



Vieux Carré Commission Architecture Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 11, 2025

The seal of the Vieux Carre Commission is an oval emblem. It features a central shield with a stylized fleur-de-lis and a scroll. The shield is flanked by two vertical bars with diamond shapes. The entire shield is enclosed within a circular border. The text "VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION" is written along the top arc of the border, and "ESTABLISHED 1936" is written along the bottom arc.

Old Business



518 Governor Nicholls

ADDRESS:	518-520 Governor Nicholls		
OWNER:	801 Patterson Owner LLC	APPLICANT:	Heather Cooper
ZONING:	VCR-2	SQUARE:	19
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	2,176 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: Green , of Local Architectural or Historic Importance

This is one in a row of three c. 1836-38, 3½ story masonry buildings with attached two-story masonry service wings. The facades of these Transitional style buildings, which perhaps were constructed by Claude Gurlie, who owned the property between 1836-38, present a symmetrical arrangement of arched openings on the ground floor and square-headed openings with French doors leading onto balconies on the upper floors. This building contains an exterior passageway, (arranged back-to-back with that of 516, to create the appearance of a carriageway), that leads to the rear court and semi-attached service wing.

<u>Architecture Committee Meeting of</u>	03/11/2025
<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023 & 02/18/2025.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

At the 02/11/2025 meeting the Committee conceptually approved a mechanical arrangement that was discussed during the meeting to locate all the equipment for both this property and the neighboring 524 Gov. Nicholls to the rear of the shared courtyard. The idea was the equipment would be stacked on a rack and screened from the rest of the courtyard. In formally implementing this plan and reviewing it with their mechanical contractor, the applicant found that one existing condensing unit in the loggia space would need to be retained, and one other condensing unit would need to be installed adjacent to this unit.

Staff finds it unfortunate that not all equipment could be consolidated to a single location, however, this location in the loggia space is very discrete and only visible from within the space itself. In addition to being in a discrete location, staff does not find the work needed to install a unit in this location to be overly invasive and could be reversed in the future.

There is also a question regarding the refrigerant lines for the courtyard mounted equipment. The applicant is proposing to run several of these lines along the underside of the courtyard facing balcony and into the loggia space where they will either enter the building or travel upward. There is a note about constructing a furdawn to minimize visual exposure of the lines, but this detail has not been fully developed. Staff requests additional information on this aspect of the proposal to ensure the impact of the lines and furdawn would be acceptable. Staff would not want to see the entire underside of the balcony become enclosed to accommodate the lines, for example.

Although the location of the loggia mechanical units does detract from the historic open stairway, staff finds the proposal consistent with the requirements of the Guidelines in terms of visibility. Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposed mechanical equipment and refringent lines.

<u>ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:</u>	03/11/2025
---	------------

<u>Architecture Committee Meeting of</u>	02/11/2025
<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	02/11/2025
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023 & 01/15/2025.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	02/11/2025
--	------------

This application was last reviewed at the 10/24/2023 meeting, where it was deferred partly over concerns of the units crossing the property line. The applicant has submitted revised proposals for this property as well as for 524 Gov. Nicholls, also on the agenda.

This proposal continues to locate units on the neighboring 524 Gov. Nicholls property. The revised proposal has eliminated a previously proposed wall mounted unit above the loggia entrance, but it now shows a wall mounted unit on the rear service ell wall.

Staff is concerned about the units crossing the property line, having the units spread throughout the site rather than being consolidated to one or two areas, and having wall mounted units. Staff notes that revised plans were sent yesterday on 02/10 but were not fully reviewed ahead of this meeting. The applicant noted that those plans eliminated units across the property line and installed both of the courtyard units at grade. In the loggia space, four units are proposed to be mounted high on the wall.

Staff prefers the plans only just submitted but is still concerned about the units wall mounted in the loggia. Staff notes a proposal recently approved at another property that consolidated all mechanical equipment to a single screened rack in the back of the courtyard and staff questions if a similar approach may be preferred for these installations and the ones for 524 Gov. Nicholls, which shares the same courtyard.

Staff recommends deferral of the application and recommends that the applicant submit various options for mechanical equipment installation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:
DRAFT

02/11/2025

This matter was heard in conjunction with the next agenda item 524 Governor Nicholls. Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Ms. Cooper present on behalf of the application. Ms. Cooper stated that DSP was ok with the mechanical crossing property lines, but the owner was open to whatever the VCC wanted. Mr. Albrecht stated, but they are independent lots of record. Mr. Fifield asked if they could discuss both together. Mr. Albrecht stated yes. At this point the ARC reviewed recently submitted drawings. Ms. Cooper stated that they would prefer option 2. She went on to say that they wanted to get it all out of the courtyard and put it in the stairwell, but the engineer told them it would be too hot, so they decided to switch it and move it all to the courtyard. For clarification Mr. Fifield asked, “so all stacked at rear with a screen?” Ms. Cooper stated yes. Mr. Bergeron asked if they would be ok with this solution. Ms. Cooper stated yes. Mr. Bergeron asked if they were planning to repave and perhaps, they could bury the lines. Ms. Cooper state that this was not part of the proposal at this time, but this might be a good option.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer today’s proposal but to give conceptual approval to the mechanical consolidation at the rear discussed today with all details at the stall level. Ms. Steward seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of
DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN

10/24/2023
10/24/2023
Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

10/24/2023

The Committee reviewed and approved a proposal for mechanical equipment at the neighboring 516 Gov. Nicholls property back in June, 2023. A new application has been filed with the plans primarily addressing the interior work of the renovation of this property. The majority of the exterior work has previously been permitted but these new plans do feature proposed new exterior mechanical equipment in need of Architecture Committee review.

