind, called “Windjammers in Charlevoix Harbor.” In 1904 Young took a black and white photo of schooners in Round Lake, valuing it as an idyllic depiction of Charlevoix’s past. He had the photo colorized, enlarged, and framed. It was said to be the largest translite photo made up to that time. The image hung above the stairway to the lower level for over four decades, but began to deteriorate and had to be removed in 2001. It has been replaced by a large mirror.
Another interesting feature are the multiple thermo-pane windows that line the restaurant’s south elevation. In 1951, three years before he obtained the rights to the property, Young ordered these large thermo-panes. He also installed four more-than-a-century-old exterior lighting fixtures, street lanterns obtained on a trip to Copenhagen, Denmark, that grace the entrance. He had them wired for electricity and replaced their original glass with plastic.

The most recognizable and celebrated materials used in the construction of the Weathervane Inn Restaurant are the granite boulders, most of which were collected by Young himself; area fieldstone; and cut limestone from the Onaway quarry. Granite boulders and fieldstone make up the restaurant’s monolithic chimneys. The majority of the restaurant’s exterior, however, is constructed of cut Onaway limestone interspersed with local fieldstone and laid in an irregular pattern.

The use of stone continues on the interior, forming walls, stairways, and impressive fireplaces. Cut Onaway limestone, stacked horizontally, was used in the spiral stairway that connects the first and second floors. Five fireplaces are scattered throughout the structure—two on the main level, two on the lower level, and one in Young’s former office. Each of the stone fireplaces has its own unique character. The most famous is on the main level. This fireplace is dominated by an enormous 18,260-pound granite boulder discovered by Young’s workmen when
they were clearing a Boulder Park road in 1928.\textsuperscript{187} They brought it to his attention and the deeply buried but partially exposed rock immediately caught Young’s eye. Its veining seemed to him to resemble a highway map of Lower Michigan.\textsuperscript{188} So that he could save it “for future reference,” Young memorized its dimensions, which measured nine feet across and two and a half feet thick, before he had it dug out and hauled away by a team of horses and buried in the woods nearby.\textsuperscript{189} It wasn’t until 1954, twenty-six years later, that he found the perfect spot for the gigantic discovery. The granite wonder was to be placed atop two other boulders, to form the keystone of the central fireplace. By the time the boulder was unearthed from its secret location, the construction of the restaurant was nearing completion. The only way to get the boulder into its intended spot was to lower it by crane through a gap in the rafters, which Young had spaced according to the stone’s dimensions.\textsuperscript{190} However, the measurements that he had held in this memory for twenty-six years proved to be inaccurate—the boulder was too wide to fit through the gap. In jest, Young’s explanation to the workmen was: “It grew eleven inches during all those years in the woods.”\textsuperscript{191} Consequently the workmen had to remove a rafter to allow the stone to be lowered into place. It fits precisely between its two support stones, which had been placed perfectly to
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\caption{Earl Young next to the massive boulder the forms the keystone to the restaurant’s main dining room fireplace. Photo Credit: Charlevoix Historical Society}
\end{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure111.jpg}
\caption{View of the fireplace today. Note the black rock at the lower right base—this is rumored to be a meteorite. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson}
\end{figure}
receive it. The placement of the boulders is to this day an astonishing example of Earl Young’s eye for contour and detail. Another interesting feature of the fireplace is the small black rock in the lower right base, which is rumored to be an iron meteorite discovered by Native Americans and said to weigh as much as the keystone boulder.\textsuperscript{192}

Historically the lower level also housed four small commercial spaces, one of which was Earl Young’s real estate office.\textsuperscript{193} These spaces were accessed by a small walkway that wound down around the southeast elevation of the building. The entry to Young’s office on the east elevation was sheltered by a small cedar shingle overhang; a large leaded glass window provided light. Young’s office contained a fireplace constructed of native fieldstone. For the mantel he used driftwood he had found years earlier on Charlevoix’s ‘boulder beach’ along the shore of Lake Michigan; like the boulder, Young also hid the driftwood in the woods until he found a perfect use for it.\textsuperscript{194}

“It’s quite a showpiece,” he said, “moss is still growing on it, and we keep it well sprinkled so that it will continue to thrive. Out of the moss come an unpredictable variety of plants and flowers. We never know what will pop up next. It has sprouted wintergreen, arbutus, toad stools, and several other plants. We do all we can to encourage it.”\textsuperscript{195}

The restaurant has since expanded to occupy the entire upper and almost all of the lower level. Young’s former
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\caption{Present site of Earl Young’s former real estate office. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure113}
\caption{The mantel on this fireplace used to sprout plant life; today it is entirely dried out. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson}
\end{figure}
office is presently the only ‘shop’ remaining in the building, and is now occupied by an insurance agency.

Earl Young’s masterpiece has been one of Charlevoix’s most distinctive attractions since it opened in July of 1954. On October 16, 1964, Young sold his rights to the property to Weathervane, Inc. The sale of the building included an agreement that Young would retain a life-long lease for his office. Today the Weathervane Inn is owned and operated by Stafford’s Hospitality of Petoskey, Michigan, which purchased it in 1988. The restaurant remains one of Charlevoix’s most popular eateries and is sometimes regarded as a defining feature of the city.
The Lodge Motel
120 Michigan Avenue
_Built 1958-1959 in partnership with the Pines, Inc._

The Lodge Motel, historically called the Weathervane Lodge Motel, was the second structure that Earl Young built in his quest to create a unified commercial complex in downtown Charlevoix. The motel sits a block north of the Pine River channel just north of Thistle Down on what had been a vacant lot. Although Young designed the structure, he did not finance it himself. Instead he
partnered with The Pines, Inc., a group of investors from Detroit, Chicago, and Charlevoix, to finance the construction of the motel. Construction began on April 28, 1958; in December of 1958 Young sold his holdings on the property, which he had acquired from the Argo Milling Company in 1954, to the Pines, Inc.

When the motel opened in August of 1959, The Lodge was touted as the first two-story motel in the area with a passenger elevator. It also advertised such amenities as a solarium, bellboys, and rooms paneled in mahogany, walnut, and ash. A swimming pool later replaced the solarium.

