

VIEUX CARRE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

LaToya Cantrell
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block
DIRECTOR

Notice of Public Meeting
Tuesday, February 9, 2021
1:00 PM, WebEx Conference Call
(504) 658-7001, Access Code: 993 150 672

NOTE: The below minutes are in draft form and are a summary of actions taken. They are not a verbatim transcription of the meeting.

Minutes of the VCC Architectural Committee meeting of Tuesday, February 9, 2021 – 1:00 pm.

Committee Members Present: Rick Fifield, Toni DiMaggio, Stephen Bergeron

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Director; Renée Bourgogne, Senior Architectural Historian; Nick Albrecht, Senior Building Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Senior Plans Examiner
Marguerite Roberts, Inspector; Tony Whitfield, Inspector

Others Present: John Williams, Daniel Winkert, Corbett Scott, Dixon Jelich, Robert Cangelosi,
Walter Bringaze, Erika Gates

AGENDA

Prior to the start of the meeting, Mr. Block explained the process for a web conference as follows: after the presentation of the staff reports and a period for questions from the Committee members to the applicant and staff, the Committee would take a 30-minute recess to allow for the submittal of public comments via email at VCC@nola.gov. The comments would then be read to the Committee members prior to any motion or vote for each item. There would be a cap on the length of the comments to what could be read within two minutes, and the emails received have been saved as part of the public record.

At approximately 1:00 pm Mr. Fifield called the teleconference to order. Mr. Block called roll and all three Committee members were present, constituting a quorum.

Minutes

Old Business

501-07 Decatur St: 18-15039-VCGEN; C Williams John, applicant; 501 Rue Decatur LLC, 501 Rue Decatur LLC, owner; Proposal to add gutters to new gallery construction and appeal to change approved gallery roof material, per application & materials received 05/10/2018 & 01/29/2021, respectively
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=761338>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Winkler present on behalf of the application. Mr. Winkler asked if copper was the only option if they could not paint on site or have a pre-finish roof installed. Mr. Fifield asked staff if alternatives were allowed; Ms. Vogt stated that galvanized metal could be approved for this rating, but all roof materials, including flashing, were approved as copper. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant where they were with construction; Mr. Winkler responded that they were complete except for the roof system. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she agreed with the staff report and approach to drainage. She added that galvanized could only be considered as an option if the other elements were likewise changed for compatibility to avoid galvanic reaction. Mr. Fifield stated that the 6" gutter seemed to be larger than what should be needed, asking if any other water was being transferred to the gallery roof. Mr. Winkler responded that they were not transferring water. He added that they likely could reduce the gutter size but did not want to overwhelm the bird's mouth scuppers.

Mr. Bergeron asked the applicant if they wanted the Committee to entertain a material change to galvanized metal; Mr. Winkler responded yes. Mr. Fifield stated that, if the gallery elements were a ferrous metal, galvanized might be a more sustainable match. With nothing left to discuss the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

1014 N Rampart St: 18-19094-VCGEN; Corbett Scott, applicant; Mohit Srivastava, owner; Proposal to convert single pedestrian gate to double gate, per application & materials received 06/08/2018 & 02/01/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=764945>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Scott present on behalf of the application. Mr. Scott stated that they would revise to include an airgap at the pier. He added that the post was designed to be removable as they feared someone might run into it if both gates were left open. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant why they even needed a post, to which Mr. Scott responded that the panic hardware needed a point of attachment. Mr. Fifield asked why they needed to expand the width of the opening. Mr. Scott responded that the gate would be the primary entrance for the restaurant from the street, so they wanted it wider. Mr. Bergeron asked why panic hardware was necessary if the gates would be left open when the business was open. Mr. Scott responded that the gates might not be left open the entire time. Ms. DiMaggio asked for clarification regarding whether the post would be removed every time the gates were opened, and if the panic hardware was required by the Fire Marshall. Mr. Fifield stated that this was an excellent question, and also asked about hardware on the outside of the gates. Mr. Scott stated that he would select hardware and send to staff for review. Ms. Vogt stated that the stamped materials noted that hardware was to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to purchase and installation. Mr. Fifield instructed the applicant to check with the Fire Marshall to see if panic hardware was required, which Mr. Scott agreed to do. Mr. Bergeron noted that one leaf of the gate could be fixed and the operable leaf could lock into it, eliminating the need for a center post. Mr. Scott agreed to consult the iron shop and State Fire Marshall. With no other questions, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