The plans show four new units proposed at the first-floor level of the courtyard. Two units (keyed note 3) are actually shown in the alleyway on the 524 Gov. Nicholls property. Although these properties are used together, they are technically separate properties and staff questions how other departments may view the proposed crossing of property lines. These units are noted as being installed at the highest point within the corridor. Provided there are no complications with other City departments, staff finds the proposed location approvable.

The next unit (keyed note 2) is noted as being installed approximately 8’ above grade over the archway opening. This is a similar location as was approved at 516 Gov. Nicholls. As was the case for that

property, visibility of this unit is likely limited to within the courtyard itself. Still, staff questions if there may be an alternative location for this unit that would keep it off of the rear elevation of the main building. A location in the alleyway near the first two units (keyed note 3) would be more in keeping with the Guidelines.

The last unit at this level (keyed note 1) is shown at grade near the end of the service ell. Staff finds this location consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines and approvable.

At the second-floor level, one additional unit is proposed and is shown installed on the balcony at the end of the service ell. The installation of mechanical equipment on balconies and galleries is always discouraged and very rarely approved. Notably, photographs show an existing condensing unit in this location. Staff did a search of VCCs digital records and found no evidence of approval for this unit. Staff suggests that a wall mounted unit on the courtyard wall below the balcony may be a preferred location.

The associated lines for each of these units appear to feature relatively short runs. The plans note that the routing can be modified to within the length limitations. Staff requests that final plans be submitted that include final locations for refrigerant lines and that exterior exposed lines be kept to a minimum.

With the exception of the unit proposed on the balcony and possibly the one on the rear of the main building, staff finds the proposed exterior mechanical equipment consistent with the Guidelines. The equipment will be minimally visible except from within the property itself. Staff seeks clarification over the possible complication of having the units cross the property line and commentary from the Committee regarding the proposed balcony and rear wall mounted equipment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

10/24/2023

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Patten present on behalf of the application. Ms. Bourgogne noted that the VCC staff was dealing with a similar issue at another property and noted that the equipment cannot cross the property line. Mr. Patten stated that they could look at moving the condenser into the alleyway. Mr. Bergeron stated that he was surprised the staff was supporting the location in the alleyway.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved to defer the proposal to allow the applicant time to revise the proposal based on the discussion during the meeting. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.



524 Governor Nicholls

ADDRESS:	524 Governor Nicholls	APPLICANT:	Heather Cooper
OWNER:	801 Patterson Owner LLC	SQUARE:	19
ZONING:	VCR-2	LOT SIZE:	2,583 sq. ft.
USE:	Residential		

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: Green , of Local Architectural or Historic Importance

This is one in a row of three c. 1836-38, 3½ story masonry buildings with attached two-story masonry service wings. The facades of these Transitional style buildings, which perhaps were constructed by Claude Gurlie, who owned the property between 1836-38, present a symmetrical arrangement of arched openings on the ground floor and square-headed openings with French doors leading onto balconies on the upper floors. This building contains an exterior passageway, (arranged back-to-back with that of 516, to create the appearance of a carriageway), that leads to the rear court and semi-attached service wing.

Architecture Committee Meeting of	03/11/2025
DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:	03/11/2025
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023 & 02/18/2025.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:03/11/2025

Similar to at 518 Gov. Nicholls, the applicant found that the mechanical equipment could not all be consolidated to a single courtyard location. On this property, the applicant is proposing to install a single condensing unit in the open stairway adjacent to the carriageway. This location is similar to the one proposed for 518 Gov. Nicholls and it would very likely only be visible from within the stairways space itself. Staff does not believe there would be any visibility of this unit from the street or from within the courtyard. Like at 518 Gov. Nicholls, staff finds the addition of equipment in this secondary location unfortunate, but ultimately in keeping with the requirements of the Guidelines in terms of visibility.

The same concern regarding the running of refrigerant lines is also present on this property. Staff requests additional information on this aspect of the proposal to ensure the impact of the lines and furdown would be acceptable.

Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposed mechanical equipment and refringent lines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:03/11/2025

Architecture Committee Meeting of	02/11/2025
DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:	02/11/2025
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023 & 01/15/2025.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:02/11/2025

As noted with the previous application, this proposal was also last reviewed at the 10/24/2023 meeting and was deferred due to concerns over the amount of equipment proposed between the two applications.

The original revised proposal for today’s meeting showed three units at grade along the service ell, one wall mounted unit on the service ell, and a wall mounted unit above the loggia stairs. This would all be in addition to the two units in the carriageway that would service 518 Gov. Nicholls.

Additional revised plans for this property were also submitted just yesterday which eliminated the two units from the carriageway, shows four units along the service ell all at grade, and still proposed the wall mounted unit above the loggia stairs.

As with 518 Gov. Nicholls, staff questions if consolidating all the equipment for the two properties at the

rear of the courtyard may be more successful than spreading the units out as seen in the two proposals. Staff recommends deferral of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:
DRAFT

02/11/2025

This matter was heard in conjunction with the previous agenda item 524 Governor Nicholls. Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Ms. Cooper present on behalf of the application.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer today's proposal but to give conceptual approval to the mechanical consolidation at the rear discussed today with all details at the stall level. Ms. Steward seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of

10/24/2023

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:
Permit # 23-27608-VCGEN

10/24/2023

Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht

Proposal to install new exterior mechanical equipment in conjunction with ongoing renovation work, per application & materials received 10/09/2023.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

10/24/2023

This application is very similar to the one just reviewed for the neighboring 518 Gov. Nicholls property. The plans show four new units proposed on the first floor in the courtyard. Two of the units (keyed note 2) are above the carriageway and are noted as being installed approximately 8' above grade. Similar to at 518 Gov. Nicholls, staff questions if an alternative location may be available for these units to keep them off of the wall of main building. There appears to be additional room at grade near the next unit, keyed note 6.

