

VIEUX CARRE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

LaToya Cantrell
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block
DIRECTOR

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

Minutes of the VCC Architectural Committee meeting of Tuesday, October 11, 2022 – 1:00 pm.

Committee Members Present: Stephen Bergeron, Toni DiMaggio, Rick Fifield (Mr. Fifield arrived at approximately 1:30pm)

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Director; Renee Bourgogne, Deputy Director; Nicholas Albrecht, Senior Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Senior Plans Examiner

Staff Absent: Marguerite Roberts, Inspector

Others Present: Hector Lopez, Pascual Carlos, Tony Stafford, Katherine Harmon, William Donkervoet, Richard Woodroof, Randy Lauman

Old Business

1100-1116 Chartres St: 22-13026-VCGEN; Hector Lopez, applicant; Our Lady Of Victory Church, owner; Proposal to install new 30 kw standby generator, per application & materials received 05/02/2022 & 09/27/2022. <https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=926678>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Hector Lopez present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Lopez stated that they had an electrical engineer draw up the plan. Ms. DiMaggio asked if the line would run overhead. Mr. Lopez said yes, surface mounted to the wall, at the same height as the existing electrical. Mr. Bergeron asked, "mounted to the brick wall." Mr. Lopez stated yes. Mr. Block asked if it could go underground. Mr. Lopez stated that running underground would involve a lot of demolition work to the existing concrete slab and that it would still need to be run above the existing fence. For clarification Ms. Bourgogne asked if all current lines were mounted to the church wall. Mr. Lopez stated yes. Mr. Block asked how high. Mr. Lopez stated approximately 8'. Mr. Block asked if it could be located lower. Mr. Lopez stated no. Ms. Bourgogne asked if the wall could move out. Mr. Lopez stated that they could review that. Mr. Bergeron noted that the wall wouldn't need to come out if they added another layer of screening and asked if it would be on a rack. Mr. Lopez stated yes. Mr. Bergeron asked how high? Mr. Lopez stated, "about 3' up."

Public comment: Maureen Sherman, with the archdiocese, stated that the whole purpose of the generator was to allow the police to use the power during a hurricane.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the location was most appropriate but that they would need to see screening and conduit information. Ms. DiMaggio added "and photographic info on the existing mechanical." Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the conceptual approval of the location and to forward the proposal to the full Commission for review with screening and conduit routing details to be worked out back at the Committee level. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

1116-20 Dauphine St: 22-26866-VCGEN; Donkervoet Laura, applicant; Laura C Donkervoet, owner; Proposal to modify pavers and patio elevation in middle and rear courtyards, and to modify courtyard steps, per application & materials received 09/12/2022 and 09/26/2022, respectively. <https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=943044>

[Mr. Fifield arrived during the discussion of this item]

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Donkervoet present on behalf of the application. Mr. Donkervoet stated that they were trying to make the courtyard more typical and level for usable walking, eliminating trip hazards. He added that the plan was to install the brick on a sand bed, to match the existing patterns in each area. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she had not seen any utility trough proposals like this one, and asked if they were usually buried; Ms. Bourgogne responded that they were. Ms. DiMaggio asked if the metal plate would be level with the brick; Ms. Vogt responded that that was what the drawings indicated. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she felt the courtyard work was going in a positive direction and that she did not find the introduction of the steel plate to be a large intrusion. Mr. Bergeron was concerned that raising the middle courtyard might cause drainage issues, and asked what was being planned. Mr. Donkervoet stated that there were trenches that ran the length of the property on both sides, and that the current bricks were on dirt, so the new installation on gravel and sand should be an improvement. He stated that they would reuse as many bricks as possible.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved to **approve** the alterations at the rear and mid courtyards, **approve** the new brick steps, and **conceptually approve** the wooden steps and landings, with all final approval to be handled at staff level. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1301 Chartres St: 22-28345-VCGEN; Broadway Eddy, applicant; Melody S Douglas, Palo Inc, Rachel D Perkoff, Eddy D Broadway, Carolyn C Looper, Jeanne M Taylor, Geoffrey Kleine-Deters, owner;