The motel is sided with California redwood and contains thirty-seven rooms and three two-room suites on two levels. Unlike the majority of Young’s structures, stone is used only as a decorative accent. The west elevation is characterized by a massive stone chimney constructed of native fieldstone and granite boulders. Three turrets constructed of Onaway limestone and topped by hexagonal metal roofs house spiral iron stairs that lead to the second level. In addition, panels of cut limestone laid ground-to-roof in random patterns add contrast to the expanses of dark redwood on the west and south elevations.

The lobby’s interior is paneled in wood and contains a large stone fireplace and stone reception desk. The fireplace is composed of black cut granite laid vertically in white mortar;
its mantels are pieces of sculpted driftwood salvaged from the shore nearby. Several small tables made of slices of black walnut trunks coated with thirteen layers of varnish are scattered throughout the small lobby. Young made these tables himself during the construction of the motel.

The rooms are a snapshot of the 1960s. Adorned with wood paneling and dark carpeting, their salmon- and blue-tiled bathrooms are equipped with commercial grade fixtures. They have a cozy, almost cabin-like, feel. While attempts have been made to modernize them by providing small refrigerators and VCRs, their décor is somewhat outdated. The benefit of this, however, is that visitors today can still bear witness to what was likely Young’s original design.

The Lodge Motel continues to be one of Charlevoix’s most affordable and popular lodging facilities. It is situated in a prime location a few steps from downtown Charlevoix, Round Lake, and the Pine River channel.
Earl Young’s third step towards development a waterfront restaurant-motel-marina complex was the Weathervane Terrace Hotel. Situated just north of the Weathervane Inn Restaurant, the motel is fronted by granite boulders and mature trees. Construction began in July of 1962; it was completed in 1964 after a two-year delay due to the need for additional funding. Earl Young and son-in-law Paul Olsen, who jointly believed the Terrace would attract more year-round business to the area, were the primary financiers for the project. When it was opened it was said to be “a distinctive luxury and convention motel.”

The Weathervane Terrace Inn and Suites, its current name, is constructed primarily of stone, with vertical wood siding covering the two-story wings that house the thirty-six rooms. The south elevation is dominated by a one-story semi-circular lobby faced with local...
fieldstone. Five large beveled leaded glass windows made in Poland in 1897 give the lobby an air of elegance unlike that of any other motel in the area. The windows are presently covered by small brown awnings with the initials ‘WHT,’ for Weathervane Terrace Hotel.

Characteristic of Young, the main entrance is protected by a small overhang and a row of rooms on the second story that cross over the main drive. Small lanterns add an old world feel to the lobby’s stone exterior.

The lobby contains a fireplace and reception desk both constructed of stone. The main fireplace is perhaps Young’s most unusual; it is constructed of black and red cut stone laid vertically in an irregular pattern. The stonework extends from floor to ceiling, making it the focal point of the large room. During construction Young described his vision for the fireplace saying, “The stones will be black and grey and red. I couldn’t find stone red enough around here, so I brought some back with me from Canada when I went around Lake Superior last year.”

Another of the lobby’s distinguishing features are the coarse exposed beams that appear to radiate in a sunburst pattern from the top of the fireplace.
The motel's second fireplace is more typical of Young. Constructed of large fitted granite boulders, it is the focal point of the breakfast room off the lobby and shows Young’s uncanny visual ability to place stones together.

While the lobby is the primary feature of the building, the portions that house the rooms make up the majority of the structure. These sections are two-storied and faced with vertical wood siding with stone accenting. Three stone turrets, all topped by hexagonal metal roofs with a green patina, hide circular stairs that lead to the second level. The rooms have been modernized, with small refrigerators and even a few recently installed working fireplaces.

Today the Weathervane Terrace Inn and Suites remains one of Charlevoix’s most popular lodging facilities. It is located a short distance from the Weathervane Inn Restaurant, the Pine River channel, Round Lake, and Lake Michigan.
The Apple Tree building was the home of Earl Young’s real estate office for more than thirty years until he moved into the new location in the Weathervane Inn in 1954. Located at 224 Bridge Street in the heart of downtown Charlevoix, the Apple Tree was a small structure that Young faced with limestone and decorative half-timbering in the 1920s. The building had two front doors and a unique stone fireplace designed by Young. In 2003 the structurally unsound building was slated for demolition; developers planned to...
construct a three-story structure with retail spaces on the first floor and condos on the second and third called the “Apple Tree Building.”

Heated discourse among Charlevoix residents made preservation of the building a hot topic throughout 2003. At an August 11, 2003, city council meeting, city residents and summer visitors crowded into the room to express concern for the developers’ plans and voice their support for saving the building. However, the Apple Tree building proved to be beyond repair. The city council decided the building must either be moved at the purchaser’s expense or demolished.

The Roby family purchased the building in August of 2003 for $1. They expected to spend $30,000 to $40,000 to fortify and move the building to a very small lot at 101 Auld Avenue on Charlevoix’s north side, and another $150,000 to restore it. But the lot’s neighbors protested and prevailed. The building was slightly too large to fit and did not conform to zoning regulations. Now saddled with a useless deteriorating structure whose disintegrating support timbers were riddled with decades of rot and gnawed by squirrels building nests, the Robys discovered that if they tried to move the Apple Tree the walls would torque and the stone facing, as firmly as it was

Figure 127: Plans for the new building to occupy the site of Young’s Apple Tree building. Photo Credit: Amick Lakeside Realtors. Online at:

Figure 128: The replicated Apple Tree building still has a similar appearance to the original; however, many of Young’s touches—like the cement-frosted chimney—have been lost. Photo Credit: Kelly Simpson
applied, would come apart. The city advised they would be responsible for replacement of any portion of the sidewalk damaged during removal. So they abandoned the idea. The Robys were able to salvage the stone fireplace. It was jackhammered out in pieces. The rest of the building was demolished with a backhoe. On their little lot the family built an imitative, slightly shorter Apple Tree using new cut limestone. The building’s reconstituted stone fireplace was the only remnant of Earl Young’s historic real estate office able to be saved.
Chapter Six

Earl Young’s Architectural Influences

It is impossible to identify all of the sources that influenced Earl Young. But in order to appreciate Young’s architecture it is necessary to try to understand them. Because Young was never formally trained in architecture, he likely was influenced by popular and local trends, styles, techniques, and building trade publications. His architecture incorporates design elements from national styles and movements like the Arts and Crafts style, Storybook style, the Cotswold Cottage style, the American thatch style, and most importantly Frank Lloyd Wright’s theories of organic architecture. It also includes elements that may have been inspired by local and regional stone architecture, especially Charlevoix’s Loeb Farms. Virginia Olsen, Young’s daughter, does not recall her father being influenced by anything other than nature and stone; however, it is impossible to deny the presence of both local and national influences in Young’s architecture.

