

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

Mitchell J. Landrieu
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Brian Block
INTERIM DIRECTOR

Architectural Committee meeting of **Tuesday, March 8th, 2016**

Committee Members Present: Daniel Taylor, Nick Musso, Rick Fifield,

Committee Members Absent: Dennis Brady, George Hero,

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Interim Director; Renee' Bourgoigne, Architectural Historian; Nicholas G. Albrecht, Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Plans Examiner; Erika Gates, Building Inspector; Jennie Garcia, Intern; Erin Cook, Intern; Kelly Calhoun, Intern; Joseph Newman, Intern

Staff Absent:

Others Present: Ralph Long, Mark Thomas, Henry Hanisee, Hank Smith, Betty Norris, Kim Girvan, Stephanie Larrieu, Deb Harkins, Logan Trotter, Mary Hewes, Brian Sublette, Jenna Burke, Richard Choate, Robert Pell

AGENDA

Old Business

200 Decatur St: Ralph Long, applicant; 200 Levee Street LLC, owner; Proposal to add fresh air intake louvers to the ground floor of the Clinton elevation, per application & materials received 06/30/15 & 03/01/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated he would prefer to defer the application rather than flat out deny it.

Mr. Long asked if the revised proposal should include only vertical louvers. Mr. Musso responded that would be in keeping with guidelines and this could be approved by staff if the revised proposal conforms to the recommendations of the guidelines.

Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the application. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

336 Decatur St/ 400 Conti St: Mark Thomas, applicant; Joseph C Paciera, owner; Proposal to demolish existing yellow-rated structure and construct new three story building with rooftop terrace, per application & materials received 07/04/15, 02/16/16, & 02/18/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Thomas and Hanisee present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that the barn doors were worth study, but he was concerned with the proportions and heights of the floor levels. He continued that it has greatly improved but needs significant changes before moving forward. Finally, Mr. Musso stated that he believes the ground floor windows are too tall and that header heights and proportions should respond to those of the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Fifield inquired about there not being rolling shutters on operable doors. Mr. Thomas responded stating that goal on the second floor was to open the doors out 180°. Mr. Fifield stated that it was odd that shutters are only on some of the windows/doors noting that their placement should follow an apparent order and be less haphazard. Mr. Fifield also asked what was driving the height of the windows.

Mr. Hanisee stated that the window heights were matched to the adjacent buildings and could be lowered although it may depend on the kitchen layout. Mr. Taylor stated that the entire street had consistent window heights and expressed concern over the proposed irregularity of the windows and their proportions.

Mr. Fifield stated it seems to be three different buildings floor to floor but that the building as presented is more “believable” than ones previously proposed.

Mr. Musso stated that the large expanse of open doors at the ground floor results in the loss of definition in the buildings edge, possibly in the combination of height and width of the opening.

Mr. Fifield stated that he would prefer a uniform treatment of shutters on all openings and that the proportion of windows held with the building and not totally tied to the neighbors.

Mr. Musso stated that the building now reads as three separate components – the ground floor, the second and third floors, and the rooftop terrace that doesn’t quite work with the rest of the composition and needs further study. Mr. Musso continued that the building needs lots of modifications moving forward.

Mr. Fifield stated that the fans and exterior lighting provided an opportunity to unify the vision of the building in a more contemporary way. He questioned the use of the ground floor gas lanterns as not being in keeping with the contemporary nature of the design.

Mr. Musso commented on the stark contrast of color between the flat white and the flat black colored elements. He suggested restudy of the colors for the building.

Mr. Fifield commented that it would be important to see a signage packet along with the proposal as the signage design should be considered holistically with the schematic design, not as an afterthought. Mr. Fifield then moved to **defer** the application, adopting the comments of the staff including responding to the floor to floor heights of adjacent buildings, adding a more uniform shutter treatment on all openings, larger portions of solid wall expressed on the ground floor, restudy of the height and width of the first floor openings, restudy of lighting and fans, and for the revised proposal to include signage. Mr. Musso seconded the motion.

Debra Harkins, a member of the audience but involved with the project, stated that she would appreciate conceptual approval at this point and was hoping to move forward with the demolition. Mr. Musso said that a conceptual approval at this point would not move the application forward at this point. Mr. Taylor stated there were too many open issues. Mr. Musso inquired if there was a signed lease on this property. The applicants responded that there was a lease.

Mr. Taylor called the vote and the motion passed unanimously.

1101 Decatur St: Diane Hickman, applicant; Vtm Properties, LLC, owner; Proposal to install new hood vent and other mechanical intakes/venting in conjunction with a **change of use** from vacant to restaurant per applications & materials received 09/15/15, 02/24/16, & 03/01/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that he concurs with the staff recommendation and appreciates the applicant for finding a less intrusive means of accomplishing the ventilation.