Proposal to structurally reinforce balcony on the rear elevation of the main building including the addition of new metal plates at each existing wood outrigger, per application & materials received 09/19/2022 and 09/27/2022, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=944116>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Carlos present on behalf of the application. Mr. Carlos stated that there had been a misunderstanding regarding the scope of work and what had been permitted. He went on to say that they stopped work once they realized the error. Mr. Carlos stated that the intention of this proposal was to stiffen up the joists with metal. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she agreed with staff regarding the potential for reconstruction here. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if they would be open to that. Mr. Carlos stated that the beams aligned with those on the inside. Mr. Fifield stated, "I think what staff is suggesting would be best and that in the past we have asked that the metal be sistered in between the wood." Ms. DiMaggio stated that she was concerned about the additive nature of the proposal. Mr. Bergeron asked if reframing with steel would affect the masonry. Mr. Carlos stated yes. Mr. Fifield stated that he believed they needed to hear from the structural engineer. Mr. Bergeron agreed that his question for the engineer was if they used the plates could they remove the brackets installed below the balcony.

There was no public comment.

Ms. DiMaggio moved to defer the application so that the structural engineer could be present. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1117 Royal St: 22-29007-VCGEN; Philip Hebert, applicant; Steven E Young, Carolyn C Hyman, William R Posnick, Roland P Toups, Steven E Young, owner;

Proposal to replace existing French doors at alleyway entrance with new single leaf door, per application & materials received 09/26/2022.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=947057>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Hebert present on behalf of the application. Mr. Hebert noted that the existing French doors present a security risk and that there would be no change to the header. Mr. Fifield asked if a new door could be milled to appear as a paired door. Mr. Hebert stated that could be done. Ms. Bourgogne stated that this might be a hardware issue. Mr. Bergeron questioned if a solution could be found with hardware. Mr. Hebert stated that he had no confidence that the doors would be deadbolted by the residents. Mr. Block stated that if there was hardship it could go to Commission. Mr. Hebert stated that they just wanted to go with the same style as the rest of the block. Mr. Bergeron asked if it was possible to fix the existing doors. Mr. Hebert stated that the plan was to mill a new door.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to conceptually approve the fixing of the 2 existing leaves to create a single swing door with details including hardware to be worked out at staff level. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Appeals and Violations

711 Bourbon St: 22-23903-VCGEN; Loretta Harmon, applicant; Seven-Eleven Bourbon LLC, owner;

Proposal to correct or retain violations including proposed retention of paint on previously exposed natural brick, per application & materials received 08/09/2022 & 10/04/2022, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=938447>

This item was heard last during the meeting.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Stafford and Ms. Harmon present on behalf of the application. Mr. Stafford stated the following:

Heaters- seasonal and are down now, they are installed by hanging chains.

String lights- we are working on that now and Ms. Harmon is looking for fixtures.

Vegetation- is gone now.

Cap flashing- we will never get access to that building again. Ms. Harmon interjected "we are asking for temporary retention.

Paint- this was a mistake and not on purpose. We did try to remove it in two test patches but the owner didn't like it because he was worried it would pull the mortar out so he would like to retain the paint.

The property is immaculate now and we are preserving it.

Mr. Bergeron asked, "who order the paint?" He went on to say that obviously they ordered a lot, so no one questioned this. Mr. Stafford said the same paint was used everywhere and that the owner owns a construction company so a large paint order was not noticed. Mr. Block asked what kind of paint- elastomeric? Ms. Harmon stated that she was told by the owner that it was breathable. Mr. Stafford stated that the owner would try anything as long as it didn't damage the building. Ms. DiMaggio stated that the NPS had briefs and guidelines regarding this. Mr. Stafford stated that they had tried an off the shelf product but didn't like the way it looked. Ms. DiMaggio stated "that is only one type of removal. There are many." Ms. Bourgoigne asked that they please included a time frame in their motion as this had been going on for almost 2 ½ years.

