

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

Mitchell J. Landrieu
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Brian Block
INTERIM DIRECTOR

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Architectural Committee meeting of **Tuesday, April 12th, 2016**

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

Committee Members Absent: Dennis Brady, George Hero,

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Interim Director; Renee' Bourgogne, Architectural Historian; Nicholas G. Albrecht, Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Plans Examiner; Erika Gates, Building Inspector; Erin Cook, Intern

Others Present: Mary Hewes, Kate and Richard Bishop, Betty Norris, Jenna Burke, Meg Lousteau, L. Katherine Harmon, Mark Thomas, Henry Hanisee, John C. Williams, Lacey Wotring, Kay Champagne, Hank Smith, Brian Sublette, Stephanie Larrieu, John Stewart, Peter Lignieres, Elaine Bergeron, Sean Wagner, Steve Olson, Mike Buckley, Jim Cripps, Ronald J. Kitto, Daniel Zangara, William Sonner, Robert Pell, Natan Diaion-Furtado

AGENDA

Old Business

508-16 Bourbon St: Loretta Harmon, applicant; Anglade 500 Properties LLC, owner; Proposal to revise previously approved treatment of courtyard landings, install landing railing, and to remove/replace courtyard doors, per application & materials received 06/15/15 & 04/11/16, respectively.

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

Mr. Musso moved to **approve** the proposal consistent with staff analysis and recommendation, with final approval and permitting to be completed by staff. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

200 Decatur St: Ralph Long, applicant; 200 Levee Street LLC, owner; Proposal to add brackets to previously approved balcony, per application & materials received 06/30/15 & 04/05/16, respectively.

The application was deferred at the request of the applicant.

336-40 Decatur/400 Conti/341 N. Peters 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 and materials received 07/04/15 & 04/08/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Thomas and Hanisee present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso reiterated the concerns of the Commission for rooftop terraces in general stating that more stringent regulations for rooftop decks in general are needed. Mr. Musso also stated that this proposed building is in a kind of amphitheater with sound emanating 180°.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicants what their thoughts were on the noise issue. Mr. Hanisee stated they have been in touch with a sound management company who were reviewing the plans to prepare a report. In reference to the capacity of the rooftop area, Mr. Thomas stated that code would allow for 98 individuals but the developer would prefer to limit that to around 45-50 for more of a lounge feel. Mr. Musso stated that the developers could create a covenant for reduced occupancy, as well as for no amplified music, that would be signed into perpetuity.

Mr. Musso continued that, in addition to the noise concerns, there are also architectural concerns with the proposed new building, stating that there was no sense of it being contemporary architecture, traditional, or a mix. Mr. Fifield noted there is concern from sound not only from the roof but the galleries as well, adding that no speakers should be installed in outside areas. Mr. Fifield stated that he did not believe the bar overhang was a successful design.

Mr. Taylor stated that the site was very prominently located in a delicate historic neighborhood, and that there was an expectation for a certain level of delicate refinement, sophistication and elegance in the design.

Ms. Lousteau, in the audience, commended the applicants for contracting a sound management company and stated that the VCC needs to address commercial uses of rooftops holistically. She continued that the N. Peters fourth floor wall section was awkward and that the location of the building as a whole calls for an elegant, powerful design.

Mr. Thomas stated that they have designed other Margaritaville locations within malls where the sound is not allowed to spill out into the general mall area and that they can accomplish similar sound design in this instance. Mr. Hanisee commented that they were going for a more contemporary design but the previous comments have led them in the current direction. Mr. Musso responded that the building needs to be a strong statement in either direction and not a middle ground. Mr. Taylor commented that the site is extremely difficult to build on and that the site demands “award-winning” design.

Mr. Fifield stated that the applicants should not just consider the experience of people within the building but also around the building. Mr. Fifield moved to **defer** the application. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

808-810 Royal St: John C. Williams, applicant; N I C E Investments LLC, owner; Proposal to construct new four story building, per application and materials received 06/09/15 & 04/05/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Williams and Ms. Wotring present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that it was a very confusing and ambiguous elevation, one that imposes contemporary materials atypically onto a blatantly historicist form.

Mr. Fifield stated that the ground floor openings are a traditional design with contemporary materials. He continued that the garage door doesn't work at all. Mr. Taylor stated that the desire for a garage was driving the ground floor design. Mr. Taylor continued that this was new infill construction that has an expectation for high quality architecture and the proposed building seems confused. Mr. Taylor suggested that the building could be based on the previously existing building.