Building magazines

Because Young was never trained as an architect, he took it upon himself to study modern building styles and techniques. Young “subscribed to several building and architecture magazines,” in which he likely found inspiration and kept abreast of the latest trends. These magazines discussed the latest ideas in building technology and also provided floor plans for homes and other building types.
*American Builder* is one magazine from which Young may have sought inspiration. The July 1929 edition featured an article about a home designed in the Adirondack style. It was described as having “a delightful ‘woodsey’ atmosphere…[with] picturesque surroundings.” The home featured a number of elements commonly seen in Young’s architecture, like a “huge fireplace of native stone” and ceilings with exposed wood beams.

The December 1930 edition of *American Builder and Building Age* featured a discussion on several ‘modern’ homes, described as “Homes of Charm.” One such house, similar to many of Young’s structures in its use of materials, was described as having united stacked cut stone and stucco “…in a graceful informality.” While it is impossible to assess the levels of influence that these magazines may have had on Young, it is likely that they were known to him. Therefore, popular building and architecture magazines can be considered as a likely source of design inspiration in Young’s architecture.
Regional Stone Architecture

Stone architecture abounds throughout Michigan, and is particularly prevalent in the northern portion of the state. This is, in large part, due to the geological history of the region, which was covered by the Wisconsinan-period glacier over ten thousand years ago.²²⁰ Today, the landscape is characterized by rolling hills which were formed when the glacier retreated. It also left behind rocks and boulders of all sizes as well as considerable accumulations of limestone. As land was cleared for farming and development purposes, these glacial deposits often were put to good use, most commonly as building materials. Stone has been used for a variety of purposes and frequently it can be seen in foundations and as decorative accenting along facades, as exterior facing and as a structural material.

Growing up in northern Michigan, Earl Young was undoubtedly exposed to stone used in a variety of ways in local architecture. The Charlevoix area contains multiple examples of stone buildings. However, the structures that likely had the most impact on Young were those at Loeb Farms, located only three miles south of the city. Loeb Farms was completed in 1918 for the
vice-president of Sears-Roebuck Company, Albert Loeb. The imposing farm complex was designed to resemble French provincial architecture and was built using indigenous stone. Steep roofs, towers, arched windows, and multiple fireplaces gave the structures a chateauesque feel, and made the complex a popular local landmark. In the 1930s Young captured many of the buildings on film. He focused particularly on the roofs and door and window openings, indicating that he may have been inspired in some way by their design.

Trips to Europe

Over the course of his life Earl Young traveled several times to continental Europe and Great Britain. There, he not only purchased building materials and fixtures, like the thatch roof used on 316 Park Avenue, but may have also sought inspiration from the architecture. American architects have historically found inspiration in British and European architecture. The majority of Young’s houses...
appear to have been influenced by the homes and cottages of rural Great Britain. His use of rustic, aged-looking stonework in conjunction with half-timbering and stucco indicates he may have sought to emulate the centuries-old architecture of the Old World.

Storybook Style

The Storybook style became popular in California in the early 1920s but was largely forgotten by the late 1930s. The unusual style combined exaggerated features with fine craftsmanship and a sense of humor. It typically included half-timbering with rough-faced stucco and wavy wood shingled roofs. While the buildings often were made to resemble medieval structures, they were not constructed using antique or recycled materials. Instead, walls were purposely framed to appear unsound and timbers charred and wire-brushed to give them an aged look.

While Young was likely not exposed to structures constructed in the Storybook style in the 1920s, he probably saw images of them later in his life. Young’s later architecture, like the “mushroom house” and the Weathervane Inn Restaurant, often appears more exaggerated and imaginative than his earlier works. These structures typically include undulating rooflines and have an overall aged appearance. While Young did not seek to make new materials appear old, a characteristic of the Storybook style, his use of scrap lumber, half-timbering, and wavy, serpentine roofs do give several of his structures a storybook appearance. Whether Earl Young was influenced by the Storybook style is speculative thought.
Arts and Crafts Movement

The Arts and Crafts Style was clearly one of Earl Young’s biggest design influences. The Craftsman Movement developed in England in the late 19th century. Inspired by the writings of social reformists like John Ruskin (1819-1900) and designer William Morris (1834-1896), the movement challenged the tastes of the Victorian era, calling for standards of design directly linked to societal ideals. During the late 19th century, manufactured goods were typically poor in design and quality, as the capabilities of the manufacturing process were relatively crude. Social reformists like Ruskin and Morris responded to the situation by proposing that individual craftmanship be revived. Their principal influence for ideal craft production was medieval European guilds and traditional Japanese carpentry and designs. The reformists urged that with a return to traditional building and production methods, workers would not be “brutalized by the working conditions found in factories.” Instead they could take pride in their craftmanship and produce quality goods.

In England the high costs associated with handcrafting materials caused the products and architecture of the Arts and Crafts movement to be accessible only to the wealthy; yet in the United States the concept of design for the masses was more fully realized. While the American Arts and Crafts movement remained similar in theory to the English movement, U.S. designers and architects advocated mass production of parts in order to deflate the costs associated with handcrafting. Gustav Stickley (1848-1942), one of the pioneers of the movement in the United States, was the first to apply factory methods to produce basic furniture components and use skilled craftsmen to finish and assemble the product. This allowed him to create well-built and attractive furniture that adhered to the design principals of the Arts and Crafts movement in vast quantities so that it could be affordable and accessible to all.
In the United States the shift from the design characteristics of the Victorian era began with the introduction of the Shingle Style, which was popular in the 1870s and 1880s. Throughout the 19th century the use of historical architectural styles and embellishment based on pattern books predominated. This era also tended to view the natural world with fear and suspicion, resulting in buildings whose purpose was to protect people from that world. The Arts and Crafts movement, however, took an opposing perspective. It embraced nature for its virtues and designs and sought to create more natural and truthful dwellings.

