Vieux Carré Commission
Architecture Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 12, 2024

Old Business

327 Bourbon

ADDRESS:	327 Bourbon		
OWNER:	327 Bourbon Street, LLC	APPLICANT:	Erika Gates
ZONING:	VCE	SQUARE:	69
USE:	Vacant	LOT SIZE:	5,472 sq. ft.
DENSITY-		OPEN SPACE-	
ALLOWED:	9 Units	REQUIRED:	1,641 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	None	EXISTING:	1,679 sq. ft. approx.
PROPOSED:	No Change	PROPOSED:	No Change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Rating: Blue - of Major Architectural or Historical Importance.

This c. 1835 Greek Revival townhouse is noted for its historical associations as the home of Judah P. Benjamin, as well as for its elegantly detailed features such as the carriageway entrance, main entrance, and "bow and arrow" wrought ironwork. The components of the original complex (house, kitchen, stable) remain intact. The mansard roof is a late 19th century addition.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 22-34992-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate building including proposed modifications to rear balcony railing and carriage house millwork, per application & materials received 10/13/2022 & 02/27/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

The applicant has returned with revised details on the rear balcony railing and first-floor millwork at the rearmost building, both of which were specifically excluded from the conceptual approval from the 01/23/2024 meeting. The applicant notes that modifications to the guardrails on the Bourbon St. elevation will be submitted separately.

Rear Balcony Railing
At the stairs connecting the previously approved reconstruction to the existing service ell, the applicant proposes to reinstall the historic railing that was previously in place in this location. The existing railing is only 27” above the stair nosing so obviously does not meet modern building code. In order to meet code, the applicant proposes to reinstall the rail with the top of the rail at 42”. Below the rail, the applicant proposes to install two new 4 x 4 bottom rails, spaced evenly below the historic rail and arranged to satisfy building code.

Staff questions if the 4 x 4 notation is possibly a drafting error as this would be quite cumbersome under the railing. The railing detail shows the top rail as 2-1/2” wide and the bottom rail measures at only 1-1/2” wide. A 2 x 4 added bottom rail would be more appropriately sized.

Besides the concern over the dimensions of this element, staff finds the concept simple and effective and would likely be fairly inconspicuous.

In addition to the height modification, the applicant also proposes a new grab bar. This is shown at a 34” height and attached to the pickets of the historic railing with ¾” bent steel rods. Staff’s only concern with this aspect of the proposal is the fact that the historical rail pickets look to be quite slender in dimension. Staff questions if people leaning or grabbing the grab bar could potentially damage the historic railing and if there may be a more secure method of attachment.

At the existing service ell balcony, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the existing railing at an expanded height of 42”. Stretching a guardrail in this manner can sometime affect the proportions of the overall building elevation, but staff believes there is sufficient height to this service ell that a railing height increase will not be particularly noticeable.

Millwork
At the rearmost building the applicant has submitted a few different options for replacement millwork. As previously noted, this millwork previously in this location was certainly not original, with photographs from the 1940s and 50s showing different millwork in these openings. There is a question about the shape of the openings themselves. The previously existing fanlight was a faux element but it is unclear if this was always a faux feature or if in fact this opening previously had an arched top.

Two options are shown for the treatment of this arched top area. Option A proposes to expose and paint the stacked lintels that are currently present in the wall. Option B proposes a trim board around the arch and a solid panel.

Three different options are shown for the muntin pattern treatment in the French doors. Option 1 appears to be similar to the previously existing conditions with four rows of unevenly sized lites. Option 2 simply shows a single lite and no muntins, while option 3 shows three horizontal muntins to create a four lite door.

Although matching the previously existing condition, seeing option 1 in a drawing looks a little busy. Again, noting that the previously existing doors date to sometime after the 1960s. When taken in context with the traditional windows above, option 2 may be a little too simplified. Therefore, staff has a preference for door option 3.

Summary

In summary, staff requests commentary from the applicant and Committee regarding:

- The dimensions of the proposed rails under the historic stair rail
- The attachment point of the grab bar
- The preferred treatment at the rear building fanlight, and
- The preferred lite pattern at the rear building French doors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

921-25 Burgundy

ADDRESS:	921-25 Burgundy		
OWNER:	Cheryl Lynn Kirby	APPLICANT:	Loretta Harmon
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	104
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	4223.5 sq. ft.
DENSITY:		OPEN SPACE:	
ALLOWED:	4 units	REQUIRED:	1267 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	1 unit	EXISTING:	2373 sq. ft.
PROPOSED:	2 units	PROPOSED:	2000 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.

An early (c. 1810), brick-between-posts Creole cottage, with the addition of late Victorian cornice lintels over the façade openings. [N.B: As with 901-907 Burgundy, the bricks-between-posts construction has been left exposed, but in this instance it has been painted over.]

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #23-34666-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to build new two-and-a-half story dependency in rear yard, per application & materials received 12/20/2023 & 02/20/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

Revised materials, including new structural plans and additional development of details already reviewed by staff, were submitted 24 hours before this hearing. Changes include items that were already presented and ultimately rejected at the Committee level during the 2020 review of this building under a previous architect. Since staff is unable to review a new, larger set within that short period of time, and since several changes were already discussed and then eliminated from a previous proposal, staff finds review of the obsolete drawings at this hearing to be an unproductive use of time and requests **deferral** until the 3/26 hearing, where the new set may be considered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

New Business

737-739 Barracks

ADDRESS:	737-39 Barracks Street		
OWNER:	Carmencita Baker	APPLICANT:	Michael Bertel
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	53
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	2,574 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: Green, of local architectural/historical importance.

This c. 1840 4-bay frame Creole cottage has a strange addition over its lakeside entrance.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 24-00872-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Violation Case #21-03671-DBNVCC **Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to replace two existing front doors with new doors that do not match existing, per application & materials received 01/10/2024 & 02/29/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

An application was filed to make some exterior repairs to this neglected property. The majority of the work is to match existing and staff approvable but the one item in need of Architecture Committee review is the proposed replacement of the two front doors on the building. The applicant provided a photograph of one of the existing doors, a simple six panel wood door, and noted that the other door is currently inaccessible but does not match the six-panel door.