Mr. Musso stated that the use of metal doors and windows was done historically in the 1910's – 1930's but there should be a different vocabulary that reads throughout the rest of the building. Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the application to allow the applicants to resubmit materials taking into account comments from the discussion and staff report.

Mr. Williams stated that he was trying to make the building work, that the owner desires off-street parking, and that he will continue to work with staff to develop the building. Mr. Block commented that balconies are typically narrow and are not outdoor living areas to the degree of galleries. Mr. Musso suggested possibly pushing the balconies inward into the building.

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

600 Decatur St: Kay Champagne, applicant; Jackson Brewery Millhouse LLC, owner; Proposal to modify ground floor millwork including the installation of a new service window, per application & materials received 11/10/15 & 04/06/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Williams and Ms. Champagne present on behalf of the application.

With no additional discussion necessary, Mr. Musso moved to concur with staff and **approve** the application with final details to be worked out with staff. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

411-415 Bourbon St: John C. Williams, applicant; Cajun 411 LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate structures and construct second floor addition, in conjunction with a proposed **change of use** from *night club/retail* to *restaurant*, per application & materials received 01/11/16 & 04/01/16, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Williams and Lara present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield stated that he was agreeable to the idea of the proposed rooftop addition and was not concerned about the extra 10" of additional parapet height being proposed. Mr. Fifield continued that he concurred with staff concerning the proposed awning in the rear courtyard. Finally, Mr. Fifield suggested that the matter of the addition be forwarded to the Commission to get their feedback regarding the proposed addition.

Mr. Musso stated that this was a case that was similar to other rooftops being proposed for use on a commercial building.

Mr. Taylor stated that he believes lowering the addition helps to distinguish it from the existing building.

Mr. Williams stated that the proposed restaurant was dependent on constructing the addition, noting that the current proposal would allow for an 11' ceiling rather than a 10' ceiling if the total addition height was lowered. Mr. Block stated the requirement for 12' as a maximum height of an addition comes directly from the Guidelines.

Mr. Musso moved to **forward** the application to the Commission with no recommendation to get feedback regarding the rooftop addition. 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 *commercial/residential*, per application & materials received 12/14/15 & 04/05/16, respectively.

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

Mr. Taylor stated that he concurred with the decision to relocate the parking and further develop the program, but that the façade needed further study. Mr. Taylor commented that the elevation did not need to adhere to symmetry, and that the parking gate should not be duplicated on the opposite side of the façade.

Mr. Musso reiterated that the programmatic and spatial development of the project were successful and very close to being conceptually approvable, once the exterior of the building could be addressed further.

Mr. Fifield stated that the proposed dormers appeared to be overlarge skylights, and are out of proportion to the building and not located functionally. He also found the steep roofline to be of

some concern, but complimented the N. Rampart side balconies that are both inset and projecting from the front façade, giving the elevation depth. Both Mr. Musso and Mr. Fifield emphasized the idea of creating depth within the front elevation openings, and breaking away from symmetry.

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

204 Decatur St/205 Clinton St: Harry Baker Smith Architects, applicant; Decatur Live LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate structure and install balconies, in conjunction with a proposed **change of use** from *vacant* to *restaurant/residential*, per application & materials received 02/15/16 & 04/05/16.

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

Mr. Fifield agreed with the staff analysis that a hybrid balcony/awning would not be appropriate. Mr. Smith responded that he personally liked the large awning that has historic precedent, but that balcony use would be preferable. Mr. Musso was receptive to the idea of installing balconies, while Mr. Fifield and Mr. Taylor preferred the reconstruction of the awning. Mr. Musso stated that installing the balconies on Clinton Street would be a great improvement to the façade and block as a whole, particularly considering the multiple approved renovations at other properties facing Clinton. Mr. Fifield commented that he felt that the cast iron railing should be more ornate in order to better fit the overall ornament of the building. Mr. Block asked the Committee if they agreed that the brackets, as shown, would be too large to be approvable; the Committee agreed. Mr. Musso suggested that Mr. Smith look at Italianate brackets in the Central Business District.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if he would consider moving the Clinton-side mechanical platform as part of the proposal, relocating the platform to the Iberville-side of the building, at the location of other mechanical equipment. Mr. Smith agreed. Mr. Musso also suggested that Mr. Smith attempt to remove the elevator penthouse from the proposal.

Mr. Fifield moved to **defer** the application for the applicant to return with revised materials for review. Mr. Smith asked the Committee if there were any comments regarding the proposed removal of brick infill at the first floor Clinton elevation; the Committee praised the proposed improvement. Mr. Musso seconded the motion to defer the application, which passed unanimously.