The Arts and Crafts style was popular in the United States from 1905 to 1930, though it began to fade from favor after the mid-1920s. The movement was just one of several reform movements that took shape in the United States in the late 19th century, like the Garden City movement and the rise of the popularity of more culturally simple expressions like vegetarianism and folksongs. Ideas such as these inspired people to place romantic values ahead of those of modern technology. The Arts and Crafts movement embraced these ideals. It encouraged the design of houses in which all elements received artful attention, giving rise to a more planned décor, with built-in furniture and cabinets made of natural materials. The goal of the Arts and Crafts movement was to foster architecture that embodied a way of living – truthful, simple, and showing the handiwork of craftsmen.

One of the most influential forces in the development of the Arts and Crafts style was the Japanese Pavilion, which first appeared at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. The 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago also had a Japanese Pavilion, which featured the Ho-o-den, a half-scale adaptation of a Buddhist temple at Uji, Japan. The wooden building was prefabricated in Japan and sent to Chicago, where it was assembled by Japanese carpenters. Its design featured crossed-axes, a cantilevered hovering
roof, and an overall horizontality. The design and construction of the Ho-o-den made a
lasting impression on architects and designers of the
late 19th century. It influenced not only the growing
Arts and Crafts movement, but emerging architects like
Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959).  

After the Columbian Exposition, evidence of
Japanese influence began to appear throughout the
United States; open floor plans, latticework, extended
eaves, and high quality construction of building parts
became essentials in modern Arts and Crafts style construction. New design theories
couraged buildings to be integrated into their site, and many houses incorporated Japanese
gardens into their landscaping. The rectilinear and angular decorative motifs of the Arts and
Crafts style and the innovative floor plan design made the architecture of this new style
startlingly different from that of the Victorian era.

Young’s architecture has visible Arts and Crafts influences. His use of indigenous
materials, exposed rafter ends, built-in cabinets, and extended eaves indicate that he
subscribed to those aesthetics of the Craftsman movement. Because the style was popular
until approximately 1930, it would have been considered a contemporary style when Young
began to design his homes. Consequently there is a good chance that he may have studied
the style, particularly as it related to building construction. Young’s first structure, at 304
Park Avenue, is a perfect example of an interpretation of a Craftsman bungalow. His
subsequent designs, like 17 Boulder Avenue and 24 Boulder Avenue, also feature Arts and
Crafts elements like exposed rafter tails, low-lying roofs, and an overall horizontality.
Frank Lloyd Wright and Organic Architecture

The only education in architecture Wright had was at the firm of Adler and Sullivan, with Louis Sullivan (1856-1924) as his informal teacher. Throughout his career Sullivan wrote books on what came to be known as organic architecture. His belief was that architecture should embody humans’ connection to nature while also accepting modern needs and materials. As a student of Sullivan, Wright came to adopt his superior’s philosophy; his theories of organic architecture are directly related to Sullivan’s philosophy. Despite his own personal success, Wright always revered Sullivan because it was he who had guided him to nature as a source of inspiration.

Like other architects and designers of the American Arts and Crafts movement, Wright subscribed to the belief that natural materials should be exploited to bring out their best qualities. Fine craftsmanship was necessary in construction; but Wright also believed that production costs should be kept low in order for products and homes to be accessible to all. As a designer he sought to create pieces that were “appropriate to the old (natural) and new (synthetic) materials …but design them so that the machine…would make them better.” In an essay on organic architecture written later in his life, Wright reflects on the shift from the Victorian era design aesthetics, describing the American house of the 1890s as a dwelling that “did not belong anywhere.” He continued, stating, “essentially, whether of brick or wood or stone, this ‘house’ was a bedeviled box with a fussy lid; …the floors were the only part of the house left plain after ‘Queen Anne’ had swept past.”

In designing buildings, Frank Lloyd Wright often chose sites close to woods, rock formations and waterfalls, following the notion that a building should evolve out of its site. Wright believed that architecture should be a living thing, subject to the rules that govern organic growth. If a house were to be built in a natural setting, it should enhance and
conform to the site. As a whole, Wright believed that buildings should fulfill their particular functions as well as have character, life, spirit, beauty, and create a vibrant environment.\textsuperscript{240} His philosophy is best illustrated in many of his Prairie style houses.

In essence, Wright’s philosophy of organic architecture was an attempt to integrate the natural site and the structure into one through the use of sensitive design, appropriate forms, and natural materials. While Wright acknowledged that his theory did not ensure a beautiful building, he believed that organic buildings had the integrity that Renaissance and Baroque architecture lacked.\textsuperscript{241}

Frank Lloyd Wright’s theory of organic architecture appears to have had the most influence on Earl Young’s building designs—although he was known to become indignant at comparisons to Wright. Concealed or sheltered main entryways are one example of Wright’s influence on Young. As a designer and builder Earl Young sought to create structures the belonged in their environment. His architecture not only subscribes to Wright’s theory of organic architecture, it \textit{is} organic architecture.
Chapter Seven

Earl Young’s Impact on Local and Regional Architecture

Earl Young’s extraordinary designs have undoubtedly had a significant impact on Charlevoix, Michigan. While stone architecture is not uncommon in northern Michigan, Young’s unique application of stone is unparalleled. Over the past fifty years Young’s creations have come to define Charlevoix, attracting many visitors each year.

Young’s architecture began to be noticed in the lakeside community in the late 1930s. Although he constructed his first house in 1921, he did not begin to build on a large scale until the 1930s. Young constructed a number of homes on commission in the Boulder Park subdivision, beginning with Boulder Manor in 1928. Boulder Manor is Boulder Park’s defining structure. All of the homes Young designed there are constructed almost entirely of stone, and despite his use of colored mortar in two of them, all are relatively conservative in design. It wasn’t until the late 1930s that Earl Young began to construct more free-form houses on the triangular Park Avenue block. He continued to build homes—both large and small—on this small block until the early 1950s.