Mr. Musso moved for **approval** of the application using Option 2 as presented. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1031 Chartres St: Kimberly Girvan, applicant; Samuel P Girvan, owner; Proposal to repair structural damage to masonry walls, per application & materials received 09/16/15 & 02/18/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Ms. Girvan present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso commented that the proposed waterproofing method was not technically within VCC Design Guidelines, but may be found approvable in this situation. Ms. Girvan explained her concerns regarding maintenance of the 616 Ursulines property, due to the portion of wall which

crosses the property line and bears on the rear wall of 1031 Chartres.

Mr. Fifield stated that the proposed waterproofing plan was excellent, and then referred to staff's concerns regarding "General Notes Item 3," which proposed to "firmly grout and embed all wood framing members within the replaced brick wall." Mr. Fifield agreed with staff opinion that material shifting could be problematic if the floor joists were grouted, and recommended that the joists are pocketed per typical practice. Mr. Fifield also suggested waterproofing "Option A," and requested that the applicant to provide dimensions on the drawings resubmitted to staff.

Mr. Musso moved to **approve** the proposal per staff recommendations, specifically approving waterproofing "Option A." Mr. Fifield amended the motion, including the requirement for the applicant to resubmit dimensioned drawings, and to remove "General Notes Item 3" from the scope. Mr. Musso accepted the amendments, and Mr. Fifield seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

614-18 N Rampart St: Harry Baker Smith Architects, applicant; 616 N Rampart LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate building in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *residential*, per application & materials received 12/08/15 & 02/15/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application.

Complete Minutes Needed.

822 Barracks St: Sarah Busch, applicant; Barda Properties LLC, owner; Review of changes to previously approved plans for renovations of green-rated buildings, per application & materials received 01/28/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

1216 Dauphine St: Sarah Busch, applicant; Barda Properties LLC, owner; Review of changes to previously approved plans for construction of new single family residence, per application & materials received 01/29/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

1218 Dauphine St: Sarah Busch, applicant; Barda Properties LLC, owner; Review of changes to previously approved plans for renovation of existing orange-rated building, per application & materials received 01/29/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

1220 Dauphine St: Sarah Busch, applicant; Barda Properties LLC, owner; Review of changes to previously approved plans for construction of new single family residence, per application & materials received 01/29/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

1222 Dauphine St: Sarah Busch, applicant; Barda Properties LLC, owner; Review of changes to previously approved plans for construction of new single family residence, per application & materials received 01/29/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

New Business

1022 St Peter St: Lee Page, applicant; Janet L Rail, Russell Mc Levy, Gay Gordon, Barry Starr, Pamela S Champion, Ira P Babin, II, Joseph R Linn Jr, Eunice G Gordon, Thomas L Keister, Marcia W Rosen, Michael Kendrick, Linda J Sumner Revocable Trust, Jude T Smith, Ellen G Wilson, John L Wilson, Condo Master Owner, Sanjo LLC, Jeffrey K Roby, Tony Viejo, Joseph R Linn Jr, William T Conger, Vito Petretti, owner; Proposal to install new structural tie and renovate exterior of green-rated service building, per application & materials submitted 01/07/16 & 02/29/16, respectively.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

923 Barracks St: Brian Sublette, applicant; Earl L Larrieu, owner; Proposal to renovate courtyard and pool, including the installation of a spa, fountain, and exterior kitchen appliances, per application & materials submitted 02/01/16 & 02/22/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Ms. Larrieu and Mr. Sublette present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso explained that review of tile, colors, materials, etc. would need to be submitted for Committee review and could not be approved at staff level. Mr. Musso stated that he had no objection to the 16" high spa wall, as the courtyard and existing pool differs from typical French Quarter courtyards.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant where they planned to locate HVAC equipment. Ms. Larrieu indicated the rear Burgundy-side alley. Mr. Fifield requested the applicant revise the drawings to show the units, and subsequently moved for the **conceptual approval** of the application, with the applicant to return for further Committee review after all required drawings and materials are revised and submitted to staff. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

400 N. Peters St: Amanda Story, applicant; Chalon F Seale, Elizabeth M Fontaine, Edgar B Fontaine Jr, Laura F Etienne, Nathan B Fontaine, Christian Fontaine, Joan M Fontaine, owners; Proposal to remove existing mechanical equipment and install new units, per application & materials submitted 02/02/16 & 02/18/16, respectively.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

632 Burgundy St: Kevin Buford, applicant; Kevin-Steven C Buford, owner; Proposal to remove deteriorated wooden driveway gate and replace with ornamental iron gate, per application & materials received 02/10/16.