524 Esplanade Ave: 20-34343-VCGEN; Robert T Kenny, applicant; Robert T Kenny, owner;

Proposal to revise previously conceptually approved front railing design, per application & materials received 07/13/2020 & 01/11/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=850034>

The following is a transcription of the recording from this portion of the meeting:

After Mr. Albrecht read the staff report, Mr. Fifield asked for discussion between the committee and the applicant.

Toni DiMaggio: A critical element of the previously approved railing was that it was to be constructed of wrought iron with cast iron decorative elements. Acknowledgement of that in the current proposal sees that to be lacking. This had been explicitly a critical element for approval previously for this location.

Rick Fifield: I agree that this was a compelling reason for the previous approval. Have you been able to work with staff to receive approval for the other handrail requested for improvement of the safety of the these steps?

Robert Kenny: Staff said they would work on it but this was the first I have heard they would require further details.

Bryan Block: Staff emailed the request for additional information for that rail. Correct, Nick?

Nick Albrecht: Yes, it was emailed February 1.

BB: So we had previously been in touch with Dr. Kenny regarding this request.

RK: I have not received it.

RF: The safety elements of the proposal is being addressed at the staff level. Staff will follow up.

BB: We forwarded immediately after the last meeting. We will follow up again.

RF: So the discussion is about the decorative rail and I'd like to return to Toni's position. The thing that was swaying me (in the previous reviews) was the notion of using traditional detailing including wrought iron was the compelling reason for entertaining this decorative rail. I do not find now the current proposal of cast iron to be as compelling. Not so much the material proposed as how this changes the character and fabric of the rail itself.

RK: Originally the design that Lewis Robinson proposed was very fancy from an 1840 book on designs that were current at the time. Then it started changing and changed. So if you want to go back to the 1840s book design I'm all for it. But this has been changed and changed with no direction. "Submit something simpler." Used to be we got direction. But now has that been made illegal?

BB: We met with Lewis Robinson in the office numerous times over each of the dese designs directing him so he would be able to design an alternative based on the AC's direction. So the idea that we haven't provided and direction is not correct.

RK: Well, I wasn't there so I don't know.

BB: We met with your architect numerous times, so that he could provide appropriate responses to AC recommendations.

RK: You have not answered the reason why you changed what Lewis Robinson said we could put up any rail, that what was there was awful. Then we had a big shift in opinion to make it very simple. Went from being very decorative to very simple. And no one has ever answered that.

TD: I'd like to address going back to the 1840s design. The first time we ever saw this, the only stance I have ever taken is that what was being proposed was too ornate which is why the 1840s proposal, from a preservation stance, the way it is practiced today, under the guidelines today, which have changed multiple times over the past 70 years to reflect current thinking and advancements about preservation - my stance as a preservationist which is backed up by the guidelines- is that replication of a false history is the issue which is the reason that I commented on and feel that I have supported the comments of the staff and committee that the replication and ornateness of some of the earlier designs are not appropriate here. So that is the answer to your question although I do think it was clear and I think important for me to be clear about that.

RK: The railing that is on porch and on the sidewalk was approved by the VCC. I've heard this argument for 50 years about not doing reproductions but I disagree with this. I think you are absolutely wrong with this idea and I don't understand why we can't have some flexibility. The porch rail and fence were approved by the commission and now you say it was wrong. I think that is awful. This is distressing to someone who has lived in the French Quarter since 1970.

RF: I'd like to ask the director at which level the changes to the porch rail and fence were made. Commission level or Council?