Initial community response to Earl Young’s architecture was one of curiosity and interest rather than annoyance or dislike. Of course Young’s structures were atypical in the small lakeside town filled with larger, colorful Victorian homes. But they were tolerated and considered a form of curious architectural expression by a man who was believed to be rather unusual himself.
In the 1950s Virginia Olsen began to offer tours of his architecture. These tours were quite popular, and over time others began to offer them as well. In 1988 the Charlevoix Chamber of Commerce released a map for self-guided tours of Young’s homes and buildings, which also included a brief account of his life and career. These maps continue to be available at almost every hotel, motel, and rest stop in northern Lower Michigan, extending as far south as central Michigan. Earl Young’s architecture has been a tourist attraction in Charlevoix for many years, opening the city to cultural recognition and interest.

Commercial Architecture

Young’s stone structures have clearly influenced contemporary commercial architecture in the area. Downtown Charlevoix has storefronts inspired by Young. The entryway of the New World Café at 208 Bridge Street is sheltered by an overhang adorned with whimsical, undulating cedar shingles. A doorway next to the Shop of the Gulls at 205 Bridge Street is faced with cut Onaway limestone laid in a pattern similar to Young’s design at 711 Park Avenue.
The Edgewater Inn hotel that went up on the site of the former Charlevoix Lumber Company in the late 1980s, somewhat completing Young’s dream for the area, has stone entry columns that show Young’s influence.

East Park’s Clarence Odmark Pavilion, with its undulating cedar shingled roof, stone-faced concrete walls and half-timbering, is the downtown area’s most visible example of architecture influenced by Earl Young. Dedicated in 1991, the outdoor stage is an excellent representation of this architectural style and design unique to Charlevoix.
Residential Architecture

There are also a number of residential structures in and around Charlevoix that are clearly influenced by Earl Young. Their most distinguishing diagnostic feature is the serpentine cedar-shingled roofs. While stone is used on many of these houses, less expensive stucco is also used.

One newly constructed home just south of Charlevoix displays features characteristic of Young’s designs like a dramatically undulating shingle roof, stone chimneys with excess cement, and landscaping using boulders. Each of these unusual modern homes is unique and designed to accommodate its owner’s needs; yet they are all clearly inspired by Earl Young.
Interesting examples of homes influenced by Earl Young are those constructed by Virginia Olsen, Young’s youngest daughter and overseer of several of his later projects. Olsen built four homes in northern Michigan, three of them in Charlevoix. She constructed them for her personal use; she never built for profit or speculation.

Virginia Olsen’s first house, 1 Thistle Down, was constructed between 1960 and 1962 along the north shore of Round Lake. Tax records indicate a significant increase in the value of the property between 1960 and 1962, confirming that the cottage was constructed at that time.

This was the first home constructed on Thistle Down and it was also the only one not constructed by Earl Young during this lakeside neighborhood’s development. Like all the homes on Thistle Down, the cottage is oriented towards the lake. Its location at the end of the narrow roadway gives it an air of privacy and seclusion. Stone pillars that support a metal gate fashioned to resemble thistles indicate the beginning of the property. From the façade the cottage appears deceptively small; however, the north elevation reveals a lengthy two-story wing that extends from the main structure.

As a whole the home appears to have been inspired by traditional English cottages. It is primarily faced with white stucco and accented by wooden half-timbering. The windows
and doorways are arched and framed in dark wood. Unlike her father, Olsen used very little stone. But the undulating cedar shingle roof is clearly reminiscent of Young’s structures.

In 1999 Olsen supervised the installation of a new shingle roof on this house after the original had succumbed to the ravages of time and harsh winter weather. Decorative landscaping provides a colorful accent to the site, adding to the “English” feel of the home and making it one of the most distinctive residences on Thistle Down.

Olsen’s second house, built in 1983, sits above the shore of Lake Michigan, hidden from public view. She lived in this house for many years, but ultimately moved into her current home on the other side of the lot.

This third house, built in 1991, sits at the corner of Burns and Division Streets, nestled into a small hill along the shore Lake Michigan. Like her other homes, it is faced with white stucco accented by dark wood half-timbering, and topped by a dramatically undulating cedar shake roof that, from a distance, appears almost to be thatched.

Olsen’s fourth house is located just outside of Petoskey. Built in 1996 for her daughter, this house resembles Olsen’s other creations. It was designed specifically for her daughter’s family. The house is often mistakenly identified as an Earl Young home.
Like her father, Virginia Olsen built her homes to satisfy herself, using her own taste to dictate her designs. Olsen’s roofs are similar to Young’s, but their motion seems to be a bit more pronounced. As a whole they appear to resemble historic thatched roofs more than cedar-shingled roofs. Olsen also uses a significant amount of salvaged materials in her architecture, another characteristic of Young’s designs. In the center of the living room in her present home is a massive coffee table constructed from a piece of driftwood.

Aside from these obvious features Virginia Olsen’s architecture is different from her father’s. “I never use stone in my designs,” she says of her creations. Instead, Olsen’s structures are faced with white stucco and accented by decorative half-timbering. To some degree her architecture could be described as “storybook” merely on the basis of its unusual rooflines and intentionally rustic feel. As a whole her homes have been influenced by rural English cottages, with a dash of whimsy and informality reminiscent of her father’s designs. Virginia Olsen’s structures are equally as unique as Earl Young’s, however much they differ in form and design.
Chapter Eight

Recommendations for the Conservation of Earl Young’s Architecture

There are a number of unique factors to consider in the maintenance, preservation, and conservation of Earl Young’s structures. Materials such as stone, mortar, and cedar shingles all contribute to the unique appearance and character of Young’s homes and commercial buildings. The preservation of these materials is essential in order to retain the unique appearance of Young’s structures. It is also important to replace damaged or missing materials, or portions thereof, with appropriate substitutes. The improper removal or replacement of original materials will ultimately detract from the appearance of the structure as Young had intended. Therefore, it is necessary to use an experienced contractor with any and all work done on the buildings. Before any repairs or replacements are made to a building, it is essential that historical and photographic evidence is collected so that the original materials and features are thoroughly documented.