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 received 02/01/16 & 03/31/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Ms. Larrieu and Mr. Sublette present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Fifield moved for **approval** consistent with the staff analysis and recommendation, with final details and approval to be completed by staff after materials are revised and resubmitted by the applicant. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

New Business

200 N Rampart St: Rampart Garage LLC, applicant/owner; Proposal to install a new chain link fence and new concrete waterproofing & sealant, per application & materials received 03/14/16.

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

Mr. Musso mentioned that the VCC has permitted chain link fences in limited circumstances, specifically mentioning the New Orleans Athletic Center, where photographs from the 1920s

showed the extended use of the material. However, all members of the Committee agreed that chain link would not be appropriate in this case.

Mr. Stewart stated that the chain link fence would be set back from the existing railing. Mr. Fifield responded that the owner needed to address the overall appearance of the building after addressing the life safety issues, and that a comprehensive proposal should be submitted for Committee review.

Mr. Fifield recommended that the applicant provide drawings showing the impact a new railing would have on the appearance of the building and to propose a mesh or cable rail system. Mr. Musso also asked that signage and lighting be included in an overall proposal, as well as a schematic proposal for the first floor along Iberville.

Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the application pending a revised railing proposal, as well as comprehensive plans and elevations indicating all components of an eventual renovation. Mr. Fifield informed the applicant that the proposed elastomeric sealant could be addressed in a separate permit application. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion to **defer**, which passed unanimously.

1116-20 Dauphine St: Loretta Harmon, applicant; Myron P Hamer, owner; Proposal to install new wooden gates per application & materials received 03/24/16 & 03/28/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Ms. Harmon present on behalf of the application. Ms. Harmon was receptive to the staff recommendation of attaching the gate to a 2x4 on the flat mounted to the house, rather than directly to the house itself.

Mr. Fifield asked if the electrical equipment infringes on the width of the alley. Ms. Harmon answered that the globe above does not, but the electrical box does. Ms. Harmon also noted that the CMU wall (located on the neighboring property at 1122 Dauphine) is collapsing, and therefore her client does not want to have gates attached to the neighboring wall.

Mr. Fifield suggested that the applicant could also propose to install a metal channel rather than a 2x4 on the flat, in order to increase the available width. Mr. Musso agreed. Mr. Fifield moved to **approve** the installation with the caveat that the gates not be hinged directly to the house, with final drawings to be submitted to staff for permitting. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

806 Conti St: Rebekah Williams, applicant; Johnny Provenza, owner; Proposal to stucco over existing brick on the ground floor of the Conti elevation, per application & materials received 03/04/16.

The application was deferred due to a lack of representation on behalf of the proposal.

1226 Dauphine St: Peter Lignieres, applicant; Alan C Santos, owner; Proposal to construct new fences and gates to separate courtyard from parking area and screen mechanical units, per application & materials received 03/15/16.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Lignieres present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Musso stated that he concurred with the staff that approval was appropriate in this situation and with no other discussion necessary moved to **approve** the application with final details to be worked out with staff. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

933-35 Bourbon St: Craig Lehnhardt, applicant; Nola Bourbon, LLC, owner; Proposal to remove existing wooden decking on front porch and stairs and replace with Aeratis Heritage synthetic decking, per application & materials received 03/16/16.

At the applicant's request, Ms. Bourgogne gave the staff presentation without the applicant's presence on behalf of the application. Staff noted that the applicant had been present but was unable to stay, and had provided staff with a sample of the Aeratis Heritage to be used on the stairs. The applicant requested that the Committee consider installing the material on the stairs only, if the porch decking could not be approved.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the proposed material would require two boards per stair tread, leaving a lengthwise seam. Both Mr. Musso and Mr. Fifield agreed that the seam would be problematic. Staff offered to check available tread depths to see if avoiding a seam would be possible.

Mr. Musso moved to **delay** the application until other trials could be evaluated and until it could be established if the material came in an appropriate sizing. Mr. Fifield 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 received 02/02/16 & 03/31/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Olson, Wagner, et. al. present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Fifield moved to **approve** the application consistent with staff analysis and recommendation, with permitting to be completed by staff. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

400 N Peters St: Steve Olson, applicant; Chalon F Seale, owner; Proposal to modify portion of building including new doors & windows in existing openings and the demolition of a CMU trash enclosure, per application & materials received 03/23/16.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Wagner, et. al present on behalf of the application. The applicant clarified that one of the doors marked on the plans to be replaced was actually staying in place and that once the work was complete all doors would be the same.