BB: Approved by the commission, not appealed to Council. However, I would like to add that although this was approved by the VCC a number of years ago, I don't think it appropriate that those elements now be considered to be form-givers for further modifications to this blue rated building. It is more important that we are true to the character of the building, true to preservation best practices and not allowing an earlier renovation to the building to be the form-giver to future renovations.

RF: In the correspondence from Dr. Kenny the cost of creating this rail was mentioned as a limiting factor or a generating factor for the changes in the decorative material and I'd like to point out that we did approve a decorative rail for this location and it was approved by the commission. So now what we are discussing here is something being initiated by the owner based on what would appear to be a hardship based on cost. Would that be correct, Dr. Kenny,

RK: Yes, the cost has skyrocketed.

RF: Yes, as has in all construction, but I can understand that having designed this without knowing what the cost is, you could be surprised. This may be a matter not for design consideration but may be a hardship being expressed by the owner based on cost. As such, may be better handled at the commission level than the AC where we talk about architectural design.

Stephen Bergeron: Typically matters of hardship are considered by the commission on items that are net elective in nature. This is sort of an elective procedure. Not really a matter of hardship.

RK: I disagree. The rail is unsafe. Has been declared unsafe. Therefore, not exactly elective. Now that we know it's unsafe if anyone falls down it I am more than just liable for just my insurance company because I know now that this railing is unsafe. It's too low and full commission approved construction of the unsafe concrete railing.

RF: Let's go back to the guardrail we actually approved for construction. We approved a railing that would have addressed the safety concern. You're coming to us with an alternative design so I think the record shows that we approved a design that meets the safety requirements for this location. That's a matter of record. So now what we are talking about is a change to that approval to meet the same criteria but with a different design. Stephen's comment actually stands here. The hardship may be cost rather than a need to do this work.

RK: One of the decorative elements on the approved design has now been discontinued.

RF: That would be the responsibility of your designer in proposing something not available. Not the responsibility of this committee.

RK: I understand that this is not your responsibility but you have to understand something proposed many months ago and got finally approved has now become discontinued. That is the nature of this game which goes on and on.

TD: Did your metal contractor that you are working with give options for switching out the cast iron element as opposed to changing the entire rail design because it seems like one element of the cast iron accent is discontinued that there might be an alternative that is similar, as opposed to a complete change to the entire rail design. Some other accent piece that can be used on the rail that was approved.

RK: There is not another athenium that is of that size and design that's available. I do want an athenium because that is what's over my front doorway and is open the front fence. So I want something that ties this thing together.

I don't think the, quote, approved design, really... I just got worn down by all the changes and all the cost. I was almost willing to accept almost anything but I'm not willing to accept that design anymore. I'm just going to fight

it. I don't like it! Why should I building something that don't like?

Renee Bourgogne: At the end of the last hearing, Dr. Kenny asked if we could just please approve the wall rail which we have done. We just need to know the material. That would address the safety concern.

RK: Just to the point where the railing from the face of the building. But once you take a turn there are several more steps. That safety rail is not going to go all the way to the street. Correct?

With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

932 Bourbon St: 20-44886-VCGEN; Archetype LLC, applicant; 932 Bourbon Street LLC, owner;

Proposal to renovate building and correct VCC violations including proposal to rebuild existing balcony and add soffit vents, per application & materials received 10/27/2020 & 01/25/2021.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Ms. Wotring present on behalf of the application. Ms. Wotring stated that they were trying to mitigate water issues that the original design had created. She went on to say that they would be happy to go with synthetic decking, they just wanted to abide by the rules. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she would side with protecting the structure. She went on to say that she was not opposed to synthetic decking in this location and that the Aeratis product includes a waterproof installation that might work better. Mr. Fifield stated that the Aeratis decking required a furring out between the shield and the deck. He went on to state that he did not see how it would work for the preservation of the wood as it seemed it would hold in water. He then stated that he supported the vents in the soffit. Ms. Wotring stated that their approach was to prevent water intrusion 100% but that with wind driven rain the vents would help. Ms. DiMaggio stated that it was a dual pronged approach and that she understood that another point of protection would not hinder the aesthetics. Mr. Bergeron asked if a structural engineer had looked at the proposed design. Ms. Wotring stated yes and that he believed the structural members to be ok, so they would be retaining them. Mr. Bergeron asked if the proposed vents would interfere. Ms. Wotring stated no that none would conflict with a centered vent. Mr. Fifield asked if the applicant had requested Aeratis. Ms. Wotring stated yes. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