The National Park Service’s Preservation Briefs are a good resource for information on the preservation of historic masonry and cedar shingle roofs. Much of the information presented in the following discussion of general maintenance and conservation procedures for stone, mortar, and cedar shingles was taken from the Preservation Briefs; suggestions for replacing or repairing these materials are also included.
Stone

Stone has been used for thousands of years in building construction and is one of the more lasting and versatile masonry materials. In constructing his thirty stone structures, Earl Young used four different types of stone: granite boulders, fieldstone, limestone, and—in the case of two homes—rose-colored sandstone. Granite boulders were Young’s favorite building material. Granite, which has a granular, crystalline texture, is an extremely hard and durable igneous rock that is formed essentially of white quartz, colored feldspar, and black ferromagnesian minerals. Granite has traditionally been used for structural work and foundations, as it has an extremely high compressive strength and is very durable, resisting both corrosion and the freeze-thaw cycle common in northern Michigan. Granite is also a beautiful, naturally varied material that provides a natural acoustic barrier and good insulation due to its high density. Today, it is quite expensive to purchase granite, whether in polished slabs or massive boulders. Earl Young saved money by collecting many of his granite boulders from the local countryside, purchasing them from the landowner at a negotiated price. Because of its strength and durability, Young’s structures constructed of granite boulders have had no structural or cosmetic problems to date.

In combination with granite boulders, Young also used a profusion of fieldstone, which is, simply, “stone in unaltered form as taken from the field.” The majority of the fieldstone Young used was collected from the countryside and is, like granite, a very durable material. Because Young used indigenous fieldstone, the stones are well-suited for the northern Michigan climate and have had no documented structural or cosmetic problems.

The third type of stone Young used was buff-colored limestone from the Onaway quarry just outside of Petoskey, Michigan. Limestone consists primarily of calcium carbonate and is formed by the accumulation of organic sediment, like shells or fossils under
pressure. The soft stone is quarried and most often visible in cut slabs. Limestone has a high absorption rate, and is not recommended for use in wet climates unless treated with a sealant. Because the Onaway limestone that Young used was quarried nearby, it should be able to stand up to the environmental conditions in the Charlevoix area. However, the cut limestone used in Young’s structures should be carefully examined each year for signs of water penetration or damage as the stone is very porous and subject to deterioration.

In the case of two of his most unique structures, Young used red-tinted sandstone he acquired from the building of a canal on the St. Mary’s River. Like limestone, sandstone is a sedimentary stone formed under pressure in areas such as lake and river bottoms. It is characterized by a visible grain, and can found in a variety of colors and textures. The distinctive sandstone gets its color due to the abundance of ferric iron oxides in the earth’s crust. Generally a soft and absorbent stone, sandstone weathers easily. It should be thoroughly examined annually for signs of water damage.

Masonry Damage

The most common causes of masonry damage are settlement of foundations, water penetration, wind erosion, and air pollution. However, before these issues can be addressed, it is first necessary to determine and rectify the root cause of the problem. Water is the most common cause of masonry damage. Usually caused by rain or snow in conjunction with roof leaks or malfunctioning gutters, water infiltration results in mortar deterioration and can freeze within the masonry itself, causing the stone to spall or crack. Water can also penetrate a structure through rising damp, where water rises from the ground up through the foundation and into the masonry wall.
Observed Masonry Issues in Young’s Architecture

Water that runs from the roof onto the stonework is the biggest masonry issue in terms of Young’s architecture. Many of Earl Young’s structures have extremely shallow eaves in certain locations. In those areas the stone is more likely to be subjected to water run-off from the roof. This can be particularly harmful to the building. The excess water can not only seep into the porous limestone and mortar and cause spalling in freezing temperatures, but it can also damage wooden window frames and moldings. In cases where water run-off is coming into contact with the masonry, the best remedy is to extend the eaves of the structure sufficiently so that the run-off falls directly onto the ground. A gutter system is another possible solution for correcting water run-off problems.

In Boulder Park, Earl Young’s homes may have potential issues with rising damp. Rising damp is typically the result of high water tables or a constant source of water within close proximity to the building. Artesian wells were built for many of the homes in Boulder Park; these sources bring sub-surface water to ground level, often creating a high water table. Rising damp occurs via capillary action; in essence, the moisture from the soil “wicks up” into porous stones at the base of a building. A good indication of rising damp is the presence of
efflorescence, or white salt crystals, on the surfaced of the masonry wall one to three feet from ground level.

Unfortunately, rising damp is a difficult, and rather expensive, problem to solve. The first course of action should be to reduce the amount of water that comes into contact with the building. This requires making improvements to the drainage system around the perimeter of the structure or locating the source of the moisture (like an artesian well) and either diverting it elsewhere or closing it off. If the source of water cannot be located, or if the water table is chronically high, the best remedy is to install a damp-proof barrier to stop the moisture from rising up into the masonry. Damp-proof barriers can be a course of slate or a lead or plastic sheet inserted into the masonry wall just above the foundation. Under no circumstances should a water-proof coating, like cement parging or a vinyl wall covering, be applied to the damp walls. This will result in moisture being sealed within the masonry, which will ultimately lead to severe deterioration of the wall.

General Maintenance

One of the primary maintenance issues for masonry buildings is cleaning. Cleaning masonry walls not only improves the appearance of the building, but it also removes materials that may damage the masonry and provides a clean surface on which masons can re-point mortar joints. Before cleaning begins, it is first necessary to determine the source and nature of the soiling material so that it can be removed in the gentlest means possible. Cleaning should always begin with the gentlest method possible, moving only to stronger or more invasive methods if absolutely necessary. Cleaning masonry should always be performed with the utmost care as the use of inappropriate cleaning agents can have a deleterious affect on both the masonry and other building materials. It should also be taken
into account that not all dirt or stains are removable; additionally, a ‘brand new’ appearance may actually detract from the look and character of the building. Following cleaning, the application of water-repellant or water-proof coatings is unnecessary if the building is water-tight and in good repair. These coatings can often be detrimental to masonry, trapping moisture within the wall and permanently damaging the building.

There are three different types of masonry cleaning methods: water, chemical, and abrasive. Water methods soften the soiling material and help to rinse the deposits from the masonry surface. These methods are the gentlest means possible, and should be used before attempting to clean using any other method. There are four types of water cleaning methods: soaking, which consists of prolonged spraying or misting with water, is especially gentle and effective for cleaning limestone; pressure water-washing (often in conjunction with a hand-held natural bristle or synthetic bristle brush) uses low or medium-pressure water no higher than 300-400 psi and is the most common water cleaning method used; water washing with non-ionic detergent is especially effective in removing oily dirt; and, steam or hot-pressurized water cleaning, which is actually low-pressure hot water washing because steam condenses as water on the building.

