

New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2024

Location: Homeland Security Conference Room, located on the 8th Floor of City Hall, 1300 Perdido Street

Called to order: 12:30 p.m.

Members Present: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting:

Members absent:

AGENDA

I. Roll Call

II. Minutes of the previous Tuesday October 22nd meeting

Motion: Approve the meeting minutes.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

III. Agenda

1. 436-442 Soraparu St

Application: New construction of a 18,585 SF, three-story, multi-family residential building and the demolition of a Contributing rated, one-story, single-family residential building to grade.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer this application for additional review. The ARC stated that the overall massing, fenestrations and materials used do not relate to the surrounding context. The two buildings to the left that are two stories at the front with a third floor at the rear were more successful than the right most building that starts as a one story and goes up to three. The ARC stated that the entry sequence at the buildings needs to be more pedestrian friendly and have more interaction with the streetscape, this will also help the buildings relate to the context. The window to wall ratio needs further study. The parking and setback requirements should be verified with the Department of Zoning, as it could affect the massing of the buildings.

By: Tracie Ashe

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:
Comments:

2. 3039 & 3047 Saint Claude Ave

Application: New construction of a 5,343 SF two-story commercial motel building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application for additional review.

- The variety of forms, massing, and materials should be further studied and refined to be simplified and more cohesive across the elevations.
- At the Felician Street side, the breakdown of the building massing appears to be successful, however, the number of materials should be reduced and refined to relate more closely to the programmatic elements. For example, the lobby and bathroom massing could be treated in the same material, with the parking and units above at the rear also treated similarly to each other.
- The variety of opening types should also be simplified.
- An additional window should be added to the Felician Street side of the lobby space.
- At the St. Claude Avenue side, the overall massing and scale should be further studied and refined so that it better relates with the existing surrounding context.
- The one-story form/massing at the right-side appears to be domestic but does not relate to the context of existing domestic forms around it. The applicant could consider extending the 2-story massing of rooms at the rear of the building toward the front at the right side.
- The proposed heat-treated Ashe wood cladding may appear too “precious” and may not be an appropriate material for such a prominent elevation along St. Claude Avenue.
- New visible access stairs are not permitted where visible from the public right of way, so the applicant should explore alternative floor plan options that can relocate or reconfigure the two required egress stairs, so they are no longer visible at the exterior.
- The egress stair located at the St. Claude side could potentially be reconfigured to occupy the current location of the second or third interior room.
- 3D massing and aerial perspective diagrams should be provided for the next review.
- The applicant should consider providing a few massing and material options for the next review.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

3. 2223 Carondelet St

Application: Final detail review of previously approved new construction of a 5,345 SF two-story, two-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level.

The ARC agreed that:

- The changes made to the FTC heights are successful and help give the building more of a vertical expression. The modifications at the right-side canopy are also successful.

- Roof Option 1 is approved, with the proviso that the left side wall at the second floor must be set back at least 1'-0" so the bay projection visually reads as a distinct and separate element from the street.

By: Cynthia Dubberly

Second: Jonathan Tate

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

4. 620-622 Louisa St

Application: Partial demolition of a Contributing rated, one-story, two-family residential building for renovation and new construction of a 7,600 SF three-story rear addition.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application for additional review.

- Options 1 and 2 showing the overall building massing stepping up to 3 stories at the rear appears to be too large, foreign, atypical, and acontextual to be appropriate for the existing historic building and the historic context and will be highly visible at the right-side elevation and from several vantage points from Royal and Chartres Streets.
- For example, the proposal seeks to accommodate 3 stories within a building envelope that is typically intended for only 2 stories. The overall height and floor-to-ceiling heights should be reconsidered and refined relative to the adjacent camelback building on the block at 610-12 Louisa Street.
- The applicant should explore alternative massing options that may be more compatible with the existing historic context and that lessen the overall impact of the addition on the original building and adjacent structures.
- If Zoning allows, the applicant could consider a more traditionally designed and scaled camelback addition at the front and create a new rear accessory, service structure, or connected addition that utilizes the depth of the lot to shift to some of the program and massing further to the rear to reduce its overall height and visibility.
- For example, the applicant should consider the existing two-story rear accessory structure at 634 Louisa Street and how it allows for better distribution of the program and utilization of the overall site.
- Additionally, the operator apartment program on the 3rd floor could easily be shifted on the site and relocated within a new rear structure with units below to maintain the same number of units.
- Additional information on the proposed new roof deck, parapet, and how it is incorporated into the design with the other proposed roof forms should be provided for the next meeting.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Jonathan Tate

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments: Public Comment by Alicia Dunbar and Adam Newman

5. 2838-2844 Magazine St

Application: Renovation and alteration of facade at a Contributing rated, commercial building.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer this application for additional review. The ARC stated that the removal of the two entrance doors of the historic double is not appropriate, and the doors should be retained. The removal of the large cornice was also not appropriate, and the ARC recommended a free hanging sign rather than a wall mounted sign that obscured or removed the historic trim.

By: Daniel Zangara

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

6. 2738 Saint Charles Ave

Application: Renovation of a Non-Contributing rated, two-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level. The ARC recommended the following:

- Final drawings to show dimensions of car port and new gate design
- Installation of eight equal-divided window lights on the French doors.
- Installation of dormer, retaining the arch, while ensuring that each window is of equal size.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Jonathan Tate

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

7. 929 N Robertson St

Application: Construction of a new pavilion on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Jonathan Tate

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

8. 5200 Dauphine St

Application: Renovation including reconfiguration of an existing window wall and installation of new awning and storefront entry door at the left side of a Contributing rated, two-story, commercial building.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level. The ARC recommended the following:

- Should the canopy be retained, it is advisable to incorporate drainage solutions, such as rain chains
- Can move forward with every other aspect of the design, if further review of canopy is needed

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Jonathan Tate

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

9. 837 Desire St

Application: Renovation and modification of a Non-Contributing rated, one-story warehouse structure including partial roof demolition for conversion to residential use.

Motion: The ARC agreed the proposal was an appropriate readaptation of the existing non-historic building.

By: Jonathan Tate

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In Favor: Jonathan Tate, Amanda Rivera, Daniel Zangara, Cynthia Dubberley, Tracie Ashe

Opposed:

Comments:

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.