937 Dumaine St: 20-50455-VCGEN; C Williams John, applicant; 937 Dumaine Street LLC, owner; Proposal to structurally reinforce masonry, install new iron gate, install MEP, and review of existing millwork, per application & materials received 12/29/2020 & 02/02/2021, respectively.

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Jelich present on behalf of the application. Regarding the MEP, Mr. Jelich stated that the louver was a drafting error remaining from the previous design, but had been removed. Regarding the gate, they agreed to move forward with a wooden door to match the other buildings in the row. Regarding the structural work, he stated that the intention was to maintain and stabilize the existing masonry instead of needing to rebuild. He noted that the crack was only 2'-3' in length, and the helifix ties were consistent with NPS guidelines to repair in a less invasive manner. Ms. DiMaggio responded that, while she preferred a method that mitigated structural issues without rebuilding, but she still questioned why the crack emerged. She stated that her concern was that this solution would simply push the problem to another area. Mr. Jelich stated that the crack did not go through the entire wall, only the first and second wythe of bricks, which is why they believed it would be the least invasive method based on their evaluation. Mr. Fifield stated that helical ties would destroy the historic fabric and asked the applicant if they knew why the crack emerged. Mr. Jelich responded that it appeared to be due to settlement. He again stated that they only wanted to stabilize, not rebuild.

Ms. DiMaggio asked staff if the Committee should comment on millwork. Ms. Vogt stated that on the second and third floors of the service building the millwork was quite unusual. She went on to say that it was very "high waisted" and that clearly a lot of the millwork had been replaced over time with salvaged items making it hard to determine if new millwork should be more typical in detailing or match existing conditions. Ms. DiMaggio stated that existing conditions should be repaired as possible, but that it did not appear that the existing millwork had any particular significance. Mr. Fifield stated that any new millwork should be consistent and work with the age of the building. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

New Business

740 Esplanade Ave, 1350 Bourbon St: 20-50155-VCGEN; Nofio Pecoraro, applicant; Jerry M Gilbreath, Angela B Reif, Hodgeswarren, Gary L Bommelaere, Antonio J, Jr Busalacchi, Sherry Cesare-Pumar, Mark W Rivero, Robert Peiser, Timothy A Atzinger, Richard G Reiners, 1350 Bourbon Street LLC, Richard S Wright, Thomas Kahler, Linda Neal, Jerome A Provenza, Carl B Young, Charles P Ryan, Jennifer Bazar, Porcupine Peak Properties LTD, Sally Painter, Lyman Family Living Trust, Coakley and McElwee Trust, owner;

Proposal to remove existing fixed plate glass windows from two openings and install new French doors and transoms in both openings, per application & materials received 12/23/2020 & 01/11/2021, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Thevenot present on behalf of the application. The applicant stated that 34" tall would need a safety rail and that the third floor had no transom but that they would be happy to install one for consistency with the openings that face Bourbon Street. Ms. DiMaggio stated that the Esplanade elevation had panels. The applicant stated yes but that he was trying to maintain the light in the unit so he would prefer not to have the panel. Mr. Fifield stated that requiring a panel would not be necessary here. Mr. Bergeron asked what the door height was. The applicant stated that he was not sure exactly but that he believed they were over 80," consistent with the Esplanade elevation. Ms. DiMaggio stated that a return to this style would be a huge improvement. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