With no one present to represent the application, the application was **deferred**.

204 Decatur St: Harry Baker Smith Architects, applicant; Decatur Live LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate structure and install gallery, in conjunction with a proposed **change of use** from *vacant* to *restaurant/residential*, per application & materials received 02/15/16.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso noted a historic photograph and commented that he could consider a one story gallery.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant how he planned to support a projection due to the existing cast iron lintel. Mr. Smith answered that brackets would be installed on top of the lintel and through the existing brick wall per typical installation. Mr. Musso commented that the decorative cornice above the second and third floor windows were likely not intended to be covered, and that he could not support a double gallery. Mr. Fifield suggested the installation of an awning rather than a gallery or balcony, and stated that the proposed change of use was appropriate.

Mr. Fifield moved to **defer** the application. Mr. Musso added that a roof plan would be required for subsequent review, and seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

608 Bienville St: Richard Choate, applicant; Monteleone Real Estate III LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate building including new windows and exterior door in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *residential* (6 units), per application & materials received 02/19/16.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Choate present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso asked about the size of the proposed apartments. Mr. Choate responded that the largest was around 650 sq. ft. and clarified that these would be used by student interns for the Monteleone. Mr. Musso responded stating that generally there is a real opposition to units this small.

Mr. Fifield asked where mechanical units would be placed to service these apartments. Mr. Choate responded that there is a neighboring building with a flat roof with the same owner and he was planning on locating mechanical units on that roof.

Mr. Musso moved for **conceptual approval** with the applicant to revise the proposed millwork and include information on mechanical units in a subsequent submittal. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

301 Chartres St: Richard Choate, applicant; Rathborne Properties LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate building in conjunction with a proposed **change of use** from *commercial* to *restaurant*, per application & materials received 02/22/16.

Complete Minutes Needed.

Appeals & Violations

1113 Decatur St: Neal Bodenheimer, applicant; 1113 Decatur LLC, owner; Proposal to retain unpermitted walk-in cooler in rear courtyard and install new mechanical screening, per application & materials received 12/09/15 & 02/16/16, respectively. **[Notice of Violation sent 11/16/15]**

Complete Minutes Needed.

1014 Royal St: Donna F Steg, applicant/owner; Proposal to correct/repair structural fault in façade wall, installing new tie-backs, per application & materials submitted 12/22/15 & 01/13/16, respectively. **[Notice of Violation sent 06/26/15]**

The item was deferred until the end of the meeting, at which time Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation although no one was present to represent the application. Mr. Musso stated that the applicant should provide a timetable for proposed repairs.

Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the proposal per staff recommendation, stating that the applicant should provide an up-to-date engineer's report within thirty (30) days, as well as a timetable of implementation, with permitting and work to begin within ninety (90) days. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

934-940 Bourbon St: Red Door Construction, applicant; Bourbon Saint Philip Inc., owner; Proposal to alter previously approved drawings restoring main building balcony, and to raise original balcony to meet code, per application & materials received 03/01/16. **[Notice of Violation sent 01/23/15]**

Ms. Gates gave the staff presentation with **Mr. _____?** present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso moved to **conceptually approve** the proposal per staff recommendation. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Complete Minutes Needed.

918 Dauphine St: Robert Pell, applicant; Mark W Seale, owner; Proposal to retain and modify HVAC units installed without benefit of VCC review or approval, per application & materials received 12/30/15 & 03/01/16, respectively. **[Notice of Violation sent 04/03/14]**

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Pell present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that the units could be moved to the side and mounted on the wall. Mr. Pell inquired if the units would be more visible located down the driveway. Mr. Musso responded that not a lot of people look down the driveway.

Mr. Taylor inquired if the units could be located in the rear yard. There was a brief discussion of the regarding the distance and capabilities of the units if located in the rear yard.

Mr. Pell stated that he met with the mechanical inspector and they identified other mechanical units, which were more or less installed to code. Mr. Pell also stated that he spoke with the City's Zoning Administrator who stated that the units in the front yard were within the buildable area of the front yard.

Mr. Musso suggested other locations on the sides of the building where the units could be relocated that may be more acceptable. Mr. Pell inquired if any kind of permanent screening would be acceptable. Messrs. Taylor and Fifield stated that screening would essentially make it worse and draw more attention to the units.

Mr. Pell inquired about the possibility of relocating the units to the porch area, located in the corners of the columns. Mr. Musso suggested that Mr. Pell propose that and discuss that possibility with the owner.

Mr. Fifield moved to **approve** the existing units on the side and rear elevations of the building and to defer consideration for the units in the front to allow the applicant to propose alternate solutions that are less prominent. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