The applicant proposes to install two new wood and glass doors in a Victorian style. The design of the proposed doors was inspired by two historic photographs of the property that staff previously located and shared with the applicant. The proposed doors each feature two lites with arched tops and two lower panels. In the preparation of this report, staff found a 2008 photograph that had previously been missed. This photograph shows the now inaccessible door in greater detail than was seen in the older photographs. The door in this location appears to have matched what was seen in the earlier 1951 and 1964 photographs. Although certainly not original to the building, staff finds this door has significant age and tells a story about this building over time.

Staff requests photographs of the currently covered door once access becomes available to see if this door matches the one in the 2008 photograph. If in place, staff recommends repair to this door and installing an exactly matching one in the opposite door opening.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal as noted with any final details to be worked out at the staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

1000-04 Governor Nicholls

ADDRESS:	1131-41 Burgundy, 1000-04 Gov. Nicholls		
OWNER:	Frank J Floyd, Robert Wadsworth, Atkinson & Boxton 2019 Revocable Trust, Michael W Wendel, Sarah Ashleigh Knuth, Henry P Powers, Brian D'Arcy, George M Ozborn, Melanie L Ozborn, Robert A Sutherland	APPLICANT:	Russo Michael Dba Mason Masters
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	106
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	4914 sq. ft. (approx.)

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

1000-04 Gov. Nicholls/1137-39-41 Burgundy:
Main building: **green**, or of local architectural and/or historical significance.
Rear additions: **orange**, or of post-1946 construction.

This circa 1825 brick Creole cottage is divided into three living units, each consisting of two bays (one door and one short window). The additions at the rear are ca. 1950 replacements of the historic ells.

1133-35 Burgundy: **brown**, detrimental, or of no architectural and/or historical significance

This small, 2-story brick structure (today stuccoed) was built in the 1920s in the open area between two 19th century structures.

1131-33 Burgundy. **Pink**, potentially of local/major architectural and/or historic significance, but with detrimental alterations.

This address features a circa 1860, 3-story brick Greek revival style townhouse, which has the unusual feature for the French Quarter of a basement level

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #24-02749-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal selectively demolish and reconstruct service ell masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/30/2024 & 02/23/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

The applicant has submitted two engineer's reports and diagrammatic drawings for proposed reconstruction of the upper floor at the rear service ell at 1131-33 Burgundy. Multiple violation letters were issued for this property, as the wall has been visibly deflecting and structural ties were installed without permit at some point prior to 2018. Following Hurricane Ida in 2021, the wall continued to move, and two engineers were consulted. The first report, provided by Robert B. Anderson, P.E., is dated April 13, 2022. It states:

> The wall has, in the past, tilted towards the neighboring property to the west as can be seen in Photograph #1. Tie-back rods were installed prior to our inspection, in an effort to prevent further movement towards the neighboring property. While the tie backs provide some support, they do not address all issues and in our professional opinion the masonry wall is still in danger of falling. The brick masonry work has experienced significant weathering on the interior face of the wall as can be seen in Photograph #2. The wood rafters and joist which tie into the masonry also have experienced significant weathering as can be seen in photograph #3, and since these wood members provide necessary lateral support, it is a concern with respect to the integrity of the wall.
>
> We were made aware that prior to our inspection a brick had fallen through the ceiling to the dwelling unit below. Some patch work has been done on the interior of the wall; However, it is insufficient, and additional cracks have occurred around the patch work as can be seen in Photograph #4. If nothing is done the brick work could continue to dislodge, causing a safety hazard and further weakening the structural integrity of the masonry wall potentially leading to a more serios failure.
>
> In conclusion, in our expert opinion this brick wall is in danger of falling and should be incrementally dismantled and rebuilt in kind. The wood members which tie into the wall and have been compromised due to rot should also be addressed in this repair. If the corbel brick footing below the wall in question is found to be in an acceptable condition it may be capped with concrete to level and used as the foundation for the rebuilt wall. Should you need drawings for any of the remediation work suggested in this report, we would be happy and capable of providing them under separate cover.

Mr. Anderson's statement "in our expert opinion this brick wall is in danger of falling and should be incrementally dismantled and rebuilt in kind. […] If the corbel brick footing below the wall in question is found to be in acceptable condition," leads staff to understand that Mr. Anderson was referring to reconstruction of the entire wall, not just the upper floor. However, this is not explictly stated.

The applicant also consulted Emma H. Tayhlor, P.E. of Carubba Engineering, Inc., who provided a report dated September 22, 2022. This report is much more extensive in identifying Hurricane Ida as a contributing factor and noting observations on the site:

> From the alleyway between 1129 and 1131 Burgundy Street, we observed the exterior of the masonry wall in question at the rear of 1004 Governor Nichols Street. This wall is approximately three-stories tall and does not adjoin the neighboring buildings. The brick masonry is clad in a smooth stucco finish. We observed brick tie anchors at the rear of this wall to be newer in appearance than the ties on adjacent walls. We understand from our conversation with the owner that these ties were added approximately ten to fifteen years ago in an effort to mitigate further movement of this exterior load bearing masonry wall.
>
> We observed an obvious lean to the upper portion of this wall, as well as grout repairs that appeared to be made to the cracks and voids this displaced wall created between the neighboring masonry walls. We observed cracks in these repair locations that appear to have resurfaced from the original displacement described.
>
> From the interior of the second floor unit, we observed cracks in the drywall ceiling and walls in multiple locations. Additionally, we observed water stains and a puncture through the ceiling near the exterior wall. We were informed by the owner that a brick fell through the ceiling. From the attic above, there was evidence of a missing brick adjacent to a rafter connection directly above the damage.
>
> Additionally, from the attic above this unit, we observed the brick tie rods described previously in this report. The rods span from the exterior wall to their tie back point at the roof rafters. This connection consists of a steel plate fastened to the rafters (parallel to the rods) with a tube opening through the center. The rod runs through this tube and is tightened on the opposite side via nuts and washers. The rods appear to be bowed upwards and the rods rest on the lower portion of the tube connection. This bow and location of the rod inside the tube aligns with our previous assertion of wall movement allowing the rods to loosen. We also observed new, clean cracks in the previous grout repair at the exterior wall, water damage to the roof deck, and water stains near the cracks of the grout mentioned previously.