618 Conti St: 21-01052-VCGEN; Cangelosi, Jr Robert, applicant; 618 Conti Street LLC, owner; Proposal to replace existing flat roof structure over light well, per application & materials received 01/13/2021

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Cangelosi present on behalf of the application. The Committee had no questions or comments and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

532 N Rampart St: 21-01164-VCGEN; Werling Kurt, applicant; Mercier Realty Co Inc, owner;

Proposal to renovate building including installation of a new standing seam metal roof and reconstruction of portion of masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/14/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=871192>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Werling and Mr. Bendernagle preset on behalf of the application. Mr. Werling stated that the doors were there for roof access, at least that is what he assumed. He went on to say that he was ok with there removal as long as they could find another access point for the roof. Mr. Bendernagle stated that at some point the roof was reframed and that it was now flat. He went on to state "personally he believed the roof need to be reframed with a more sloped roof, in a traditional style and that would eliminate the need for the doors." Mr. Werling stated that the was ok with this as long as they still had roof access. Ms. DiMaggio inquired as to the color of the TPO. Mr. Werling stated that they would be fine with whatever color was recommended by staff or the Committee. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

Appeals and Violations

812-14 St Philip St: 20-39570-VCGEN; 814 St Philip St: Sidney Lapuyade, IV, applicant; A Brooks Living Trust Debra, owner; Appeal to retain gas fixtures and service lines installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 09/11/2020 & 11/04/2020, respectively.

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Bringaze present on behalf of the application. Mr. Bringaze stressed that he wished to remedy the situation as soon as possible and was looking for guidance. He noted that only five of the fixtures were gas, and that they had been installed symmetrically but the outriggers are not centered over doors and windows. Mr. Fifield stated that, if an application had been submitted before undertaking the work, the Committee would not have allowed these fixtures in the rear of the property. He went on to say that the best thing to do would be to eliminate all gas fixtures and install electric, non-decorative fixtures. Mr. Bringaze asked if electric Bevolo fixtures would be acceptable; Ms. Vogt stated that the Design Guidelines called for limiting the number of decorative fixtures and not locating them at the rear of a property. She added that staff would not have recommended approval of these fixtures and the sistering of outriggers for their installation was a significant alteration. Mr. Bringaze stated that there had been three fixtures in the rear and that the current fixtures simply replaced what was already there, with one additional fixture added. He then asked if they could reduce the number from five to three, noting that his neighbor had decorative fixtures at the service ell. Mr.

Fifield stated that the application asked to “retain all fixtures,” and encouraged the applicant to revise his application. Mr. Bringaze asked what the Committee would approve.

Ms. DiMaggio stated that she hated this situation and noted that the sellers of the fixtures also bore some responsibility. She went on to say that the fixtures would never have been approved as installed, and that she was also concerned about the gas line installed without permit. Ms. Vogt stated that the Mechanical Division had inspected the work before realizing no permits were issued, and no objections to their installation were noted at the time. She stated that she would confirm this with Mechanical.

Mr. Fifield asked staff to clarify that the recommendation was to reduce the number of fixtures from seven to three; Ms. Vogt agreed. Mr. Block noted that staff was obligated to uphold the Design Guidelines, but the Committee could choose to make an exception. Mr. Bringaze stated that Ms. Bourgogne had seemed comfortable with retaining more fixtures than recommended in the report; Ms. Bourgogne stated that the staff recommendation was what was discussed, and that she was very concerned that the service ell joists were altered to fit the support plate for light fixtures. Mr. Fifield then asked the applicant if he was willing to work with staff; he responded that he was. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

625 Chartres St: 20-47095-VCGEN; Erika Gates, applicant; 625 Chartres LLC, owner; Appeal to retain hood vent installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 11/18/2020. **[Notices of Violation sent 07/28/2017, 07/12/2018, & 04/25/2019]**