Before undertaking any water cleaning project, it is necessary to first ensure that the mortar joints are sound and that the building itself is water-tight. Water cleaning should never be done in cold weather, as it takes over a week to dry and can freeze within the masonry, causing the stone to crack or spall. It is also imperative that water is not used at too high a pressure; commonly referred to as “power-washing,” this type of water cleaning is very abrasive and can easily etch soft stone. If grains of stone or sand begin to appear on the ground while washing, the water pressure may be too high.
Chemical cleaners react with the soiling material to stimulate their removal and are subsequently washed off with water. Chemical cleaners can remove not only dirt but also paint and other coatings and stains. There are several different types of chemical cleaners, both acidic and alkaline, as well as organic compounds. Before applying any type of chemical cleaner, it is necessary to test a small hidden portion of stone. The use of chemical cleaners should be undertaken only if water cleaning methods are not appropriate. Chemical cleaners are typically applied to wet masonry and allowed to sit for a specified amount of time before washing off with water. Acidic cleaners should only be used on stone that is not acid sensitive, like granite or concrete. Alkaline cleaners can be used on limestone or other acid sensitive materials. Like water cleaning, chemical cleaning should not be undertaken in cold weather, specifically in temperatures under 40 degrees Fahrenheit, when there is a chance of the liquid freezing within the wall. These cleaners can also be harmful to humans, plants, and animals; if they are not chosen carefully, they can even react adversely with many types of masonry.

Abrasive measures of cleaning remove soiling agents mechanically and include blasting the surface with sand or grit or using grinders or sanding discs. Abrasive cleaning methods should never be used on historic structures, no matter how durable one believes the materials are. Abrasive cleaning methods not only remove dirt, but the outer surface of the masonry units as well, which can permanently damage the structure. This method also damages the mortar joints, which can allow water to penetrate into the building.
Mortar

One of the most crucial elements in masonry construction is mortar. Each of Earl Young’s stone structures incorporates mortar with a different mixture of sand, water, and cement based on the type of stone used. Beginning in the 1930s, new mortar products were developed to simplify masonry construction. Masonry cement, a premixed, bagged mortar that combines ground limestone and portland cement, was one of the most popular “new” masonry products at that time. Because Earl Young constructed thirty buildings over the course of fifty years, the mortar is different in almost every building. In addition, it must not be assumed that all of Young’s homes incorporate the use of lime mortar; realistically, most of his structures probably contain mortar with some amount of portland cement. While lime mortar remains the preferred choice in masonry construction, mortar with small amounts of portland cement will not always negatively affect masonry units. Instead, it may even provide strength to the mortar and speed its setting time.

Re-pointing Mortar Joints

Mortar re-pointing is one of the most critical maintenance measures that one can take to preserve a masonry structure. Re-pointing is typically done in response to an obvious sign of deterioration, like cracking or disintegrating mortar, loose stones, and damp or damaged walls or plasterwork. However, before beginning any mortar re-pointing or even entire replacement, the root cause of the deterioration, like leaking roofs, gutters, or rising damp, should be identified and remedied. When re-pointing or replacing mortar, one should first conduct analysis of the historic mortar in order to create a matching mortar mixture. The new mortar should match the historic mortar in terms of color, strength, and vapor permeability. Re-pointing mortars should be always softer or more permeable than the
masonry units and no harder or impermeable than the historic mortar.\textsuperscript{265} The primary function of mortar in masonry construction is to absorb stresses caused by expansion, contraction, moisture migration, and settlement; if the new mortar cannot relieve those stresses, the consequence will be damage to the stone in the form of cracking or spalling, which is often difficult to repair. A laboratory analysis of the historic mortar’s aggregate in terms of composition, gradation, and color will allow the new mortar to be matched with some accuracy. Mortar can be analyzed by architectural conservators or masonry experts, who will then provide a specific written formula for the historic mortar so that the re-pointing mortar can be matched with ease.\textsuperscript{266} The new mortar mixture should take into consideration factors like site conditions and the condition of the masonry units.

When re-pointing a masonry wall, it is usually preferable to re-point only those areas that need work. However, if 25\% to 50\% of the wall needs to be re-pointed, then it is best to re-point the entire wall to provide visual uniformity.\textsuperscript{267} It is also important to consider the wall temperature when re-pointing mortar joints. Wall temperatures between 40 and 95 degrees Fahrenheit will help to prevent freezing or excessive evaporation of the mortar’s moisture content. In addition, the pointing styles and methods of both horizontal and vertical mortar joints should always be carefully replicated so as to preserve the visual character of the building.

When re-pointing masonry walls, it is important to remember that a good re-pointing job is often a lengthy and expensive process. All mortar joints will inevitably need re-pointing, as mortar is intended to be the sacrificial element for the entire masonry unit. However, if done correctly, re-pointed joints should last at least 30 years—preferably 50 to 100 years.\textsuperscript{268} Shortcuts and poor craftsmanship will not only result in a shorter lifespan for
the mortar joints, but will also detract significantly from the historic character of the building.

Tinted Mortar

Earl Young used vibrant red and green colored mortar in two of his Boulder Park homes. His use of pigments in the mortar is instrumental in complementing the overall design of each house. In duplicating mortar for these homes, it is first necessary to perform a mortar analysis to determine the make-up of the original mortar mixture. The type and color of both the sand and cement compound will determine the mortar’s shade of color. Light colored sand with a large particle size will allow for a darker colored mortar, while more fine-particle sand will result in a lighter shade. Only high quality color pigments made from natural and synthetic mineral oxides should be used when coloring mortar to ensure the color’s longevity. The color pigments should always be added by a trained masonry professional in order to ensure that the appropriate level of pigment is added.

Cedar Shingles

The roof is the most vulnerable element of a house. Historically roofs were designed to serve a functional purpose, such as directing rain water off and away from the house, and shading the structure from the sun. Because the roof is typically the first component of a house to be exposed to the elements, it often receives more wear over time than other features of the house. If a roof is not properly maintained, the structure as a whole will be compromised. In the case of Earl Young’s architecture, the roofs impart much of the architectural character.
Cedar shingle roofs are not only varied in the design and patterns they create, but they also have many positive structural qualities. They have more than twice the insulating factor of standard asphalt roofs, and are also extremely wind-resistant.\textsuperscript{271}

Wood shingle roofs were commonplace in early American architecture. They enjoyed a renewed popularity in the later 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century—about the time Earl Young began to construct houses—with the introduction of revival styles and the move to the hand-crafted materials of the Arts and Crafts movement.\textsuperscript{272} Although Earl Young’s cedar shingle roofs are visually unique, they were constructed similarly to more ordinary shingle roofs, and therefore will be assessed as such.