Suggested repairs are not detailed in this report beyond recommendations that an experienced licensed mason correct the wall. However, drawings were also produced by Carubba, as follows:

The upper floor of the service ell is noted as "rebuild load bearing masonry wall as required to meet VCC requirements. No structural ties are shown in section, but damaged rafters are "to be repaired or replaced in kind." A 2x header is shown where the rafters meet the masonry wall, with "1/2" Hilti Hit Z Rod @ 16" o.c. w/ HY 270 epoxy & HIT-SC sleeve or approved equivalent" and "Simpson LSSR" rafter hangers to be installed. The reconstruction of the wall is shown wrapping around to a portion of the N. Rampart side wall, and a typical detail calls for Simpson Heli-ties to be installed @ 12" o.c., wrapping the corner. It is unclear if the ties would only be installed in mortar joints. Staff notes that this drawing is noted as "for pricing only" and is unstamped.

Staff finds the drawings a bit diagrammatic and would find the addition of architectural drawings helpful, but otherwise seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding the proposed structural repairs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

508-16 Bourbon

ADDRESS: 508-16 Bourbon Street
OWNER: Anglade 500 Properties, LLC
ZONING: VCC-2
USE: Commercial

APPLICANT: Loretta Harmon
SQUARE: 62
LOT SIZE: 5721 sq. ft.

DENSITY
Allowed: 9 Units
Existing: Unknown
Proposed: No Change

OPEN SPACE
Required: 1716 sq. ft.
Existing: 2160 sq. ft.
Proposed: 2160 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building & carriage house: **Blue**, of major architectural and/or historic significance.
Main building & service ell: **Blue**, of major architectural and/or historic significance.

C. 1831 2½-story brick building and separate, brick carriage house, which were built as dependencies of the Samuel Kohn House (510 Bourbon). Alterations include the ground floor granite columns and lintel (c. 1840-50) and the upper floor, which obliterates the hip roof and one half attic floor.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #24-05109-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal for exterior renovation, including installation of mechanical equipment and modification of millwork, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *Adult Live Performance Venue* to *bar/restaurant (standard)*, per application & materials received 02/23/2024 & 02/28/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

[NOTE: 508 Bourbon and 516 Bourbon are located on the same parcel, and there are extensive outstanding violations on the entire property, including both buildings. Despite numerous applications over the last several years, there has been little to no follow through on completing the permitting process or performing work to correct the violations. Multiple violation cases remain open, and the property has been taken to administrative adjudication. If no applications are received within the next 30 days, the property will once again be scheduled for adjudication and may be subject to further fines.]

The proposed work in conjunction with the **change of use** at 508 Bourbon is largely located at the front elevation and the unrated infill between the main building and rear carriage house, as follows:

Mechanical:
- The roof plan shows four condensers relocated closer to the property line shared with 500 Bourbon.
- A 10-ton package unit by Trane is proposed to replace an existing 4-ton package unit. It is shown weighing 1058 lbs, and measuring 53-1/4” x 88-5/8” x 40-7/8”. Sound data was not included.
- A new 54” dia. x 71” tall cooling tower for the daiquiri machines is shown close to the property line with 500 Bourbon.
- No condensers are shown for the walk-in cooler or the ice machine.
- A new hood vent and intake vent are shown 10’-0” from the property line, but the hood vent is very close the opening at the rear of the main building. Staff notes that satellite imagery seems to show that this opening is a window, not a door as shown on the roof plan. If possible, staff recommends that the hood and intake vent locations be flipped (or moved further away) in order to prevent grime from the hood vent from accumulating on the rear of the Blue rated building.
- It is not clear what the height of this roof is, or if railings will be required. If the roof is less than 16’-0” above grade, it is likely that railings are not mandated by mechanical code.

Front elevation:
The applicant proposes to replace the first-floor millwork, which is not original. Photographs from 1951 show a large amount of infill and plate glass shop windows, while photos from 1965 onward show the current millwork configuration largely as it exists today. The elevation is divided into two unequal bays with granite pilasters.

A single lite door with a single wood panel is located in the Toulouse-side bay. The applicant proposes to remove a step at this door, as well as wood infill above the existing millwork, making the new door 3’-0” wide by 8’-7” tall. It is shown swinging out into the right of way.

The St. Louis-side bay currently has a center six-lite door flanked by two wide six-lite sidelites, with single panels below. The applicant proposes to replace this bank of millwork with two pairs of four-lite, single panel bifold doors.

Staff notes that the proposed millwork is flush with the head and jamb, giving it a flat appearance. The millwork profiles are inappropriate for a Blue rated building of this age, and the stiles and rails are also out of proportion. Conceptually, replacement of the first-floor millwork can be considered, since it is not original, and the proposed overall elevation is not out of character, significant revisions are needed to the millwork details.

Overall, while revisions and additional information are needed for both aspects of the proposal before final review, staff finds the work **conceptually approvable**. Commission review is required for rooftop equipment installation, millwork replacement, and the proposed change of use. Staff requests a full site visit of the property, including of the infill roof, prior to Commission consideration of the proposed work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

Appeals and Violations

819 Bourbon

ADDRESS:	819 Bourbon Street		
OWNER:	Beomjune B Kim	APPLICANT:	Labbe Construction Co LLC
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	75
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	7935 sq. ft.
DENSITY:		OPEN SPACE:	
ALLOWED:	8 units	REQUIRED:	2380 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	Unknown	EXISTING:	Unknown
PROPOSED:	Unknown	PROPOSED:	No change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building & service ell: **Blue**, of major architectural and/or historic significance.