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Gates present on behalf of the application. Ms. Gates stated that the previous owner had obtained a mechanical permit in 2010. Added that the owner has a VCC permit in hand to repair the roof and the work would begin in the next couple of months. With no discussion needed, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

415 Burgundy St: 20-47852-VCGEN; Michael Winters Jr, applicant; 415 Burgundy LLC, owner;

Proposal to demolish and reconstruct with new design a masonry garden wall at the rear property line, per application & materials received 11/25/2020 & 01/20/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=866091>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Winters present on behalf of the application. Mr. Winters stated that they could revise the drawings and donate the ironwork. He went on to say that they preferred not to have stucco as the surrounding walls were clean brick. Mr. Fifield asked how high the wall was without the pilasters. Mr. Winters stated same height minus the pilaster. Mr. Fifield stated 9’ tall. He then asked the applicant if the proposal was to reuse the existing brick. Mr. Winters stated yes. Ms. DiMaggio stated that the wall was covered in stucco because the bundling was stuccoed, also soft reds need protection. Mr. Bergeron agreed with Ms. DiMaggio. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant why the objection to stucco. Mr. Winters stated that it would cut costs to omit the stucco. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

407 Burgundy St: 21-01095-VCGEN; Judice Corporation, applicant; Dennis S Tramel, Rosalie Lampone Revocable Trust, Marwa Badr, Aaron Davis, David A Smith, owner;

Proposal to retain and relocate exterior TV antenna equipment and proposal to replace unpermitted keypad door hardware with new keyless door hardware, per application & materials received 01/13/2021 & 01/25/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=869928>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Leech present on behalf of the application. The applicant stated the unit 4 had tried another type of antennae but now that the windows were operable, they could not attach an antennae there. He went on to state that the attic was too hot, so they would like to keep this current antennae but relocate it to a more discrete location. Ms. DiMaggio and Mr. Bergeron state that they agreed with the staff report. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved into a 30-minute recess.

With nothing left to discuss, Mr. Bergeron made the motion for a 30-minute recess for public comment. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, and the Committee agreed to reconvene at 3:23 PM.

At approximately 3:23 PM Mr. Block called the roll. All were present. Mr. Fifield reconvened the meeting.

Old Business

501-07 Decatur St: 18-15039-VCGEN; C Williams John, applicant; 501 Rue Decatur LLC, 501 Rue Decatur LLC, owner; Proposal to add gutters to new gallery construction and appeal to change approved gallery roof material, per application & materials received 05/10/2018 & 01/29/2021, respectively

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=761338>

Public Comment:

Nikki Szalwinski, FQ citizens

We agree with the staff report regarding gallery roofing material and scuppers over downspouts. When property owners restore galleries they should be designed and built using traditional materials and element that are as close to original as possible. This particular applicant regularly seeks changes after an initial approval leading to a confusing piecemeal approach that often ends up muddying the waters. Please deny this change in materials and in the future ask for more complete plan proposals.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if any copper had been installed yet; he responded that it had not. Mr. Bergeron asked what the material of the existing downspouts are; Mr. Winkert was not sure but noted the new drainage system and existing system should not interface with each other. Mr. Bergeron asked if staff had an opinion on painted roofs. Mr. Block stated that it would depend on the professional opinions of the Committee since it is not prohibited by the Guidelines. Mr. Fifield noted that the gallery is not historic, but new construction, and called for a motion. Ms. DiMaggio moved to move the item to the end of the agenda to allow for more deliberation. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Following the completion of the agenda and motions on all other items, the Committee revisited a motion for 501 Decatur. Ms. DiMaggio moved to **approve** installation of a metal roofing material in keeping with the Design Guidelines, with provisos that the material would be factory finished and compatible with existing ferrous metals. She also moved to **approve** the 6" gutter and bird's mouth scuppers. Mr. Fifield asked if she would be willing to amend her motion to reduce the diameter of the gutters; Ms. DiMaggio responded that she did not wish to risk overloading the scuppers, and did not revise the motion. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motions, which passed unanimously.