In the corner of the rear wall of the main building and the service ell, an existing condensing unit is noted as being removed and a new unit (keyed note 6) installed at grade. The fourth unit (keyed note 1) is noted as being at grade and is shown at the end of the service ell. Staff finds these two proposed units at grade are approvable.

The lines for the various new units are shown running down the carriageway and running under the service ell balcony, respectively. The plans note that the lines can be modified as long as they are within the limitations of the equipment.

At the second-floor level, one additional unit is proposed and is shown installed on the balcony at the end of the service ell. Similar to 518 Gov. Nicholls, a unit in this location would be highly atypical. Staff does not believe there is currently any mechanical equipment on this balcony.

The associated lines at this property appear to be longer with one set traveling some distance down the alleyway and one set running most of the length of the service ell balcony. Again, staff requests final details on these lines and encourages them to be internalized or otherwise installed as discreetly as possible.

With the exception of the units proposed on the rear wall of the main building and on the balcony, staff finds the proposed exterior mechanical equipment consistent with the Guidelines. The equipment will be minimally visible except from within the property itself. Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposed wall and balcony mounted equipment and overall proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

10/24/2023

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Patten present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield stated that there was possibly some other technology that may be a better solution, noting that this proposal combined with the previous one was getting a little out of control. Mr. Patten stated that they were open to removing the unit from the balcony and that the line sets would be internal in fur downs. Mr. Fifield stated that he would like to see the visual impact in elevation. Mr. Bergeron continued that a building elevation showing details with a preference for units on the ground and screened.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron moved to defer the application to allow the applicant time to revise. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The seal of the Vieux Carre Commission is an oval emblem. It features a central shield with a fleur-de-lis at the top, a scroll at the bottom, and two vertical bars on the sides. The shield is surrounded by a decorative border. The text "VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION" is written in an arc across the top, and "ESTABLISHED 1936" is written in an arc across the bottom.

525 Iberville

ADDRESS:	525 Iberville	APPLICANT:	Studio Rise LLC
OWNER:	Mr. Big Management	SQUARE:	30
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	3,317 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant		

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: Yellow: Contributes to the character of the district.

Although this 3-story masonry warehouse building with a parapeted cornice appears to date from circa 1910 after a fire had struck the block, it actually may be a remnant of a mid-19th century structure.

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit # 24-30373-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to modify previously approved plans including the installation of additional rooftop mechanical equipment, per application & materials received 10/04/2024 & 02/27/2025, respectively.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

During preparation of construction documents for this project, the applicant returned to staff noting that additional rooftop mechanical equipment would be needed. This included three mini split condensing units and a new dedicated outdoor air unit. The three mini split condensing units would be located adjacent to previously approved condensing units and being comparably sized, staff has no objection to the addition of these units.

The dedicated outdoor air unit is a considerably larger piece of equipment, measuring nearly 70” tall by 84-1/2” long and about 53” wide. This unit is proposed for installation closer to the back of the building but still more than 19’ from the rear wall of the building. The unit is shown more than 10’ from the sides of the building. Given the height of the building and location of the rooftop mechanical equipment, there would continue to be no visibility from any locations from the ground. Staff suspects that there would be visible from the upper floors of a few neighboring properties, but staff does not find this visibility to be overly obtrusive or objectionable. As such, staff finds this proposal for additional mechanical equipment in keeping with the Guidelines which allow for rooftop equipment that is not visibly obtrusive. (VCC DG: 04-11)

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

<u>ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:</u>	03/11/2025
---	------------

<u>Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of</u>	<u>12/18/2024</u>
---	--------------------------

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	12/18/2024
Permit # 24-30373-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to renovate building including the installation of new skylights, in conjunction with a change of use from vacant to mixed use, per application & materials received 10/04/2024.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	12/18/2024
--	------------

See Staff Analysis & Recommendation of 11/20/2024.

<u>VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:</u>	12/18/2024
--	------------

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Heck present on behalf of the application. Mr. Heck commented that the building had been vacant since the 80s and that for the skylights, they looked at the roof in total and kept the amount under 3% as per the Guidelines. Mr. Heck noted that the small commercial space had been removed from the proposal so there were now just nine residential units with a lobby. Ms. Virdue asked about moving the wall 7”. Mr. Heck replied that there was an existing elevator shaft that they planed to modify and use that required moving the wall. Ms. Virdue asked about the type of roofing on the lower roof. Mr. Heck responded that it was a mod. bit. roof and noted that the roof contained all new steel framing. Ms. Virdue asked about the reasoning of proposing to split the

courtyard. Mr. Heck replied that it was a small courtyard so they were hoping to add some privacy. Ms. Virdue replied that she might recommend a shorter wall or a pass through. Mr. Weaver asked about the agenda item stating that the change of use was to mixed use. Mr. Heck responded that they had previously had commercial space but this was eliminated because of the requirements of having commercial space.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Virdure made the motion for the conceptual approval of the modifications with the details to be developed with the ARC and to forward a positive recommendation to Safety and Permits regarding the change of use. Mr. Bergeron asked if she would amend her motion to state, details at staff and only return to the ARC if necessary. Mr. Virdure accepted the amendment. Mr. Tilton seconded the amended motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of

11/20/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:11/20/2024

Permit # 24-30373-VCGENLead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to renovate building including the installation of new skylights, in conjunction with a change of use from vacant to mixed use, per application & materials received 10/04/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

11/20/2024

The proposed work would convert the currently vacant building into nine condo units and a ground floor commercial space. The condo units are noted as averaging 896 sq. ft. per unit. The vast majority of the proposed work is on the interior, but a few exterior items are in need of Commission level review, as well as the work related to the proposed change of use.