This is a grand Greek Revival townhouse constructed during the flush antebellum decade of the 1850s. Its detailing includes an elaborate recessed entrance with Ionic pilasters and entablatures and a cast iron, wraparound balcony on the front and St. Ann side elevations.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #23-06960-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain HVAC equipment and proposal to conceal and/or modify refrigerant lines, per application & materials received 03/14/2023 & 02/16/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

On 4/11/2023, an appeal to retain the existing mechanical equipment and line sets as they currently exist was denied by the Committee. The applicant chose not to appeal this denial and has worked with a preservation consultant to produce alternative schemes to modify and/or conceal the lines.

As a reminder to the Committee, the property recently underwent an extensive renovation, which included removal of window units and the first-time installation of central HVAC in at least the rear service ell. On 12/22/2020, the Committee reviewed and conceptually approved the four proposed condensers and three mini splits in two areas: adjacent to the rear of the service ell and between the driveway and the St. Ann side of the main building, towards the rear. Platform and screening details were needed prior to final review and permit. In 2021, two VCC subpermits were created for HVAC applications submitted by subcontractors; one was red flagged and closed as the contractor was not licensed with the City of New Orleans, and the second was not approved or issued by the Mechanical Division or VCC (it is unclear from the record why this was the case). On 09/28/2022, staff inspected the overall property and noted extensive line sets on the exterior, particularly at the service ell. Some months later, VCC staff was contacted to close out a permit for which third party inspections had been submitted, despite the fact that no permits were ever issued. Staff requested full documentation of the units for retroactive review and permit issuance, but informed the applicant that the lines could not be permitted for retention and that an alternative should be proposed, such as running the lines on the interior or putting them below ground. Staff notes that the units themselves are typical and approvable for retention, although the Committee may choose to require their relocation.

The applicant has worked with a consulting firm on the following proposals, which staff finds to be comprehensive and rigorous in its analysis.

1. Option 1: Bury the lines underneath the building and have each condenser line come up through the floor along the interior side of the wall.
    a. Pro: Removes all visibility from the exterior courtyard
    b. Con: Requires tunneling a hole through the solid masonry bell foundation, which would negatively impact the building's structural integrity, and is potentially impossible.
    c. Con: Creates penetrations through the floor, which invites insects and moisture into the building.
    d. Con: The buried condenser lines are unserviceable, which goes against VCC guidelines.

Staff notes that this is the most typical approach in the Vieux Carré. Subterranean penetrations are normally done only a few inches below grade, which is not low enough to interfere with the corbelled foundation and allows the lines to be serviced by removing courtyard pavers.

2. Option 2: Bury the lines underneath the slate courtyard and have each condenser line come up along the exterior side of the wall.
    a. Pro: Reduces the concentration of the mechanical lines at one area.
    b. Con: Creates stripes along the exterior wall as each of the seven lines extends up to its respective unit (from grade to about 8'-0" up).
    c. Con: Creates several additional penetrations through the masonry wall.
    d. Con: Damages the historic slate in the courtyard.
    e. Con: The buried condenser lines are unserviceable, which goes against VCC guidelines.

Staff finds this option to be too visibly obtrusive.

3. Option 3: Create a single, large penetration through the top of the dependency wall (at the back) and run all the condenser units inside a soffit on the interior side of the wall.
    a. Pro: Removes visibility from the exterior courtyard.
    b. Con: Requires punching a large (~8" round) hole through the dependency's solid masonry wall, which would natively impact the building's structural integrity.
    c. Con: Requires punching holes through each interior demising wall as the condenser lines extend towards the front façade. This would natively impact the building's structural integrity.
    d. Con: Creates an unattractive soffit on the interior of the building, especially where there is a ceiling height / floor level change.

Staff notes that an approximately 8" penetration is not unheard of when installing new mechanical equipment or venting for the first time, and the structural integrity of the wall is unlikely to be compromised if a small lintel were to be installed, as is typical in these conditions. The interior is outside of VCC jurisdiction, and VCC Design Guidelines call for lines, conduit, etc. to run on the interior of the building instead of the outside whenever possible.

4. Option 4: Create a better solution (two versions) for the exterior mounted lines underneath the balcony *and* build a screen to obscure all mechanical equipment along the back wall. (See drawings).
    a. Pro: Reduces visibility of *all* equipment at the courtyard, not just the condenser lines.
    b. Pro: Requires zero additional penetrations through masonry walls or foundations, thus having the least impact on the building's structural integrity.
    c. Pro: There are 2 versions for new architectural solutions, both of which read as new construction, which is a tenant of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
    d. Pro: Both solutions are easily reversible, which is a tenant of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
    e. Pro: Both solutions allow the equipment to be located up high and in a serviceable location, which is a VCC guideline and tenant of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
    f. Pro: Both solutions encase the condenser lines in a soffit or pipe that can be painted white, and therefore better blend into the rest of the balcony. (The insulated lines are currently black, which adds to their visibility).
    g. Con: The condenser lines still exist on the exterior of the building within the courtyard, and they are still a necessity.

The mechanical equipment screening may be conceptually approvable, but more complete drawings are needed, and it should be independent of the building and operable so the equipment can be serviced, as required by mechanical code. While staff appreciates the proposals for the line sets submitted with Option 4 and considers both to be an improvement over existing conditions, both are still very visually obtrusive. Exterior use of PVC is not approvable, but if a metal option were proposed, the method of its attachment and overall size are still concerns. Consolidation of the lines where the balcony structure meets the wall, and enclosure in an angled soffit is also visually obtrusive and its method of attachment is unclear.

