

VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION

LaToya Cantrell
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block
DIRECTOR

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2022

1:00 PM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1300 PERDIDO ST, NEW ORLEANS, LA 70112

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. TEMPORARY ELECTION OF OFFICERS
- III. REVIEW OF MINUTES
- IV. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
- V. DIRECTOR'S REPORT
- VI. OTHER BUSINESS
Initial non-binding review of proposal to allow parklets to become permitted on a permanent basis.
- VII. CHANGE OF USE HEARINGS
530-34 Bourbon St: 22-06941-VCSGN Pro Signs & Graphics, applicant; Akm Acquisitions LLC, owner; Proposal to install double-sided neon sign in conjunction with **change of use** from *vacant (bar)* to *retail*, per application & materials received 03/08/2022.
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=918224>
- VIII. APPEALS AND VIOLATIONS
624 Dumaine St: 19-02566-VCGEN; Hank Smith, applicant; Bienville Street Outback LLC, owner; Proposal to stucco over improperly repaired masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/31/2019 & 04/06/2022, respectively.
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=791830>

327 Bourbon St: 21-34253-VCGEN; Bob Ellis, applicant; Karno 327 Bourbon Street Real Estate LLC, owner; Review of unpermitted demolition of rear enclosed wood gallery, per application & materials received 12/09/2021. [Notices of Violation sent 07/14/2016, 04/22/2019, 04/28/2021, & 12/13/2021]
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=909930>

830 Burgundy St: 22-00825-VCGEN; Quitman Gahagan, applicant; Harry Q III Gahagan, owner; Appeal to retain keypad hardware installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 01/12/2022 & 04/05/2022, respectively. [Notice of Violation sent 08/26/2021]
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=913253>

- IX. RATIFICATION of Architectural Committee and Staff actions since the Wednesday, February 16, 2022 VCC meeting.

ADDRESS:	830 Burgundy Street	APPLICANT:	Quitman Gahagan
OWNER:	Harry Q III Gahagan	SQUARE:	86
ZONING:	VCR-1	LOT SIZE:	1232 sq. ft.
USE:	Residential	OPEN SPACE:	
DENSITY:		REQUIRED:	369.6 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	1 unit	EXISTING:	Unknown
EXISTING:	Unknown	PROPOSED:	No change
PROPOSED:	No change		

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Main building: **Yellow**, contributes to the character of the district.

Simple frame cottage, which apparently was constructed after 1876, since the structure outlined on the site on Sanborn's Map does not have the same configuration as the existing cottage.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **04/20/2022**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 04/20/2022
Permit # unassigned **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain keypad hardware installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 01/12/2022 & 04/05/2022, respectively. **[Notice of Violation sent 08/26/2021]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 04/20/2022

The applicant is appealing to retain two Kwikset keypads with electronic levers in Venetian Bronze at the left alley gate and the front entry door. Staff notes that levered handles are approvable at alley gates but are not approvable for historic millwork unless required by the State Fire Marshal's office for commercial buildings, and single doors of this age should either use a knob or thumb latch.

The Committee has approved limited use of keypad or electric Bluetooth hardware at some properties as long as they meet certain guidelines for visual unobtrusiveness. Keypads with visible mechanical buttons are generally not allowed. Staff is sympathetic to the owner's security concerns and has no objection to the installation of electronic hardware at this property but does not find this particular model to be approvable.

Staff has researched available keypads further since the applicant decided to appeal to the full Commission, and found several that autolock after entry (Yale "Assure Lock SL" and Schlage "Encode"), including one that could be customized to lock after 15 seconds, 30 seconds or 1 minute, at the owner's discretion. Both are independent keypads that do not have integrated handles and could be used with a doorknob or thumb latch. In light of these options, staff recommends **denial** of the appeal to retain the currently installed keypads with push buttons and levers.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 04/20/2022

Architecture Committee Meeting of**02/08/2022****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**
Permit #22-00825-VCGEN

02/08/2022

Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Appeal to retain keypad hardware installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 01/12/2022. [**Notice of Violation sent 08/26/2021**]

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

02/08/2022

The applicant is appealing to retain two Kwikset keypads with electronic levers in Venetian Bronze at the left alley gate and the front entry door. Staff notes that levered handles are approvable at alley gates but are not approvable for historic millwork unless required by the State Fire Marshal's office for commercial buildings, and single doors of this age should either use a knob or thumb latch.