**Potential Problems in Young’s Cedar Shingled Roofs**

Cedar shingle roofs can last from fifteen to over sixty years, but it is necessary to perform regular and routine maintenance in order to extend the life of the roof as a whole.\textsuperscript{273} One of the most critical factors of deterioration for cedar shingle roofs is moisture. The life of a cedar shingle roof can be extended if the shingles used are properly spaced, straight-grained shingles laid on an open lath or appropriate sheathing. Shingles should be layered three deep, with approximately one-third of each exposed to the elements.\textsuperscript{274} Each row of shingles should be staggered so as to avoid creating a direct path for moisture when it runs down the slope of the roof.
Because many of Young’s roofs have a non-linear shingle patterning, special care should be taken to ensure that the shingles are providing the rafters with adequate protection against moisture infiltration. Furthermore, those homes with undulating roofs may potentially hold much more moisture than a regular roof. Earl Young was known to use scrap lumber to accentuate the undulations on some of his roofs; despite the effect this creates, it is actually detrimental to the life of the roof—and potentially the structure itself. Additional wood underneath the shingles only serves to hold moisture, keeping the shingles wet and inviting moss and lichens to grow. Ultimately, this will decrease the life-span of the shingles significantly, requiring replacement after only fifteen years as opposed to thirty.

One of the best ways to prevent moss and lichen buildup is to ensure that there is a ventilation channel underneath the shingles to allow them to dry.\(^\text{275}\) It is also important to keep the roof free of branches, pine needles, and leaves. If moss has already grown on the shingles, it should be scraped off and the residue removed with an herbicide containing a zinc sulfate or a diluted bleaching solution, like chlorine.\(^\text{276}\) Power-washing should never be used to remove build-up on the roof; while it may make the roof look new, it can also put a lot of water underneath the shingles (and subsequently into the attic). To prevent moss and lichens from returning,
exposed strips of zinc can be installed just below the top course of shingles; then, when it rains, the zinc is carried by the rainwater down the roof slope, thus continually treating it for fungal growth.

**Replacing and Repairing Young’s Cedar Shingle Roofs**

Before any repairs or replacements are made to the shingle roof, it is essential that historical and photographic evidence is collected so that the original roof is thoroughly documented. If more than 20% of the shingles are eroded, cracked, cupped, or split, or if there is evidence of moisture penetration in the attic, replacement of the roof may be necessary. If only a few of the shingles are damaged, it is appropriate to selectively replace them.

In replacing a cedar shingle roof, it is necessary to match the size, shape, texture, and configuration of the shingles as well as maintain the craftsmanship and detailing that characterizes the roof. With Young’s unusual shingle roofs, it is particularly important to maintain the visual qualities imparted by both the shingles themselves and also their installation pattern. Replacement shingles should have a similar surface texture, be a similar size and shape, and be installed in a matching installation pattern. Charlevoix’s local building codes do not require that cedar shingle roofs be treated with fire-retardants. However, it is possible to treat shingles with a fire-retardant coating and a fungicide if desired; these treatments, if applied correctly, will not detract from the appearance of the wood shingles. Accurately replacing and repairing Earl Young’s cedar shingle roofs according to his original designs will help to ensure the architectural integrity of his buildings for many years.
Earl Young has created some of the most unique designs in Michigan. Over time they have inspired a style unique to Charlevoix and have resulted in a number of buildings, both residential and commercial, that express Young’s influence. These buildings make Charlevoix truly unique. They are also a prime example of vernacular architecture in Michigan. Young’s use of local materials like stone, driftwood, and cedar shingles in addition to his ability to design the buildings around their existing landscape makes his architecture not only vernacular but organic as well.

Presently, Earl Young’s homes are used for a number of purposes. Most of those in Boulder Park are privately owned and used primarily as vacation cottages. The homes along Park Avenue are used more as year-round residences. Whatever their uses, Earl Young’s architectural creations are one of Charlevoix’s biggest attractions. Residents of the city take pride in Earl Young’s legacy; many give tours during the summer months and the Chamber of Commerce continues to distribute its 1988 map and brochure.

Local residents’ most recent display of the importance of Young’s architecture in Charlevoix occurred in 2003, when the Apple Tree building was slated for demolition by developers. Local residents flooded into city council meetings to express their concern over saving the building. When the Roby family agreed to purchase the building and move it to their property on Auld Street, members of the Charlevoix community in favor of saving the building were hopeful that Young’s former office building would be well preserved. Sadly, zoning restrictions and the poor condition of the building kept it from being moved in one
piece; it was razed in 2003. The outpouring of emotion and concern over saving the Apple Tree building is a significant example of the importance of Earl Young’s architecture in the Charlevoix community.

Yet, to date, none of his structures has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places or on any state or local rosters. The primary purpose of listing properties is to recognize their importance and encourage their preservation. Young’s house at 4 Thistle Down was another victim of development. Its demolition still angers many local residents who were unaware that its new owners intended to construct a new home on the lot in 1994.

Earl Young’s stone buildings are important not only to the city of Charlevoix but to the study of vernacular architecture in Michigan. Young’s use of indigenous stone like granite boulders, Onaway limestone, and red sandstone from the St. Mary’s River means that the buildings he constructed blend not only aesthetically with the environment, but physically as well. Stonework can last for centuries if it and the other elements of a structure are maintained over time. With appropriate conservation and maintenance procedures, Young’s architecture should last for generations. The preservation of Young’s structures also depends on careful documentation. No conservation, restoration, or reconstruction activity should be undertaken without thorough documentation, including photographs, of the original features.

Hopefully, Earl Young’s buildings will continue to be valued as pieces of significant regional architecture by residents of and visitors to the Charlevoix community. The research and information presented in this document is meant not only to assist in documenting the complete history and architectural characteristic features of Earl Young’s extraordinary stone architecture, but perhaps also to inspire its preservation and conservation over time.
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