Staff finds Options 1 and 3 to be the most appropriate and **conceptually approvable**, with the applicant to submit more detailed drawings (including screening for the mechanical equipment) for final review and permit.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

Architecture Committee Meeting of 04/11/2023

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 04/11/2023
Permit #23-06960-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain HVAC equipment and condenser lines installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 03/25/2023.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 04/11/2023

The property recently underwent an extensive renovation, which included removal of window units and the first-time installation of central HVAC in at least the rear service ell. On 12/22/2020, the Committee reviewed and conceptually approved the four proposed condensers and three mini splits in two areas: adjacent to the rear of the service ell and between the driveway and the St. Ann side of the main building, towards the rear. Platform and screening details were needed prior to final review and permit. In 2021, two VCC subpermits were created for HVAC applications submitted by subcontractors; one was red flagged and closed as the contractor was not licensed with the City of New Orleans, and the second was not approved or issued by the Mechanical Division or VCC (it is unclear from the record why this was the case). On 09/28/2022, staff inspected the overall property and noted extensive line sets on the exterior, particularly at the service ell. Some months later, VCC staff was contacted to close out a permit for which third party inspections had been submitted, despite the fact that no permits were ever issued. Staff requested full documentation of the units for retroactive review and permit issuance, but informed the applicant that the lines could not be permitted for retention and that an alternative should be proposed, such as running the lines on the interior or putting them below ground.

On 3/25/2023, the applicant submitted an application to retain the work as installed. He provided staff with a letter from Michael Vesely, P.E., which states *"the pictures and drawings for the above project have been reviewed. The split a/c systems have been placed in the best position for maximum efficiency. The addition of any piping will reduce the overall efficiency of any of the split systems. The placement of lines underground will possibly add too much equivalent pipe length and render the split systems inoperable. There appears to be no other options for the line sets."*

Staff notes that other similar applications have not required extensive line sets comparable to those installed at this property, and is unsure why the lines cannot be discretely located at this address when they are routinely buried or routed on the interior at other properties, as there does not seem to be anything unique about this site, equipment, or situation. Staff notes that the engineer's report appears to be based on photos and not a personal site visit, so it is unclear if their opinion might change if inspected in person. The report references "efficiency of the split systems;" it is also unclear if the need for extensive lines would be different if full condensers were used, or if the mini-split units could still sufficiently operate.

Staff takes no issue with the units themselves and finds the equipment and locations conceptually approvable for retention, as initially found by the Committee in December 2020. However, staff cannot recommend retention of the extensive and obtrusive line sets as installed at this Blue rated building, and seeks the guidance of the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 04/11/2023

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Labbé present on behalf the application. Mr. Labbé stated that he was the contractor and that the HVAC subcontractor could not attend and the architect was no longer involved. He stated that he thought this was the only option, as the service ell walls are solid masonry and that if they went underground the lines were not long enough and turns would not work. Mr. Fifield asked if the engineer had visited the site; Mr. Labbé responded no. Mr. Fifield stated that retention of these conditions was not even close to something that staff or the ARC would approve, and that this was not the standard at all, noting that the lines had not been laid with any care or organization. He asked why they had not gone inside; Mr. Labbé responded that they would have to go through the solid wall. Mr. Fifield noted that that was done all the time. Mr. Labbé stated that the lines would be too long. Ms. Bourgogne stated, "we would rather see the units moved than this." Mr. Labbé asked if it would be possible to cover the lines; Mr. Fifield responded that they were obscuring architectural features and reiterated that the lines had been installed with no regard for placement, with multiple brick penetrations throughout, even entering at headers. He stated that he did not find the argument for retention convincing.

Mr. Labbé stated that this was a historic tax credit project and that the work had been inspected and a certificate of occupancy issued. Ms. Vogt clarified that the mechanical was inspected by a third party and that no permits had ever been issued form Safety and Permits or VCC for the mechanical work, and that only a temporary CofO had been released by DSP. Mr. Bergeron stated that he could not imagine any architect being ok with this installation, and that he could not see NPS approving it either. Ms. Bourgogne

added that no solution had been presented and that maybe some lines could be run inside, while some could run underground, or units could be moved. Mr. Labbé stated that the architect had called for VCC inspection, so he was confused about the work not being approved. For clarification, Ms. Bourgogne added that the architect stated on site that she had been just as shocked as staff was when she saw how the lines were installed. Ms. Vogt explained that they had been granted conceptual approval as part of the overall renovation permit but that no mechanical permits had been issued.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **denial** of the appeal to retain the equipment and lines as installed. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Fifield noted that the decision could be appealed to the full Commission by notifying staff in writing within 30 days.

620 Decatur

ADDRESS:	620 Decatur		
OWNER:	New Jax Commercial, LLC, et al	APPLICANT:	Bart Sutton
ZONING:	VCS	SQUARE:	5E
USE:	Commercial/residential	LOT SIZE:	116,955 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY

Rating: **Green -** of local architectural/historical importance

The Jackson Brewery (1891) stands as a fine example of both the work of the German immigrant architect, Dietrich Einsiedel, and of brew house architecture in late nineteenth century New Orleans. Major additions made in 1902 and alterations made during 1984 somewhat changed the original 3-story design. Further building-wide alterations (including fenestration changes) occurred in 2012.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 22-35988-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Inspector: Marguerite Roberts

Proposal to retain work completed in deviation of approved permit, including improper stucco and plastic mesh, per application & materials received 12/05/2022 & 02/19/2024, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

At the Architecture Committee's request, the applicant was able to have samples of the existing stucco analyzed in a lab. The initial portion of the submittal addresses obtaining the samples. Sample 1 was taken from a corner of the building and clearly shows original masonry construction behind the stucco. Samples 2 & 3 were taken from other areas of the building and show the underlying construction in these areas as having a wood substrate covered in felt paper and metal lath. As samples 2 & 3 come from newer construction areas of the building, staff has less concern regarding the stucco composition in these locations.

All samples were then sent to a lab for analysis. The lab report only notes testing two samples so staff questions why that would be and if the lab report's samples 1 & 2 are consistent with the collection report's samples 1 & 2. Provided that "Sample 1" is consistent in both reports, this would contain the most applicable information for the purposes of the VCC. The lab found that Sample 1 consisted of "*sand uniformly distributed in a Portland cement paste with no hydrated lime or other supplementary cementitious materials*." The lab report states that the cement clusters were very large, suggesting the stucco might be very old. The report notes that, "*such large cement particles grain size typically occurred in cement manufactured prior to 1950*." The report estimated the cement-to-sand ratio of Sample 1 at 1:3. Finally, the report notes that the "*bottom layer of stucco in Sample 1 was directly bonded to red brick*."