The Committee has approved limited use of keypad or electric Bluetooth hardware at some properties as long as they meet certain guidelines for visual unobtrusiveness. Keypads with visible mechanical buttons are generally not allowed. Staff has no objection to the installation of electronic hardware at this property and has several alternative recommendations for the applicant regarding visually appropriate options that have been approved elsewhere in the District, but recommends **denial** of the appeal to retain the currently installed keypads with push buttons and levers.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

02/08/2022

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Gahagan present on behalf of the application. Mr. Gahagan explained that they needed a new functional light fixture at the front for safety, but that they also wanted something attractive. He added that the light pole had not worked since they purchased the property. Mr. Block stated that they would reach out to DPW about the pole. Mr. Fifield asked if Mr. Gahagan could work with staff on the appropriate fixtures; Mr. Gahagan responded that he was surprised by staff's recommendation against decorative lights. Mr. Fifield stated that lighting should make the building pop and the fixtures should be subservient to the building instead of attracting attention to themselves. Ms. Bourgogne stated that frankly she would suggest soffit mounted fixtures and Ms. Vogt agreed. Mr. Bergeron commented that he was surprised to hear that recommendation from staff since there was no visible soffit venting. Ms. Bourgogne stated that the overhang was tall, and the fixtures could be soffit mounted, one over each opening. Mr. Fifield suggested functional fixtures, adding that the decorative fixtures might not be adequate lighting, and that staff could suggest better fixtures. Mr. Gahagan stated that they wanted gas fixtures down the road, but he wasn't sure if it would be approved; Ms. Bourgogne stated that they did not provide enough light and would not be appropriate for this building. Mr. Fifield agreed. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

No Public Comment**Discussion and Motion:**

Ms. DiMaggio moved to **deny** retention of the current hardware, with the applicant to work with staff on selecting a replacement that would meet their needs and the Design Guidelines. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Block informed the applicant of their right to appeal decisions of the Architectural Committee to the full Commission.

ADDRESS:	624 Dumaine	APPLICANT:	Maple Ridge Architects (2021) Paul Duxworth (2019)
OWNER:	Bienville Street Outback LLC		
ZONING:	VCC-1	SQUARE:	47
USE:	Residential	LOT SIZE:	3,333 sq. ft.
DENSITY-		OPEN SPACE-	
ALLOWED:	5 Units	REQUIRED:	1,000 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	Unknown	EXISTING:	500 sq. ft. approx.
PROPOSED:	No Change	PROPOSED:	No Change

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Like many other structures in the Quarter, this 3-story brick building has been updated several times, and the original design is obscured by non-original (c. 1870) cast iron galleries. Originally this building, constructed c. 1836, was similar to 620-22 Dumaine and had only 2 1/2 stories with attic frieze window, a wrought iron balcony, and three full-length openings (including a porte-cochere entrance) on the ground floor. The service building at the extreme rear is part of the Madame John's Legacy service wing. Subject of Paint Analysis, Phase III.

Main building – Green

Rear building – Purple; Note: Originally part of the Madame John's Legacy service wing

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of

04/20/2022

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:

04/20/2022

Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to stucco over improperly repaired masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/31/2019 & 04/06/2022, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

04/20/2022

Issues with this wall date back to 2019 when staff posted a Stop Work Order on 01/22/19 when work was observed on the Royal St. elevation of the main building. An application was subsequently filed by the previous applicant and a permit was issued 02/05/19. A follow up inspection on 02/14/19 revealed that the masonry was not being repointed appropriately. Rather, mortar was essentially being rubbed on the wall and worked into the joints. This inappropriate technique resulted in mortar at least partially covering the majority of the wall, essentially covering the wall in a parge coat.

An inspection on 2/15/19 revealed that the previous contractor had attempted to clean up the bricks by grinding the mortar off the brick faces. This work resulted in damage to the bricks and quite possibly removed several of the brick faces. It is likely that these damaged bricks will lead to future problems with moisture without additional intervention.