With no other discussion necessary, Mr. Fifield moved to **approve** the application. Mr. Musso seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

400 N Peters St: Cage Blumstein, applicant; Chalon F Seale, owner; Proposal to add new signage that does not conform to sign guidelines, per application & materials received 04/05/16.

Ms. Bourgogne read the staff report with Mr. Olsen and Mr. Wagner present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Musso stated that he was concerned with the scale and mounting location of the third sign. Mr. Taylor agree with Mr. Musso and commented on how "monstrous" the sign was in the proposed location. Mr. Block concurred with both Mr. Musso and Mr. Taylor and further pointed out that if the sign was made smaller and moved, so as not to violate the architectural features, it might be approvable. Furthermore, Mr. Block reiterated that VCC guidelines call for the architecture not to be obscured by signage. All committee members agreed.

The applicant asked for guidance and clarification. Mr. Taylor stated that the third sign had a definite scale problem. He stated that meeting VCC design guidelines was essential when deciding all signage, in all zones, of the VCC. Mr. Wagner made the comparison to the H&M sign located on the pediment on the St. Peter location. He stated that Urban Outfitters was not dissimilar to H&M

in that the name is the logo. He further stated that the proposed signage was under the square foot limitation. Mr. Taylor stated that although they were under the proposed square footage, the H&M sign was much more diminutive.

Mr. Wagner asked if the sign was detached would that be approvable. Mr. Musso stated that he felt the applicant was moving in the right direction and suggested making the sign smaller and taking it off of the building. He asked for the applicant to return with options. Mr. Taylor stated again that the size of the sign was outrageous and Mr. Fifield followed by stating the scale of the sign made it feel like a strip mall.

Turning their attention to the pediment sign, Mr. Fifield stated that he would never approve a back-lit sign on the pediment. Mr. Wagner again pointed to the H&M sign located on the pediment on the St. Peter elevation that is back-lit. Mr. Musso explained to the applicant that the approval of the H&M sign was subject to much debate and approved only after it was agreed upon that the approval would not be held as precedent. Mr. Taylor brought up the position of the sign within the pediment. He suggested that it be moved down as to better fit within the confines.

Mr. Fifield made a motion to **defer** until the applicant could make the changes to meet the comments of the staff and the committed. Mr. Musso amended the motion to say that if there was a desire to proceed with the two approvable signs, that the applicant should submit a separate application for those in order to proceed at a different rate. Mr. Fifield accepted the amendment and Mr. Musso seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1000-08 Saint Ann St, 731 Burgundy St: James Cripps, applicant; Pauline Properties, LLC, owner; Proposal to renovate building in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *residential*, per application & materials received 03/24/16 & 03/31/16, respectively.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Mr. Cripps and Mr. Kitto present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Cripps stated that most of the historic casement frames are still existing, and one set of casement windows was existing. Mr. Fifield objected to the custom fabricated double-hung windows that would simulate the original casement windows, stating that if the windows were being restored that they should be restored traditionally. Mr. Cripps responded that true casement windows would leak. Mr. Musso asked if casement windows would be considered to obstruct the public right of way, and also noted that the proposed shutter type contributed to a busy appearance of the facades.

Mr. Cripps informed the Committee that they would be pursuing state tax credits for the restoration. Mr. Fifield reiterated that he found one window type masquerading as another window type to be problematic, and asked staff to contact the State Historic Preservation Officer assigned to the property so the applicant could move forward with a coordinated recommendation, particularly considering that SHPO may find the existing double-hung windows to be historic in their own right. Mr. Kitto noted that the remaining casement window was now interior due to the rear addition.

Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the application in order for the applicant and VCC staff to consult with SHPO. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion. Mr. Cripps asked for feedback from the Committee regarding the rear, Orleans-side elevation. Both Mr. Musso and Mr. Fifield stated that the façade was too busy. Mr. Taylor called the vote, which passed unanimously.

815 Dumaine St: Arlene Karcher, applicant; Arlene W Karcher, owner; Proposal to remove failing brick shed building, brick wall, and CMU wall in courtyard and replace with seven board fence, per application & materials received 03/25/16.

[Prior to the reading of the report, Mr. Musso temporarily left the meeting.]

At the request of the Committee, Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation without the applicant's presence on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked if the height of the seven-board fence would be reduced from the height of the existing brick roof; staff answered yes.