The finding of the lab report suggests that this building is in fact stuccoed in a heavy Portland cement mix, rather than the more historic VCC lime-based mix. The earliest photograph of this building dates to 1939 and shows the building stuccoed. Given the original construction date of the building of 1891 with major additions made in 1902 and the history of Portland cement gaining in popularity near the end of the 19th century, its possible the stucco on this building has always been Portland cement based.

Based on the findings of the lab report, staff finds the proposed retention of the modern StuccoBase and Senergy Senerflex potentially approvable, at least as a test case. Staff recommends approval of the proposal with any future masonry repairs to be made utilizing compatible materials based on the lab report.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

Architecture Committee Meeting of 12/05/2023

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 12/05/2023
Permit # 22-35988-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Inspector: Marguerite Roberts

Proposal to retain work completed in deviation of approved permit, including improper stucco and plastic mesh, per application & materials received 12/05/2022 & 11/28/2023, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 12/05/2023

Following the deferral at the 11/07 meeting, the applicant has submitted elevation drawings and some additional information regarding areas of repairs. According to the elevation drawings, although the repairs are extensive all over the building, the affected square footage of the repairs appears to be somewhat limited. The applicant notes that the elevation that faces the neighboring 600 Decatur St. (Wilkinson elevation) was by far the worst side. A photograph of that sides shows various areas of repair. Still, even if the deeper repairs and use of mesh was limited, it is staff's understanding that the Senerflex Fine Finish material was applied to almost the entire building.

The Committee also inquired about a test patch for the removal of the plastic mesh that was utilized at various repair locations. To staff's knowledge, no test patch removal has been completed. Staff notes that the use of lath or adherents of any kind are prohibited unless preapproved by the VCC. Staff would like to see an attempt to remove the mesh to understand the feasibility of removing the mesh without damaging the historic building fabric.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed retention.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 12/05/2023

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Sutton present on behalf of the application. Mr. Sutton noted that they were not removing old material but were repairing cracks only and skim coating the entire building. Mr. Fifield noted that the Committee was hoping for some rationale for the use of the product compared to traditional materials. Mr. Fifield also noted that a removal test patch was important. Mr. Sutton noted that the product could be removed but that it will damage the underlying material. Mr. Bergeron commented that we don't know how this material will perform long term and that there is a possibility it could trap moisture. Mr. Fifield stated that he was not hearing any reasons why this building was different from others and that he was worried about establishing a precedent. Mr. Block read the original permit that had been issued. Mr. Fifield inquired how the change happened to the product that was applied.

Ms. Sheely, in the audience, stated that they entered the project and started to fix the cracks and paint over the surface cracks but that because there were complaints from owners about the varying texture of the stucco, they went ahead with the texture and paint. Ms. Sheely continued that there was a wall that was not finished and that wall could be done per the permit to test and watch how the different materials performed. Mr. Fifield noted that knowing the substrate for the stucco may make a big difference and encouraged testing of the wall.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer to allow the applicant time to test the underlying material and to work with staff on any details. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 11/07/2023

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 11/07/2023
Permit # 22-35988-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Inspector: Marguerite Roberts

Proposal to retain work completed in deviation of approved permit, including improper stucco and plastic mesh, per application & materials received 12/05/2022 & 10/24/2023, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 11/07/2023

A permit was issued originally in December 2022 and then re-issued in August 2023 to make minor repairs to wood trim and stucco and to repaint the building to match the existing colors. An inspection on 10/23/2023 revealed that extensive stucco repairs were being made with pre-mixed materials that were not previously approved as well as synthetic mesh. The applicant provided spec sheets for two products

used: Master Builders Solutions StuccoBase and Senergy Senerflex.

The StuccoBase product is described as “Factory-blended mixture of Portland cement, reinforcing fibers, and other proprietary ingredients.” There is no mention of lime in the stucco mix at all. The stamped approved materials for this work included the VCC stucco recipe including the Portland cement ratio not to exceed one part in 12 with the majority of the mix being sand and lime.

The other product used on this building was the Senergy Senerflex. This material appeared to have the finish wall color integrated into it and was used as a skim coat on the building. This product is described on the spec sheet as a, “Factory-mixed, 100% acrylic polymer finish coat.”

Staff finds that this is one of those unfortunate situations without a direct path forward. These products could not be removed from the building without causing significant damage. If retained, the products used are not compatible with the historic materials and will likely create problems sometime in the future. Staff’s only recommendation would be that any areas that have not had either of these products applied receive repair as per VCC standard details and the different areas can be documented and compared over time.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 11/07/2023

Mr. Block read the staff report with Mr. Sutton present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield inquired if there were architect’s drawings for this work and what was the basis of the VCC approval. Mr. Sutton stated no architect’s drawings and Ms. Bourgogne noted that it was permitted as a basic repair and paint permit.

Mr. Schmidt, in the audience asked about the corresponding building permit and if the stucco used is substandard. Ms. Bourgogne confirmed that the building permit was not issued or paid for.

Mr. Fifield asked if the staff’s position was to wait and see how this material performed. Mr. Block expressed concern of the material not being easily removable without damaging historic fabric but also noted that over time, leaving the material may create more problems. Mr. Block noted that no work should take place until the building permit has been issued and that going forward, the correct stucco mix is used. Mr. Fifield noted that the applicant was seeking retention but there was no way of knowing where the work had actually been performed. Mr. Fifield continued that there was not a way to track and document over time where the unpermitted work occurred compared to the properly executed work.

Ms. Sheely, in the audience, noted that she was the New Jax Condo Association Board president. She continued that at their general annual meeting in January, the board gave permission to find a contractor and proceed with the patching of the stucco or any cracks in the stucco.

Mr. Fifield suggested that we are making an assumption that the material couldn’t be removed without damaging historic fabric and that a test patch of removal might be requested. Mr. Bergeron asked if he remembered correctly that a similar situation had been reviewed when he first joined the VCC of a mesh situation and asking how that was resolved. Ms. Roberts noted that it was not resolved.