Roof

The applicant proposes to replace the existing roof and move the existing penthouse front wall forward a distance of 7". The history of this building notes a proposal to construct a fourth-floor penthouse in the early 90s. The proposal was approved and the report continues that the applicant later returned with a revised proposal to not build out the penthouse at that time but to still raise the roof in the approved location of the penthouse. It appears this work was done and this is the area now proposed to be reworked by the current applicant. The proposal to move the wall slightly forward is in order to accommodate a new elevator. The front wall is proposed to be rebuilt with a slope to match the low slope of the roof behind the wall. Staff does not find this aspect of the proposal to be objectionable.

The applicant proposes to install a series of twelve new air conditioners on the low sloped roof of the building. These would be located a minimum of a little over 10' from any roof edge and therefore should not require a guardrail or other safety elements. Staff does not find the proposed rooftop location to be problematic.

Finally, the applicant proposes the installation of a total of eleven new skylights on the upper and lower roofs in a variety of sizes. The Guidelines for skylights include recommendations that the visibility of any skylights be minimized, the installation of the skylight requires minimal changes to the roof framing, and that the number of skylights be limited to a maximum of 3% of the roof slope.

On the raised roof portion, five small square skylights are proposed, each measuring about 2' square. Four rectangular skylights are also proposed, each measuring about 2' by 5'. In total, the proposed skylights on the upper roof would measure about 64 sq. ft. on the approximately 2,555 sq. ft. roof, representing about 2-1/2% of the upper roof. The amount of skylights on the upper roof is also within the recommendations of the Guidelines.

On the lower roof immediately behind the front parapet wall, the applicant has revised the proposal since the Architecture Committee and now proposes two rectangular skylights each measuring about 2' x 4'. On this roof, the skylights would total 16 sq. ft. of the 254 sq. ft. roof, representing about 6.3% of this roof.

Staff notes that the skylights on this lower roof portion would occupy about 6.3% of this roof area, well beyond what is recommended by the Guidelines. Combining the upper and lower roof areas and looking at the roof in it's entirety, the proposed skylights measure slightly under the 3% guideline.

Courtyard

The other area of significant exterior work occurs in the courtyard where the applicant proposes to remove the existing concrete slab. The plans show the installation of new brick paving in the courtyard as well as a proposed new 8' tall brick wall to divide the courtyard into two. The separation of

courtyards into individual areas is atypical and generally discouraged by the VCC. However, given the small size and more utilitarian nature of this courtyard, staff does not find the proposed dividing wall to be overly objectionable.

Summary

In summary, staff appreciates the efforts of the applicant to take a relatively light approach with the exterior of this building in order to bring it back into commerce. Staff recommends approval of the proposed skylights and other work related to the change of use with any final details to be worked out at the staff level.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 11/20/2024

This item was deferred as there was no one present on behalf of the application.

Architecture Committee Meeting of **10/22/2024**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 10/22/2024
Permit # 24-30373-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate building including the installation of new skylights and rooftop mechanical equipment, in conjunction with a change of use from vacant to residential, per application & materials received 10/04/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 10/22/2024

The proposed work would convert the currently vacant building into nine condo units and a ground floor commercial space. The condo units are noted as averaging 896 sq. ft. per unit. The vast majority of the proposed work is on the interior, but a few exterior items are in need of Architecture Committee review.

Roof

The applicant proposes to replace the existing roof and move the existing penthouse front wall forward a distance of 7". The history of this building notes a proposal to construct a fourth-floor penthouse in the early 90s. The proposal was approved and the report continues that the applicant later returned with a revised proposal to not build out the penthouse at that time but to still raise the roof in the approved location of the penthouse. It appears this work was done and this is the area now proposed to be reworked by the current applicant. The proposal to move the wall slightly forward is in order to accommodate a new elevator. The front wall is proposed to be rebuilt with a slope to match the low slope of the roof behind the wall. Staff does not find this aspect of the proposal to be objectionable.

The applicant proposes to install a series of twelve new air conditioners on the low sloped roof of the building. These would be located a minimum of a little over 10' from any roof edge and therefore should not require a guardrail or other safety elements. The only alternative location for mechanical equipment on this property would be within the courtyard, but staff does not find the proposed rooftop location to be problematic.

Finally, the applicant proposes the installation of a total of eleven new skylights on the upper and lower roofs in a variety of sizes. On the raised roof portion, five small square skylights are proposed, each measuring about 2' square. Four rectangular skylights are also proposed, each measuring about 2' by 5'. In total, the proposed skylights on the upper roof would measure about 64 sq. ft. on the approximately 2,555 sq. ft. roof, representing about 2-1/2% of the upper roof.

On the lower roof immediately behind the front parapet wall, two larger square skylights are proposed each measuring 4' square. On this roof, the skylights would total over 33 sq. ft. of the 254 sq. ft. roof, representing about 13% of the roof.

The Guidelines for skylights include recommendations that the visibility of any skylights be minimized, the installation of the skylight requires minimal changes to the roof framing, and that the number of skylights be limited to a maximum of 3% of the roof slope.

Although staff suspects that some reframing would be necessary at the proposed upper roof, specifically because the rectangular skylights are not all shown parallel with one another, as this raised roof portion is not believed to be historic, staff has fewer concerns about reframing here. The amount of skylights on this upper roof is also within the recommendations of the Guidelines.

At the lower roof, reframing is very likely also necessary to accommodate the 4' square skylights. As the roof framing in this location is very possibly more historic, staff is more hesitant to reframe this portion of the roof. Additionally, staff notes that the large skylights would occupy about 13% of this roof area, well beyond what is recommended by the Guidelines. Staff also notes that if you looked at the

roof and skylights as all being on the same plane, the square footage of skylights is still over the amount recommended by the Guidelines at about 3.5%. Staff recommends that the large square skylights, marked as H, be revised to be more consistent with the Guidelines.