1014 N Rampart St: 18-19094-VCGEN; Corbett Scott, applicant; Mohit Srivastava, owner; Proposal to convert single pedestrian gate to double gate, per application & materials received 06/08/2018 & 02/01/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=764945>

Public Comment:

Nikki Szalwinski, FQ Citizens

We find this mechanism is inappropriate in the FQ. More importantly we are concerned that the proposed gate design may compromise safety of other properties in the square if left open and unattended. As this is a business it seems easy enough to simply have the gate unlocked during business hours or using knob type fixture with a dead-bolt that can be locked from outside but twist open from inside yard. This sort of fixture can be dead-bolted outside of business hours as part of an overall deterrence/security plan. We encourage the applicant to carefully consider the impact of their proposed business, its security and access to numerous residential properties in the square via open gates and their courtyard.

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio moved to defer the proposal to allow the applicant to consult with all relevant life safety authorities and explore options for hardware. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

524 Esplanade Ave: 20-34343-VCGEN; Robert T Kenny, applicant; Robert T Kenny, owner;

Proposal to revise previously conceptually approved front railing design, per application & materials received 07/13/2020 & 01/11/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=850034>

Public Comment:

Robert Kenny, owner

Again, I'd like to remind the architectural committee, that the parallelogram on the conceptually approved design has the same problems with the curvature of the railing as the linear simplified Greek key ready-made piece.

The other ready-made piece does not have a linear design and would be easy to adjust to the curvature of the railing. My new architect, Grady Thomas Schutt, has shown this.

The premade cast iron anthemion that were conceptually approved, are no longer available. No mention of this in staff report!

We first started working on this in February 2020. Until July, there was no problem with historic recreation. Lewis Robinson was being encouraged to do an historical recreation in consultations with Nicholas. But in July, there was a complete reversal. Do you think this is fair? Thousands of dollars in architectural fees were wasted. The staff report has never responded to this complaint.

I am only asking that the committee approve a railing that is consistent with the gallery railing and the street fence and gate. Both of those installed designs were approved by the Vieux Carré Commission.

I am asking for some reasonable compromise that will allow this alteration to fit historically, aesthetically, and seamlessly with the home and existing approved fixtures. I have tirelessly submitted several costly design concepts without any positive feedback. I am anxious to come to an acceptable design to improve the property and remain true to the aesthetic of this historic neighborhood.

Discussion and Motion: After the 30 minute recess for public comment the committee took the matter up again. Mr. Block read the email message previously sent from the applicant into the record. Stephen Bergeron moved to deny changes to the previously approved wrought iron design which was seconded by Toni DiMaggio. The motion was approved unanimously. Rick Fifield asked Director Block to explain the applicant's right to appeal this decision to the VCC. This appeal must be made in writing to the staff within 30 days after which time this would be added to the agenda of the next VCC hearing.

932 Bourbon St: 20-44886-VCGEN; Archetype LLC, applicant; 932 Bourbon Street LLC, owner;

Proposal to renovate building and correct VCC violations including proposal to rebuild existing balcony and add soffit vents, per application & materials received 10/27/2020 & 01/25/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=863173>

No public comment

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for the approval of the soffit, vents, balcony detailing, deckboards and the ice and water shield with Aeritis also approved. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

937 Dumaine St: 20-50455-VCGEN; C Williams John, applicant; 937 Dumaine Street LLC, owner; Proposal to structurally reinforce masonry, install new iron gate, install MEP, and review of existing millwork, per application & materials received 12/29/2020 & 02/02/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=868730>

Public Comment:

Nikki Szalwinski, FQ Citizens

Please require a comprehensive mechanical plan at this address prior to issuing any approvals as six units will make placement difficult if not impossible. Further we believe the gate should be a door so as to return consistency to the row of buildings.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Bergeron moved to **defer** the application with the applicant to revise the proposal based on staff and Committee comments. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