Mr. Bergeron moved to defer the application to allow the applicant time to submit supporting documentation to the staff about the material and its performance over time as well as a set of architectural elevations that indicate the locations of all of the various repairs that have been performed to date. Mr. Fifield amended to the motion to include the ability to remove the mesh without damaging historic fabric, including a possible test patch. Mr. Bergeron accepted the amendment to the motion. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

522 Bourbon

ADDRESS:	522 Bourbon Street		
OWNER:	Anglade 500 Properties, LLC	APPLICANT:	Jennifer Taylor
ZONING:	VCE	SQUARE:	62
USE:	Commercial/nightclub	LOT SIZE:	9062 sq. ft.
DENSITY:		OPEN SPACE:	
ALLOWED:	15 units	REQUIRED:	2718 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	Unknown	EXISTING:	None
PROPOSED:	No change	PROPOSED:	No change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building: **Blue**, of major architectural and/or historic significance.

Despite years of neglect and direct injury, the exquisite detailing of this Renaissance Revival house, known as the "Rouzan House", remains striking. James Gallier Sr. possibly was the architect of this fine granite front townhouse, the detailing of which includes a pilastered entrance, pedimented window heads on the second floor front facade, wrought iron full length balcony on the second floor, basket balconies on the third floor, and a belvedere.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #24-01391-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to perform structural repairs at tower, including installation of helical ties and tie rods, per application & materials received 01/17/2024 & 02/25/2024. **[Notices of Violation sent 11/01/2019, 07/07/2021 & 12/28/2023]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

The Committee reviewed this proposal at the 02/06/24 hearing and deferred the proposal until the engineer could attend to explain the proposed changes to the structural repair plan. The architect has also submitted an elevation showing the visibility of the structural ties on the Bourbon side of the tower. Staff's report from 02/06/24 is unchanged:

The Committee approved structural masonry work at the tower on 08/09/2022, which was largely limited to the interior installation of wall straps and exterior brick repointing to address cracks. Staff issued permits shortly thereafter, but the work was not undertaken. The applicant has revised their application and is now proposing more extensive intervention. Instead of flat bar straps on the inside corners of the tower walls, the applicant is now proposing what looks to be four tie rods on the third and fourth floors of each elevation. It appears to be a total of 24 tie rods over two floors, with 6" round plates at each 1" rod. The rods are located above and below each floor level and span through the room instead of through floor joists.

Additionally, two different methods of using helical ties are proposed. The first uses 8mm helical ties installed in the mortar joint at every third course, using compatible mortar. The second method drills Helifix ties into the wall at approximately 30 degree angles, crisscrossing at 24" o.c. to be injected with Helifix helibond grout.

Staff is concerned that the proposed reinforcement has escalated significantly since permits were initially issued a year and a half ago, and requests that the applicant explain further why the more extensive repairs are needed. While helical ties installed in the mortar joint can be a sensitive method of intervention, staff shares the Committee's concerns regarding drilled ties: that their installation causes substantial damage to historic building materials, does not allow the building materials to experience thermal expansion in the same way, can displace cracking to other areas of the building in sometimes unpredictable ways, and does not allow for masonry to be salvaged and reconstructed if failure occurs in future. Additionally, the use of Helifix helibond grout is not appropriate considering its high PSI.

Staff seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding the proposed changes to the tower repair plan.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

711 Dauphine

ADDRESS:	709-713 Dauphine St.		
OWNER:	New Orleans Baptists Assoc.	APPLICANT:	Philip Wells
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	88
USE:	Commercial/Residential	LOT SIZE:	2,772 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: **Brown**, objectionable or of no architectural/historical significance

This nondescript complex of one and two story buildings may include portions of late 19th c. or earlier structures, which in the 20th cc. have been repeatedly altered in a detrimental fashion.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 24-02051-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Violation Case #22-02246-VCCNOP **Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to correct violations including the installation of new electronic keypad door hardware, per application & materials received 01/24/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

See Staff Analysis & Recommendation of 02/06/2024.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 02/06/2024

Architecture Committee Meeting of 02/06/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 02/06/2024
Permit # 24-02051-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Violation Case #22-02246-VCCNOP **Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to correct violations including the installation of new electronic keypad door hardware, per application & materials received 01/24/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 02/06/2024

Staff cited this property back in 2022 and an application was recently filed to address all of the violations. Staff found the majority of the proposed work, which includes replacement of deteriorated gallery deck boards with new wood boards and repairs to soffit materials, staff approvable. The one item staff wanted to bring before the Committee is the proposed installation of electronic keypad hardware.

The same electronic lock is proposed for installation at two separate doors that were previously cited for the installation of electronic keypads with large visible numbers. The proposed new lock features a black screen that only illuminates while in operation and can be unlocked with the keypad, thumbprint, or a hidden mechanical key. The current unpermitted keypad hardware did not replace any historic door hardware.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed new electronic hardware.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 02/06/2024

This item was deferred at staff's request prior to the start of the meeting.

1015-17 Dauphine

ADDRESS:	1015-17 Dauphine Street		
OWNER:	Richard M Handloff	APPLICANT:	Jubilee Construction Inc
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	84
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	x
DENSITY:		OPEN SPACE:	
ALLOWED:	x	REQUIRED:	x
EXISTING:	x	EXISTING:	x
PROPOSED:	x	PROPOSED:	x

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building & service building: **Brown**, detrimental, or of no architectural and/or historic significance

C. 1960 small 2-story brick apartment building, divided by a central passageway and a detached 2-story kitchen type structure. This building replaced a c. 1840 3-story brick building, which like its successor had a central passageway.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit #24-03926-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain silicone parapet cap on main building roof, per application & materials received 02/8/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

On 04/19/2023, staff issued a permit to install a new Ready Slate roof on the main building at 1015 Dauphine. The typical boilerplate was included on the permit, noting that metal cap flashing was not approved for installation. Upon inspection, staff noted that a peel and stick membrane had been installed in the valley gutter, which is approvable for retention. The membrane extends up the inside face of the parapet, is covered with Sure-Weld reinforced TPO, and is held in place with a termination bar installed horizontally on the top surface of the parapet. It is then capped with Gaco silicone.