Mr. Fifield moved to **approve** the application consistent with staff analysis and recommendation, forwarding the application to the Commission with a recommendation for demolition. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

810 Esplanade Ave: Daniel Zangara, applicant; Ibu And Bapak LLC, owner; Proposal to install geothermal wells in conjunction with exterior renovation, per application & materials received 03/29/16 & 04/06/16.

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

Due to a significant portion of the proposed renovation receiving approval by the Committee and Commission within the last 12 months, Mr. Fifield moved to **conceptually approve** items #1-3 and **defer** item #4, consistent with staff analysis and recommendation. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

[Mr. Musso returned to the meeting after the vote was called.]

623 Bourbon: Peri Luscent, LLC, owner; L. Katherine Harmon, applicant; Proposal to install replica of historic signage and new bollards, per application & materials received 04/01/16.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Ms. Harmon present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that the owners will be required to pay for air rights and accept total liability. Mr. Musso continued that he believes the installation will be subject to vandalism. Ms. Harmon stated that the owner was willing to install the sign at their own risk and would like to have the sign perpendicular to Bourbon St. rather than parallel as shown in the drawings.

Mr. Musso moved to **approve** the application with staff to handle final details. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Appeals & Violations

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

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Pell present on behalf of the application. Mr. Pell shared photographs with the Committee stating that the only areas that the units could be moved to would be highly visible.

Mr. Musso stated the he was not at all comfortable with the front location, that it would form a precedent, and there would be a danger of proliferation. Mr. Fifield agreed, stating that it needs to be removed from the front yard.

Mr. Musso moved to **deny** the retention of the two condensing units installed in the front yard without benefit of VCC review or approval. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1117 Decatur: William Sonner, applicant, owner: Decatur Street Properties LLC; Proposal to retain unpermitted walk-in cooler in rear courtyard and install new mechanical screening, per application

& materials received 03/16/16.

Ms. Bourgogne read the staff report with Mr. Sonner present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Musso stated that he concurred with the staff report and agreed that the area in question could no longer be called a courtyard due to the fact that it was unusable for anything other than mechanical equipment. He went on to say that if no one disagreed, he would like to turn that into a motion.

Mr. Fifield stated that he was beginning to see a pattern when it came to mechanical equipment in courtyards and that he was becoming uncomfortable and concerned with that pattern.

Furthermore, he stated that he was worried that with the intensification of commercial use in the French Quarter that the committee needed to think about whether or not they were creating a “cooler architecture.” Mr. Musso stated that he preferred the walk-in coolers to the alternative of restaurants having bi or tri-weekly deliveries. Mr. Fifield countered asking the committee if they were just accepting the intensification of commercial use as a given. At this point Mr. Musso stated that perhaps there should be a full VCC Commission discussion. Mr. Block informed the committee that staff had just completed a violation sweep of all bars and restaurants with liquor licenses and that mechanical equipment was found in the courtyard of almost every property.

Mr. Musso made a motion to **approve** the use of the cooler in the courtyard per staff recommendation. Mr. Fifield amended the motion to go to the full VCC Commission. Mr. Musso seconded the amended motion and the motion passed unanimously.

544 Esplanade Ave/1318 Chartres St: Natan Diacon-Furtado, applicant; Sean B Cummings, owner; Proposal to modify fenestration of courtyard elevation of rear service wing, modify courtyard including new lap pool, and to retain work performed without benefit of permits, including the installation of new carriageway gate, per application & materials received 03/17/16. **[STOP WORK ORDER placed 12/06/12; Notices of Violation sent 12/06/12, 04/16/14, 08/19/14, and 01/22/15]**

[Mr. Fifield recused himself from discussion for 544 Esplanade]

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Diacon-Furtado present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that the owner has not been responsive to the requirements or concerns of the VCC and that he would rather defer the entire application to allow the applicant to submit additional materials and better document the conditions.

Mr. Musso moved to **defer** the application with requests for additional lighting information as well as a chronology of work done. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

709-711 Bourbon St: Tony Stafford Jr, applicant; Seven-Eleven Bourbon, LLC, owner; Proposal to correct or retain various violations including exterior gas lines, mechanical equipment, TV's, lighting, and security cameras, per application & materials received 03/31/16. **[Notice of Violation sent 09/29/15]**

The application was deferred due to a lack of representation on behalf of the proposal.

Next AC Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2016

Upon request, a sign language interpreter for the hearing impaired will be available at the meeting. To place a request for sign language interpreter services, please call TDDY at (504) 658-2059 or 1-800-981-6652.

Please note that the VCC offices are closed to all other business during the meeting.