At the 08/10/2021 meeting with the Committee recommending that applying stucco would address the damage and might be the best preservation method. The applicant returned to the 04/12/2022 meeting with a proposal to completely stucco this wall of the building. The Guidelines require Commission level review for proposals to completely stucco over previously uncovered bricks for buildings of this rating. In this instance, staff and the Architecture Committee found that although it is the result of an unfortunate series of events, stuccoing over this compromised brick will be a good approach for the long-term preservation of the building. The Architecture Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:

04/20/2022

Architecture Committee Meeting of

04/12/2022

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:

04/12/2022

Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to stucco over improperly repaired masonry wall, per application & materials received 01/31/2019 & 04/06/2022, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

04/12/2021

This application was deferred at the 08/10/2021 meeting with the Committee recommending that applying stucco would address the damage and might be the best preservation method. The applicant has returned with a proposal to completely stucco this wall of the building. Staff notes that the bricks in this wall feature angled courses which likely indicate a lower previously existing roofline of this building. This feature will be lost with a complete stuccoing of the building and staff questions if any kind of stucco detail should be included to retain this element.

Staff also requests details of how the stucco around the windows will be detailed.

Besides these two questions staff finds the proposal consistent with the previous recommendations of the Committee and approvable. Staff recommends approval of the proposal with final details to be worked out at the staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

04/12/2021

Architecture Committee Meeting of**08/10/2021****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

08/10/2021

Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Review of test patch of attempted mortar and brick cleaning, per application & materials received 04/08/19 & 08/06/2021, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

08/10/2021

Staff inspected and documented an area where the masonry cleaner had been applied. Although it appears that the cleaning process did a decent job at removing some of the slurry, staff is concerned that the work also resulted in some pitting and other damage to the brick face. Given the possibility of additional damage to the wall, staff again questions if a more passive approach of allowing the wall and mortar slurry to weather over time may be the best approach to this unfortunate situation.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee and applicant regarding the results of the test patch.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

08/10/2021

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked where the test patch was exactly in the photos. He was directed to slide 100-102. Mr. Block stated that it looked like the effort to remove the slurry was further damaging to the brick, so he believed it might be better to leave the slurry on than to remove it. Mr. Fifield asked if the mortar was lime based. Mr. Smith stated yes. He went on to explain that it had also run down from the parapet when that was being repaired so in addition to the smear there was also a drip effect. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if the Committee was to follow the staff recommendation what did he propose for the rest of the building. Mr. Smith stated that they were going to try and remove the "streaming" mortar from top. Mr. Fifield asked the Committee for their thoughts. Ms. DiMaggio was perplexed. Mr. Fifield stated that this was not just a preservation technology question, but also a viewshed question due the building's proximity to a purple rated structure. Ms. Roberts stated that she had been on site and had photographed numerous empty bags of Quikrete. Mr. Fifield asked Ms. Roberts if she believed that it was likely the material was Portland based. Ms. Roberts stated yes. Mr. Fifield then stated that this fact changed everything. He went on to say that he wondered if they should recommend a paint or stucco treatment. He then asked the applicant if he thought the owner might agree to such a treatment. Ms. DiMaggio state that she was concerned that painting wouldn't be enough, and that stucco was probably the best option. Mr. Fifield stated that stucco would address the damage and might be the best preservation method. Mr. Smith stated that he would ask the owner. Mr. Fifield then stated that this was a very thin line- he would never want to encourage this behavior. He then asked Mr. Bergeron if he was ok with this approach. Mr. Bergeron agreed and stated

that this was a very unfortunate solution but possibly the only option. With nothing else to discuss the Committee moved on to the next agenda item.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion to defer the application to the next meeting on August 24, 2021. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of

07/13/2021

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:

07/13/2021

Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to address inappropriate application of mortar to faces of brick, per application & materials received 04/08/19 & 06/21/2021, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

07/13/2021

Issues with this wall date back to 2019 when staff posted a Stop Work Order on 01/22/19 when work was observed on the Royal St. elevation of the main building. An application was subsequently filed by the previous applicant and a permit was issued 02/05/19. A follow up inspection on 02/14/19 revealed that the masonry was not being repointed appropriately. Rather, mortar was essentially being rubbed on the wall and worked into the joints. This inappropriate technique resulted in mortar at least partially covering the majority of the wall, essentially covering the wall in a parge coat.

An inspection on 2/15/19 revealed that the previous contractor had attempted to clean up the bricks by grinding the mortar off the brick faces. This work resulted in damage to the bricks and quite possibly removed several of the brick faces. It is likely that these damaged bricks will lead to future problems with moisture without additional intervention.