Courtyard

The other area of significant exterior work occurs in the courtyard where the applicant proposes to remove the existing concrete slab. The plans show the installation of new brick paving in the courtyard as well as a proposed new 8' tall brick wall to divide the courtyard into two. The separation of courtyards into individual areas is atypical and generally discouraged by the VCC. However, given the small size and more utilitarian nature of this courtyard, staff does not find the proposed dividing wall to be overly objectionable.

Summary

In summary, staff appreciates the efforts of the applicant to take a relatively light approach with the exterior of this building in order to bring it back into commerce. If the applicant has not done so already, staff recommends contacting the Zoning Department regarding the number of units being proposed, but it appears there are options available in the CZO that would make this overall proposal approvable per Zoning.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal with the applicant to revise the skylight aspect of the proposal as noted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:
DRAFT

10/22/2024

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Heck present on behalf of the application. Mr. Heck noted that the front area roof had been restructured and it was non-historic framing. Mr. Heck continued that the it was there intention to keep the stairs in their current location and that the need more space for the elevator. Mr. Heck noted that he has filed an application with the BZA.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the conceptual approval of the work with the applicant to work with staff on the details. Ms. Steward seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.



New Business



531 Dauphine

ADDRESS:	531-33 Dauphine Street		
OWNER:	531-533 Dauphine St. LLC	APPLICANT:	Daniel Winkert
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	90
USE:	Unknown	LOT SIZE:	4,070 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Main Building (destroyed by fire in 2023): yellow, contributes to the character of the district;
Service building: green, of local architectural/historical importance;
Rear building: brown, objectionable, or of no architectural/historical significance.

The early (c. 1835) Creole cottage at this address actually is only a shell of a building (front wall, roof) that is used, along with the rear area, for surface parking. The building burned in 2023 and was demolished.

<u>Architecture Committee Meeting of</u>	<u>03/11/2025</u>
<hr/>	
<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit # 24-00633-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht
Violation Case #25-00401-DBNVCC	Inspector: Marguerite Roberts

Proposal to construct new wood fence and gate across the front property line, per application & materials received 01/09/2024 & 02/14/2025, respectively.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

Prior to the front building burning in 2023, this building was truly just a shell of the former Creole cottage with the front wall and a roof but the walls facing the interior of the property long demolished. Following the 2023 fire, these remaining elements were completely demolished and a temporary construction fence installed. The applicant is now proposing to construct a more permanent wood fence. Notably, this application was filed over a year ago and had been in the process of seeking a variance to have a fence at 8’ in height as the CZO states that fences are limited to 7’ in height in historic districts. The City Planning Commission ultimately determined that no variance was needed. Staff has also confirmed with the Building Department that a wood fence at this height would meet building codes.

Architecturally, staff has some concerns about this proposal. The previously existing material along this front property line was the masonry wall of the former building. As the new fence is now proposed in wood, staff is concerned about this downgrade in material. The Guidelines state that, “*a vertical or horizontal wood board fence is typically about 6- to 8-feet tall and is generally located at a rear or side yard.*” (VCC DG: 10-5) Although the front building no longer exists, there is still a green-rated rear building on the property. The Guidelines also state that, “*the VCC does not allow solid wood fencing or a wall located at the front façade of a building.*” (VCC DG: 10-7)

Staff quickly surveyed properties in the district that have large side yards or feature buildings that are well set back from the street. Examples included 1025 St. Louis (stuccoed masonry with metal gates), 909 Ursulines (exposed bricks with metal gates), 1022 Toulouse (stuccoed masonry with metal gate), 535 Barracks (exposed brick wood gate), 711 Barracks (stuccoed masonry with wood gates), and 1021 Dumaine (stuccoed masonry with wood and metal gates). The closest example of something like the proposed was seen at 931 St. Louis which features a vertical board wood fence and a wood gate. Prior to the current wood fence at 931 St. Louis, there was a contemporary metal fence which was approved to be replaced based on historic documentation that a wood gate was in place here prior to the 1980s metal fence.

As masonry is the typical materials seen in these situations and the previously existing condition was masonry, staff questions the appropriateness of a new wood fence. Staff recommends that any new fence be masonry, such as a stuccoed brick fence. Ideally, this property would be fully redeveloped and eliminate the need for a front property line fence.

Staff recommends denial of the current proposal for a wood fence with the applicant to revise the proposal to feature masonry.

<u>ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:</u>	03/11/2025
---	------------



827-29 St Philip

ADDRESS:	827-29 St. Philip Street		
OWNER:	Gregory A Johnson	APPLICANT:	Cangelosi, Jr Robert
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	77
USE:	Vacant	LOT SIZE:	2,569.3 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

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

This building is one in a pair of c. 1821 (or perhaps earlier), 4-bay Creole cottages, which have plastered walls, wide cornice banding, banding outlining the sides of the front façade, and an inverted pitched roofline. The historically adjoined, two detached kitchens were allowed to deteriorate by their owners, the Matassa family, and they subsequently were demolished. [N.B: At the time the VCS chains of title were abstracted, the building sat on two separate lots, 827 St. Philip (Lot 22952) and 829 St. Philip (Lot 22953).]