Staff is concerned that the installation of the termination bar on the top surface of the parapet will not prove to be effective as a cap, even with the installation of the Gaco silicone. It was later determined that the building's outer walls, which had initially been thought to be masonry due to the presence of brick on the interior, is actually a wood frame wall with brick veneer on both the interior and exterior faces. As is typical in newer buildings with contemporary wall assemblies, particularly wood frame, staff finds the use of a metal cap to be the most appropriate solution. Staff does not find retention of the current parapet cap to be sufficient to prevent water intrusion and recommends **denial** of the appeal to retain the current conditions. A proposal to replace the termination bar and Gaco silicone with a metal parapet cap would be viewed favorably and could be approved at staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

1301 Chartres

ADDRESS:	1301 Chartres/601-03 Barracks		
OWNER:	1301 Rue Chartres Condominium Assoc.	APPLICANT:	Stephen Cox
ZONING:	VCR-2	SQUARE:	52
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	3,575 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

1301 Chartres/601-03 Barracks
Rating: **Green**: Of Local Architectural or Historical Importance.

At this address is a nice example of a late 1820s (c. 1827) Creole style brick corner building and detached kitchen. This double building retains arched ground floor openings, dormers, rear loggia and a wrought iron railing, originally a balcony but now extended into a gallery.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 24-05435-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Violation Case #23-06971-VCCNOP **Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to retain mini-split condensing unit mounted on masonry wall on side elevation of building, per application & materials received 02/27/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

Staff cited the installation of a new mechanical unit on the Royal St. elevation of the main building on this property. This unit was installed by a previous condo owner shortly before selling it to the applicant and current owner, who is now trying to correct the violation.

The location of this equipment actually crosses the property line onto the 609 Barracks St. property next door. Staff and the applicant have been in touch with that property owner regarding the proposal and it has been noted that written documentation will be needed from that owner if this is to be retained in this location. This may include an easement as well as approval from other City Departments. There is one existing unit on this wall which was reviewed and approved by the Committee in 2018, with similar requirements of approval from the neighboring property owner.

When staff spoke with the neighboring owner, he noted that he would approve such a proposal if the new unit is sized the same or smaller than the existing unit, the lines are properly run and secured, and there is clearance of at least 2’ between the unit and the existing fire escape.

The alleyway where this unit is located is quite narrow, so the unit is really only visible when looking directly down the alley. The existing fire escape also partially obscures the visibility. The associated line sets for this unit are currently haphazardly run up the exterior wall and jog away from the wall quite a bit. The proposed retention includes securing the line sets and making them more orderly.

Based off the previous approval for the other unit in this alley and the Guidelines which recommend, “*minimizing the visibility and quantity of mounted equipment on a parcel”* (VCC DG: 10-11) staff finds the proposed retention potentially approvable.

Provided that the owner of 607-609 Barracks provides the proper approval and documentation for the installation, which may include a required easement, and that work is done to clean up the currently haphazard line sets, staff recommends approval of the proposal with any final details to be worked out at the staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024

1109 Decatur

ADDRESS:	1109 Decatur St.		
OWNER:	Mon Tay Enterprises	APPLICANT:	Lawrence Lupin
ZONING:	VCC-1	SQUARE:	19
USE:	Commercial/Residential	LOT SIZE:	3,272 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: **Blue**, or of major architectural or historical importance.

This is one in the block-long row of three-story houses constructed c. 1830-31 by the prominent architects Gurlie and Guillot as rental property for the Ursulines Nuns after this religious house moved to its new quarters on Dauphine Street. Originally constructed in the typical Creole style, with arched ground floor openings (including a side passageway),balconies and upper level French doors, the buildings received a number of individual modifications in the 19th and 20th centuries. #1109 has altered millwork has been altered and its second-floor balcony has been extended into a gallery.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 03/12/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 03/12/2024
Permit # 24-05468-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to remove existing hood vent and access path and to install new inline fan exhaust and roof hatch, per application & materials received 02/27/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/12/2024

The existing kitchen exhaust for this property is atypically installed behind the service ell building wall, almost certainly across the property line onto the neighboring 1107 Decatur St. property and not a condition that can typically be approved. The existing conditions also feature an unfortunate rooftop access ladder or walkway across a significant part of the roof.

In order to remedy these conditions, the applicant proposes to install a new rooftop exhaust and a new roof hatch. Staff notes that this work is being proposed in conjunction with a staff approvable new slate roof. The proposed new exhaust would utilize an inline fan, so the above roof, visible portion of the exhaust system would only be a gooseneck duct measuring approximately 1-1/2’ by 1’. The proposal also includes a new roof hatch adjacent to the exhaust measuring approximately 2’6” wide by 3’ long. Staff questions if any of the existing roof framing would need to be modified in order to install either of these elements. Given the dimensions, it appears that the exhaust shouldn’t require changes to the framing but the access hatch likely would. If the roof joists are to be modified, staff requests this information be added to the plans.

The roof hatch is noted as being a galvannealed steel on both the curb and cover and appears to be painted in a dark grey finish. No notes are provided on the material or finish color of the exhaust. Staff notes care should be taken to avoid any possibility of galvanic reaction if copper is to be utilized with the new slate roof. If the exhaust is to be painted, staff recommends it be painted a color similar to the new roofing.

Compared to the existing conditions, staff finds the proposed to be a huge improvement. Although this proposal features two new roof penetrations, the removal of the atypical and likely non-approvable exterior duct and exhaust as well as the removal of the crude rooftop walkway are overall beneficial for the building. Staff requests that repairs to the wall that is currently pierced by the exhaust duct be added to the scope of work.

The Guidelines note that Commission level review is required for any new roof hatches. Staff recommends approval of the proposal with the roof hatch portion of the proposal to be forwarded to the Commission for review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/12/2024