

November 14, 2018

Josh Jeffers  
J. Jeffers & Company  
225 E Michigan St, Suite 300  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

RE: Landmarks Preservation Commission Review

Dear Mr. Jeffers,

I have reviewed the letter from the City of Racine dated November 1, 2018 regarding the plan deficiencies noted by the Racine Landmarks Preservation Commission's (LPC). Below and attached is our response to their inquiries. I will resubmit this letter, along with a copy of the items referenced in the responses below, directly to Matthew Sadowski at the City of Racine. I will also plan to attend the next meeting of the LPC to answer any additional questions they may have.

Item 1 – No information is provided as to the treatment of the existing brick exterior, or the method of restoration where brick is damaged or deteriorated.

*Response – Attached is the submittal made to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the National Park Service (NPS). This notes that proposed cleaning and repointing mock-ups will be done to SHPO/NPS standards, and provided for their review prior to the completion of the remainder of the project.*

Item 2 – All existing windows should be retained and restored/rehabilitated. The plans specify that the windows are to be replaced yet no specification sheets are provided to indicate the appearance, colors, mechanics, materials and longevity of the replacement windows.

*Response – Also noted in the SHPO/NPS submittal, the intention is to replace the windows with new units that mimic the existing historical profiles. Along with the narrative, initial drawings of the existing profiles to be matched is attached. Additional drawings will be produced by a window manufacturer and presented to SHPO/NPS for their review and approval.*

Item 3 – Retain existing window openings (archs, sills). For the existing half windows on the east and north facades, why are they being opened? Replacements windows should not truncate any arches.

*Response – Existing window openings are being opened to both match historical design of the building, and bring natural light into the basement portions of the building. Replacement windows will fill historical openings, including arches.*

Item 4 – For the two story addition at the complex’s south-west corner: The plans specify 20 pane/light windows basically matching all others. However, double-hung windows with 2 panes/lights per sash appear to be more historically accurate for this portion of the complex.

*Response – Attached is the window survey narrative and plans submitted to SHPO/NPS. Windows will be replaced with units that match divisions and operation.*

Item 5 – No demolition plans were provided. Having these will assist the LPS in understanding and evaluation the projects impact on the historical structure.

*Response – Current demolition plans have been included here for review by the LPC.*

Item 6 – North façade: More detail is needed on the treatment of the fire escapes (color, finished, materials). Will there be new railings?

*Response – The SHPO/NPS submittal addresses this. The fire escape will remain ‘as is’, but will be repainted (see photo attached showing one of the existing fire escapes).*

Item 7 – East façade: The gate illustrated on the east elevation, behind the sliding door, should be recessed unless it can be demonstrated that historically there was a gate in the same position.

*Response – The gate is planned to be recessed to the back side of the wall.*

Item 8 – East Façade: Need details on the treatment of the sliding door.

*Response – The door will be stabilized, repainted and fixed in a semi-open location.*

Item 9 – East façade: Need details on the treatment of the main door on the east façade located at the first floor, NE corner of the building.

*Response – The existing door will be evaluated to see if can be saved. Either way, the existing door, or a replacement that is matched to the profile of the existing, will be fixed into the existing opening.*

Item 10 – East façade: What will be the treatment of the chimney? While it is illustrated, no detail is provided as to its termination and method to accomplish this.

*Response – The top of the chimney, including the opening, will be capped with a metal flashing that is color matched to the brick so as not to be obtrusive.*

Item 11 – South façade: stairs and railing do not appear to be appropriate and should match the existing fire escapes on the north façade.

*Response – Railings that would match the fire escapes will not meet current building code requirements. Current design with a metal mesh between horizontal members is shown because it is believed to be a good compromise to historical design and current code requirements.*

Item 12 – South façade: dropping of the doorway opening to grade is not consistent with buildings historical first floor sill line.

*Response – Portions of the funding for this project are through WHEDA (Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority), which requires townhouse style units with exterior entrances. The interior floor level of the units behind these walls matches the existing grade.*

Item 13 – Need detail on treatment of basement windows and vent openings. If they are to be filled in, reclaimed brick should be used and there should be a recess/inset to preserve the opening.

*Response – Any window openings being infilled will do so with matching, reclaimed brick. An inset is not currently planned due to a concern with water collecting and accelerating brick deterioration, but a distinct mortar line would be placed at the edges of the openings to define them better.*

Item 14 – Internal walkway: proposed stoups and associated railings appear to be of an inappropriate design. They should match the existing fire escapes on the north façade.

*Response – Railings that would match the fire escapes will not meet current building code requirements. Current design with a metal mesh between horizontal members is shown because it is believed to be a good compromise to historical design and current code requirements.*

Item 15 – Internal walkway: The brick pavers in the internal walkway should be retained.

*Response – The brick pavers will be removed, saved and replaced in the same location.*

Item 16 – What will be the use of the boiler area adjacent to the eastern chimney?

*Response – The roof membrane and decking will be removed, the structural beams will be retained, the south face of the boilers will be retained, and the space itself will be converted into a garden/patio area for the residents of the building.*

Item 17 – No details or specifications are provided for downspouts.

*Response – Most of the downspouts appear to have been fairly recently replaced. The intent is to salvage and reuse them, if possible. If not, the current profile will be matched with new downspouts. The current profile is approximately 6" diameter round, corrugated metal (see photo attached).*

Item 18 – No details or specifications are provided for exterior lighting and proposed parking lot lighting.

*Response – All building systems (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection) are design/build with the sub-contractor for each discipline. Those contractors have just recently been identified, so we request that these be held as a condition of approval and we will submit selections when they are finalized.*

Item 19 – No details or specifications are provided for the proposed parking lot fence.

*Response – The fence will be a simple vertical picket style (see photo attached).*

Item 20 – The ghost signage present on the south and west facades should be retained and protected.

*Response – The ghost signage will be retained and repainted.*

Item 21 – The clay copings should be retained.

*Response – The clay copings will be retained.*

Item 22 – Retain the railroad track currently at the south end of Packard Avenue as it provides context to the transportation component of the Gold Medal Furniture Company by informing how their products were initially taken to the nation. Additionally, while potentially not original, these tracks are in the rail right-of-way for one of the oldest Wisconsin railroad, the Racine, Janesville, and Mississippi Railroad... Racine's first railroad (founded in Racine in 1854).

*Response – The railroad track will be retained in the existing right-of-way for Packard Avenue.*

Sincerely,

**Mark D Linser**  
Team Leader

Copied **Matthew Sadowski** | City of Racine

**Melissa Goins** | J. Jeffers & Co.

**Mark Ernst** | Engberg Anderson Architects

EA File Name: Landmark Preservation Commission Response\_GML.doc