Architecture Committee Meeting of **03/11/2025**

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit #25-04510-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Proposal to renovate both buildings and courtyard, including new millwork, pavers, and foundation vents, per application & materials received 02/12/2025.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: **03/11/2025**

The following work is proposed as part of the overall renovation:

- One foundation vent is proposed for the front elevation of the main building, with two new corresponding vents at the back. Staff requests confirmation that they will match the one existing vent. Staff finds the proposed vents **conceptually approvable**, but notes that there is a conflicting hose bib in one of the rear locations. The relocation of the hose bib should be noted on the drawings.
- At the rear entrances to the main building, a note calls for “removing slate and stucco where removed.” Staff requests more information regarding whether this will be a full replacement to match existing, or if different materials will be used.
- Currently, one HVAC condenser is located on the rear roof slope of the main building. The applicant proposes to relocate the HVAC to the courtyard, which staff finds **conceptually approvable** per the Guidelines. Staff requests confirmation that the larger unit will be the same equipment currently on the roof. Manufacturer’s spec sheets will be required for the smaller unit. Drawings should indicate how condensate lines will run, and platform and screening details are needed.
- The concrete paving that previously existed in the alley and courtyard was demolished under a previous permit, and new flagstone pavers are shown in the site plan. Staff finds this upgrade in materials **conceptually approvable** but will need a section showing that the pavers are permeable. Dimensions and a section should likewise be provided for the new planters.
- It is not clear if the fountain shown in the site plan is new, or if the existing fountain will be modified, but it is shown as a stuccoed masonry with a flagstone cap. Staff finds it **conceptually approvable**, with clarification to be provided on the drawings to indicate if it is a repair or new construction.
- The doors and windows at the rear, unrated structure are to be maintained, but the inappropriate frames and shutters are to be rebuilt. Full millwork drawings, including an elevation, must be provided, but this is **conceptually approvable** as the existing conditions are clearly detrimental.
- Staff notes that inappropriate floodlights are present at the rear of the main building. Alternatives should be included in this scope of work.
- The applicant proposes to modify the existing metal gates with expanded mesh, raising the bottom to allow for full operability. The expanded mesh is unfortunately prescribed but staff has no issue with modifications for functionality. However, if the applicant wished to install a board and batten gate instead, that would be more appropriate for the style, age, and rating of this building.

Staff finds the overall proposal to be **conceptually approvable**, with additional drawings and revisions to be completed as noted above and discussed with the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: **03/11/2025**



612 Bourbon

ADDRESS:	612-16 Bourbon Street		
OWNER:	Karno 613 Royal Real Estate LL	APPLICANT:	Gary Krasnow
ZONING:	VCE	SQUARE:	61
USE:	Commercial	LOT SIZE:	4570 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main buildings & service buildings: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.

Although a 1789 building contract for a Creole cottage on this site is recorded, this one-story typical masonry double Creole cottage with abat-vent most likely dates from the early 1800s (c. 1812).

Architecture Committee Meeting of **03/11/2025**

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit #25-03754-VC GEN	Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Proposal to install new mechanical equipment, including hood vent, modify millwork, and demolish chimney, per application & materials received 02/05/2025.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

See Staff Analysis & Recommendation dated 02/25/2025.

<u>ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:</u>	03/11/2025
---	------------

Architecture Committee Meeting of **02/25/2025**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 02/25/2025
Permit #25-03754-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to install new mechanical equipment, including hood vent, modify millwork, and demolish chimney, per application & materials received 02/05/2025.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 02/25/2025

Work appears to be limited to the main building and rear infill addition at 612 Bourbon, and primarily consists of mechanical work for the restaurant. A new kitchen supply fan and exhaust vent are proposed on the flat roof of the infill, which will be screened by a new rail installed on the courtyard side. A 6'-9" x 8'-8" platform supporting a VRF unit is also proposed on the rear roof slope of the Green rated cottage, adjacent to the dormer. Steps from the lower flat roof are required to access the platform. Structural drawings have been provided which show interior reinforcement in both buildings under the new equipment. The flat roof is accessed through an inappropriate door in the existing dormer, which is not original. No work is proposed at this dormer, and it appears to have been in this condition for some significant time.

Staff is concerned that the hood vent may be too close to the property line to be found approvable by the Mechanical Division of Safety and Permits, as vent setbacks have been inconsistently enforced. It may also be visible down the alley from the public right of way, so screening may be needed. Additionally, two gas water heaters are proposed to be mounted to the side wall of the cottage down this alley. Manufacturer's spec sheets must be submitted for the water heaters, and more information about the locations and size of the gas lines should also be provided.

The applicant proposes to demolish an anachronistic chimney at the St. Peter and Royal corner of the cottage. Staff has no objection and finds this approvable, as it is clearly not a historic roof feature.

The proposal also includes replacement millwork, with the French doors closest to Bourbon on the St. Peter elevation noted to be fixed in place. Staff requests that the applicant provide more information about this aspect of the proposal, as the Guidelines highly discourage this type of modification. If the Committee finds it approvable, the millwork must be functional so future modifications could restore operability.

Flashing details for the roof penetrations must be provided for review at staff level prior to permit. Shop drawings will be needed for final approval of all new millwork prior to fabrication and installation. Spec sheets for all mechanical equipment are also needed for review of size and sound data. Staff recommends minor revisions to the flat roof rail/screening, but is happy to handle that with the applicant at staff level. Staff also suggests that the applicant take the opportunity to replace the inappropriate and worn torch down flat roof with TPO before the new equipment is installed.

Staff recommends **conceptual approval**, with revisions as noted above, and all mechanical specs to be reviewed and approved at staff level, provided that they are within the typical size and noise output range for similar equipment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 02/25/2025

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



838 Esplanade

ADDRESS:	836-42 Esplanade		
OWNER:	Soniat & Menish Enterprises	APPLICANT:	Studio West
ZONING:	VCR-2	SQUARE:	80
USE:	Restaurant	LOT SIZE:	1863 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: **Yellow** - contributes to the character of the district.