Nikki Szalwinski, representing French Quarter Citizens, stated that this business had lots of violations outside of the ones from the VCC. She continued that she was happy to see the string lights go and that they were doing more damage leaving the paint on instead of removing it.

Ms. DiMaggio stated that the paint was the biggest sticking point for her. Mr. Bergeron noted that he didn't want to see paint removal damage the building. Ms. DiMaggio suggested more research into the NPS recommended techniques for paint removal from masonry.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to deny the retention of the paint and for the applicant to test strippers within 30 days and submit product data on the paint used, conceptual approval of the HVAC with screening, denial of the gas heater, to defer the lighting and to allow the temporary retention of the cap flashing until in need of replacement. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

210-12 Chartres St: 22-28207-VCGEN; Cornelius Spottsville, applicant; 212 Management Associates LLC, owner; Appeal to reconstruct rear deck and stair built without benefit of VCC review and approval, and to repair structural crack in brick courtyard wall, per application & materials received 09/19/2022 & 09/26/2022. **[Notices of Violation sent 06/02/2021 & 06/22/2022]**

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=943757>

No applicant was present on behalf of the application. Ms. DiMaggio moved to **defer** the appeal until the applicant could be present. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

838-40 N Rampart St: 22-28495-VCGEN; Richard Woodroof, applicant; Richard K Woodroof, owner; Appeal to

retain work without permit, including mechanical equipment and venting, window screens, parapet cap flashing, gutters, and paint in deviation from permit, per application & materials received 09/22/2022 & 09/27/2022, respectively. [Notices of Violation sent 02/03/2010, 02/28/2014, 04/04/2018, and 11/08/2019]

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=944048>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Messrs. Woodruff and Lauman present on behalf of the application. Mr. Lauman stated that the VCC had asked that the vents be moved because they were affecting the neighbor, and that they had installed "temporary" redirect cowl. He stated that the paint had been approved but would be redone. He added that the eyebrow windows opened in, but they were willing to remove the screens. He stated that the parapet caps were copper, and the roof had been synthetic, but that it was now natural slate. He explained that the roofer had been unable to stop the water and that he thought all of the work had been approved, but the caps stopped the water intrusion. Mr. Fifiel asked where the leaks had occurred; Mr. Lauman responded, "at the walls." Mr. Fifiel asked if there was any VCC record of this work; Ms. Vogt responded no. She added that the cowl at the rear had not been approved. Mr. Lauman stated that they had been added to keep the heat off the roof, but he could change them to redirect the vents, but that they would be much more visible. He was apprehensive to turn them down as this would be a fire risk.

Mr. Fifiel asked about the gutters; Mr. Lauman stated that they had been installed by the roofer. Mr. Bergeron stated that they were not K-style, but maybe D-style. Mr. Woodruff stated that they wanted to replace the downspouts with galvanized; Ms. Vogt responded that that item would be handled at staff level. Mr. Bergeron asked the applicant if they were willing to remove the cap flashing. Mr. Lauman responded that they were copper.

Ms. Vogt stated that the application was vague and the submitted materials were piecemeal, and there was no clear, comprehensive proposal, so it was difficult to evaluate. Mr. Fifiel stated that staff's request was reasonable, and that the applicant needed to submit a proactive proposal. He added that the Committee could defer to allow the applicant to work with staff to address as much as possible. Mr. Lauman stated that they were requesting rulings so they could move forward. Ms. Vogt responded that the proposed work was ambiguous and unclear and could not move forward as submitted. Mr. Fifiel stated that they required comprehensive proposals. Mr. Block stated that these issues had to be discussed at the Committee level, such as the cap flashing and mechanical. He repeated that the Committee would need to review a revised proposal.

Ms. DiMaggio moved for **temporary retention** of the cap flashing until replacement was required, but not after, and **approved** retention of the gutter. She moved to **deny** all other items as submitted. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Fifiel stated that the applicant had the right to appeal and should work with staff to propose alternatives.

At approximately 2:41 Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for the adjournment of the meeting. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.