New Business

740 Esplanade Ave, 1350 Bourbon St: 20-50155-VCGEN; Nofio Pecoraro, applicant; Jerry M Gilbreath, Angela B Reif, Hodgeswarren, Gary L Bommelaere, Antonio J, Jr Busalacchi, Sherry Cesare-Pumar, Mark W Rivero, Robert Peiser, Timothy A Atzinger, Richard G Reiners, 1350 Bourbon Street LLC, Richard S Wright, Thomas Kahler, Linda Neal, Jerome A Provenza, Carl B Young, Charles P Ryan, Jennifer Bazar, Porcupine Peak Properties LTD, Sally Painter, Lyman Family Living Trust, Coakley and McElwee Trust, owner;

Proposal to remove existing fixed plate glass windows from two openings and install new French doors and transoms in both openings, per application & materials received 12/23/2020 & 01/11/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=868448>

No public comment.

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for conceptual approval of the proposed changes with details to be worked out at the staff level. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

618 Conti St: 21-01052-VCGEN; Cangelosi, Jr Robert, applicant; 618 Conti Street LLC, owner; Proposal to replace existing flat roof structure over light well, per application & materials received 01/13/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=869885>

No Public Comment

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Bergeron moved to **approve** the flat roof structure and roofing, per staff recommendation. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

532 N Rampart St: 21-01164-VCGEN; Werling Kurt, applicant; Mercier Realty Co Inc, owner;

Proposal to renovate building including installation of a new standing seam metal roof and reconstruction of portion of masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/14/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=871192>

Public Comment:

Susan Klein, Resident & North Rampart Main Street Officer

I am very pleased that the building at 532 North Rampart Street is being renovated. However, I am requesting that any mechanical equipment for these units be placed as far as possible from the rear lot line. The properties to the rear of this building are occupied by full-time residents and the noise generated from any mechanical equipment would have an adverse effect on our sleep and quality of life.

Also, I did not receive a NPP meeting notice, if one was required and generated.

Thank you for your consideration of this request,

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion to defer the application in order to allow the applicant time to make the changes based on today's comments. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Appeals and Violations

812-14 St Philip St: 20-39570-VCGEN; 814 St Philip St: Sidney Lapuyade, IV, applicant; A Brooks Living Trust Debra, owner; Appeal to retain gas fixtures and service lines installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 09/11/2020 & 11/04/2020, respectively.

No Public Comment

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio noted that the structure must be restored, and alterations reversed. She moved to **approve** the alcove fixture, wall sconce, smaller pendant at the rear loggia, and two pendants on the service ell. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

625 Chartres St: 20-47095-VCGEN; Erika Gates, applicant; 625 Chartres LLC, owner; Appeal to retain hood vent installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 11/18/2020. **[Notices of Violation sent 07/28/2017, 07/12/2018, & 04/25/2019]**

No Public Comment

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Fifiield noted that the equipment was not visible and may cause damage to the roof if changed. Ms. DiMaggio moved to **approve** the retention of the hood vent. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

415 Burgundy St: 20-47852-VCGEN; Michael Winters Jr, applicant; 415 Burgundy LLC, owner;

Proposal to demolish and reconstruct with new design a masonry garden wall at the rear property line, per application & materials received 11/25/2020 & 01/20/2021.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=866091>

No public comment.

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for the approval of the demolition and the reconstruction but to require a stucco finish with all details to be worked out at the staff level. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

407 Burgundy St: 21-01095-VCGEN; Judice Corporation, applicant; Dennis S Tramel, Rosalie Lampone Revocable Trust, Marwa Badr, Aaron Davis, David A Smith, owner;

Proposal to retain and relocate exterior TV antenna equipment and proposal to replace unpermitted keypad door hardware with new keyless door hardware, per application & materials received 01/13/2021 & 01/25/2021, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=869928>

No public comment.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to deny the retention of the TV antennae in its current location and the approval of the proposed keypad hardware. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

With no items left to discuss, Mr. Bergeron moved to adjourn the meeting at approximately 3:57pm. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.