Mortise and tenon construction on the second story of the two-story portion of the building indicates that an earlier single-story building that stood on the property in 1909 was likely incorporated into the existing building when the ground-floor commercial space, with wooden balustraded galleries with typical detailing of a late Victorian/Edwardian corner store, and an octagonal tower were added ca. 1910. Its appearance, however, has been marred by alterations to the millwork openings on both street elevations, and the removal of the gallery and third floor of the original octagonal corner tower.

Architecture Committee Meeting of **03/11/2025**

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u> Permit #25-03251-VCGEN	03/11/2025 Lead Staff: Erin Vogt
--	--

Proposal to repair millwork, replace gate, and alter a window, per application & materials received 02/10/2025 & 02/26/2025, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 03/11/2025

The proposed millwork repairs are to match existing and are approvable at staff level. While they involve repairs to millwork that was initially installed without permit, retention was approved in 2019.

The Dauphine side gate will be replaced with a new wooden gate. While the elevation calls for tongue and groove wood plans, the width of the boards is not specified, and the jamb detail provided shows vertical boards that are not tongue and groove. A 4" gap is left between the bottom of the gate and grade. While staff understands the desire for a gap, it would be preferable if it were to be reduced, as 4" is much higher than is typically seen for a wood gate. Staff finds gate replacement **conceptually approvable** with the proviso that revisions are needed, and will work with the applicant on revising some of the details to be more in keeping with typical VCC detail sheets.

An existing vinyl window at the Dauphine side of the building was installed without permit some years ago, and is used to access the rooftop HVAC equipment. In 2020, the Committee reviewed and conceptually approved an application to install a single outswinging casement, but that work was never permitted or completed. At the time, the applicant felt that an outswinging casement could be made watertight, and interior conditions prevented an interior swing. The applicant is now proposing to install a six lite inswinging casement window. Staff finds this to be more appropriate in comparison to the 2020 proposal, and a vast upgrade over current conditions, and recommends **approval**.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 03/11/2025



1002 St Peter
637-41 Burgundy

ADDRESS:	637-641 Burgundy, 1002 St. Peter		
OWNER:	Burgundy St Associates LLC	APPLICANT:	Eric Sharp
ZONING:	VCR-1	SQUARE:	100
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	2,708 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Rating: Main building: Green, or of local architectural and/or historical importance.
 Addition to rear of main building: Brown, or of no importance.

This is a c. 1848 six bay triple Creole cottage with hipped roof and wide overhang. The historic detached kitchen has been demolished.

Architecture Committee Meeting of	03/11/2025
--	-------------------

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit # 25-05179-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to replace unpermitted keypad gate hardware with new electronic hardware, per application and materials received 02/18/2025.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

The gate is located on the St. Peter side of the property to access the courtyard space. The proposed new hardware features a sliding cover that hides the keypad numbers when not in use. Staff finds this style greatly preferred over the existing hardware with visible keypad. Staff notes that the cover will need to remain intact and should be closed when not in use.

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

<u>ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:</u>	03/11/2025
---	------------

The seal of the Vieux Carre Commission is an oval emblem. It features a central shield with a fleur-de-lis at the top, a scroll at the bottom, and a central shield with a fleur-de-lis. The shield is flanked by two vertical bars with diamond shapes. The text "VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION" is arched across the top, and "ESTABLISHED 1936" is arched across the bottom.

400 N Rampart

ADDRESS:	400 N Rampart	APPLICANT:	Albert Architecture
OWNER:	Start Corporation	SQUARE:	98
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	7,920 sq. ft.
USE:	Community Center		

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Our Lady of Guadalupe Church's St. Jude Community Center, a two-story early 20th-century industrial building with simple Art Deco lines. The building had its original design revealed in a 1981-1982 renovation.

Main building – Yellow

Architecture Committee Meeting of	03/11/2025
--	-------------------

<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	03/11/2025
Permit # 25-06280-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to renovate building including the construction of a rooftop addition, per application & materials received 02/26/2025.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:</u>	03/11/2025
--	------------

A major renovation is proposed for this building but the exterior work on the elevations is pretty limited and only includes minor repairs to windows and doors and replacing the existing awning. Proposed work at the rooftop level is much more significant.

On the roof, the applicant proposes to demolish what is labeled as a mechanical room and measures approximately 1,200 sq. ft. This portion of the building rises about 9-1/2’ above the existing parapet on the Conti elevation and is located all across the Burgundy side of the building. There is an existing rooftop feature along the N. Rampart side of the building which will remain largely intact and will guide the proposed new rooftop additions. Staff found that in the mid-1980s, a major renovation was completed which included extending the parapets up to their current height and the construction of the existing rooftop additions, with the portion proposed to remain labeled as the observation room.

The applicant essentially proposes to replicate the angled roofline of the observation room three additional times across the roof. The now built-up mechanical room would become a sunken mechanical area with the equipment shown on the roof of the existing building and surrounded by the new addition. Staff measured the tallest portion of the rooftop addition at 5-1/2’ above the existing parapet on the Conti side of the building, with the parapet itself noted as being 9-1/2’ tall. In other words, the addition would rise a maximum of 15’ above the existing flat roof. The portion of the addition closest to the parapets is shorter, rising approximately 9-1/2’ above the flat roof. The wall of this portion of the addition is setback behind the parapet a distance of about 7-1/2’. The Guidelines for rooftop additions state that, “*the VCC requires that a rooftop addition be set back from the street facades of the building by a minimum of the overall height of the addition.*” (VCC DG: 14-17) In this instance, the addition is set about 1’ to 2’ closer to the edge of the roof than required by Guidelines. Still, staff notes the large height of this parapet, which should eliminate a great deal of visibility of the addition. With this building being located on N. Rampart and with a notable lack of neighboring buildings, there are street level vantage points that would have visibility of the tallest portions of the proposed addition.

If measured from the tallest point of the proposed new angled roofs, the proposed addition would be taller than allowed by Guidelines at approximately 15’ above the flat roof. The Guidelines state that, “*the VCC limits the overall height of a rooftop addition, including framing and parapet, to 12’-0” above the lowest surface of the existing roof, except for code required components, such as an elevator override.*” (VCC DG: 14-17) Still, staff notes that the tallest portion of this proposed addition would match the tallest point of the 1980s rooftop addition. Additionally, if measured from the midpoint of the angled roof rather than the peak, the addition measures closer to 12-1/2’.

The floor plan on A3 shows that the majority of the rooftop addition would be utilized as sleeping units for the community center and staff notes that no change of use is being contemplated with this work. The portion of flat roof between the addition and the existing parapet is shown as being accessible from the abutting sleeping unit. With the parapet rising 9-1/2’ above this activated roof area, there would be no visibility of these private roof terraces. The size of these private roof areas varies from unit to unit but appears to typically be around 80 sq. ft.

Staff notes a few inconsistencies on the floor plan for the rooftop addition on A3. These include notes for several skylights as part of the addition, but these are not seen on the roof plan or elsewhere in the plans for the rooftop addition. The floor plan also has a note about the parapet being 6’ tall but it is noted and

shown considerably taller on other sheets.

In summary, there are aspects of this proposal that appear to be against or not recommended by the Guidelines. Notably, the Guidelines state that, “*the VCC does not recommend a rooftop addition on a green, pink, or yellow rated building*” or “*a rooftop addition on a building of less than three full stories in height.*” Still, staff notes that the proposal is fairly consistent with the existing rooftop addition and the tall parapet should shield the great majority of the addition. Staff seeks clarification from the applicant regarding a few of the inconsistencies noted in the plans as well as commentary from the Committee regarding the overall project. Staff notes that any rooftop addition requires full Commission approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

03/11/2025

The seal of the Vieux Carre Commission is an oval emblem. It features a central shield with a stylized fleur-de-lis and a scroll. The shield is flanked by two vertical bars. The text "VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION" is arched across the top, and "ESTABLISHED 1936" is arched across the bottom.

Appeals and Violations



ADDRESS:738-42 Royal & 638 St Ann

OWNER:St Ann/Royal LLC & J & R

ZONING:VCC-2

USE:Commercial/Residential

APPLICANT:Myles Martin

SQUARE:46

LOT SIZE:3,645 sq. ft.

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Rating: Blue: Of Major Architectural or Historical Importance.

In the late 1830s, the wardens of St. Louis Cathedral constructed a row of five, 3-story red brick buildings on Royal St. between Pere Antoine Alley and St. Ann Street. 738 & 742 Royal Street are two of these five buildings. Each structure originally had arched ground floor openings, square-headed upper openings, and attached 3-story service ells, which faced small courtyards.

Architecture Committee Meeting of03/11/2025

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:03/11/2025

Permit # 24-34621-VCGENLead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to retain copper flashing cap in location of previously existing terra cotta tiles, per application & materials received 11/25/2024 & 02/25/2025, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:03/11/2025

This application was deferred at the 12/10/2024 meeting at the applicant’s request to allow time for more information to be gathered. The applicant submitted additional documentation noting that the work was done due to concerns over water infiltration and arguing that the copper flashing provides better waterproofing compared to the previously existing terra cotta. Staff has observed other applicants and contractors struggle with this detail where a single sloped roof transitions immediately to a vertical wall with no parapet for the roof to be flashed into. Staff does not have a standard detail on this and would typically recommend the historic or existing treatment, in this case the previously existing terra cotta tiles. Staff questions if the ridge tiles could still be installed over the copper flashing and if this may be approvable.

Staff does not find the retention of the as-built exposed flashing to be appropriate and requests commentary from the Committee regarding preferred detailing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:03/11/2025

Architecture Committee Meeting of12/10/2024

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:12/10/2024

Permit # 24-34621-VCGENLead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to retain copper flashing cap in location of previously existing terra cotta tiles, per application & materials received 11/25/2024.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:12/10/2024

A permit was issued for a new slate roof on this building originally in 2022 and re-issued in February of this year. The permit contained the standard language not allowing for cap flashing on parapets, chimneys, or surrounding walls. Plans were also submitted with the application that included details for various things such as mortar caps and terracotta ridge tiles. Photos sent from the applicant showed that the ridge of the portion of the building facing St. Ann was not completed per the plans or to match the previously existing condition. Instead, this ridge was capped in copper flashing.

Previously, this ridge featured terra cotta tiles along its entire length and the permit was for this detail to be matched with the new roof. The applicant is proposing to retain the copper cap flashing as installed. The other ridges have the terracotta ridge tiles as permitted. This ridge appears to be the only one on the building which features a sloped roof with slate shingles on one side and a vertical masonry wall on the other side. The other ridges with ridge tiles are sloped on both sides of the tiles. As such, some kind of alternative detailing may be appropriate here, but staff questions the appropriateness of the as-built detail.

Staff notes that the building on the opposite end of the block features the same condition of sloped slate shingles coming up to the vertical wall and this ridge is finished with ridge tiles.

Staff does not find the retention of the as-built flashing to be appropriate and requests commentary from the Committee regarding preferred detailing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

12/10/2024

Ms. Bourgogne read the staff report with Mr. Martin present on behalf of the application. Mr. Martin relayed a message from the contactor stating the flashing was used to create a watertight system; that the terra cotta ridge cap could not cover the ridge at this location and the flashing eliminated water intrusion. Mr. Martin stated the deviation was done by the contractor and roofing contractor without submittal with Mr. Martin requesting deferral to come back with more information.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to defer per the applicant's request. Ms. Steward seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.