A new applicant has filed the current proposal to attempt to address these issues. The applicant proposes to attempt to clean up some of the mortar by utilizing Prosoco Sure Klean 600. After the wall has been cleaned, the masonry would be sealed with Prosoco Weather Seal-GP.

Staff contacted the historic preservation representative from Prosoco to discuss this project and ask if she agreed with the approach of the applicant. The Prosoco rep agreed with the proposed use of the Sure Klean 600, noting that the cleaner will work at the surface to break the bond between the mortar residue and the brick. After cleaning is complete, the Prosoco rep recommended their product called H40 rather than the Weather Seal. The H40 product is described as, "a deep-penetrating water repellent and consolidation treatment for brick, most natural stone, unglazed terra cotta, historic concrete, stucco, and cast stone surfaces." The product also purports to "breathe" and not trap moisture.

The applicant agreed to revise the proposal to follow these recommendations.

As the application of a sealer or repellent product is not easily reversible, staff is somewhat hesitant regarding this aspect of the proposal and questions the necessity of this step. Staff suggests that a test patch of the H40 product may be the best approach. The bricks whose faces were ground off are the most likely to suffer additional damage and water intrusion, so staff suggests starting with these bricks only to test the water repellent product.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal with the applicant to stay in close contact with staff and to be sure that no additional damage is done.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

07/13/2021

Ms. Bourgoigne read the staff report with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application. Mr. Smith stated that he agreed with the staff report. Mr. Fifield asked if they would agree to a test patch. Mr. Smith stated yes. Ms. DiMaggio asked if there was a way to determine the percentage of bricks that were damaged. Mr. Smith stated that the ground was small in the alleyway and not very visible. He went on to say that to remove the slurry would do no further harm. Mr. DiMaggio thanked Mr. Smith for the clarification. She went on to say that they might have to replace the damaged bricks. Mr. Fifield asked if perhaps they might need to stucco the entire wall. Mr. Smith agreed and that he would ask the owner. Mr. Fifield stated that this proposal might be the first step but ultimately, they might need to look at alternatives. Ms. DiMaggio agreed with Mr. Fifield. She went on to say that there was no way to heal the bricks without replacement or stucco. With nothing left to discuss, the Committee moved on to the next

agenda item.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to approve the proposed cleaning method with the applicant to work with staff on test patch of H40 product and work with staff on any details to finalize the work. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of **06/11/19**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 06/11/19
Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to address inappropriate application of mortar to faces of brick, per application & materials received 04/08/19 & 06/04/19, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 06/11/19

When this property was last before the Architecture Committee at the 05/14/19 meeting, the Committee voted to defer the application to allow the applicant to submit a scope of work to repair the bricks and to allow the retention of the slurry in order for it to deteriorate naturally. The applicant has submitted an elevation of this side of the building showing the extent of the slurry application, the unslurred portion in need of proper repointing, and a previously existing stucco band.

Since the last Architecture Committee meeting, staff attended a conference which included a product and technique that removes mortar from the faces of bricks very similar to the situation faced here. Staff suggests that the applicant could perform a test patch to see if a similar product and technique would help to remove the surface mortar.

Staff recommends approval of the submittal and requests commentary from the Architecture Committee if a test area of chemical remover of the mortar should be explored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 06/11/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application. Ms. DiMaggio moved to approve the proposal based on the staff recommendation including a 5x5 test area of chemical remover of the mortar. Mr. Berg seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of **05/14/19**
DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/14/19
Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to stucco over exposed brick wall on the Royal St. elevation of the main building, per application & materials received 04/08/19. **[Stop Work Order posted 02/14/19]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/14/19

Following the Architecture Committee meeting of 04/23/19 staff was contacted by Hank Smith who stated that his office was getting involved with this property and that he would submit revised plans. Unfortunately, Mr. Smith did not submit any revised proposals prior to today's meeting.

Given the severity of the violation staff included this property on the agenda but provided that Mr. Smith continues to work on this property and communicates with staff a deferral may be appropriate.

Staff recommends deferral of the application not to exceed 30 days.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 05/14/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Smith present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that it was most important to protect the open faced bricks. He asked the applicant for a block elevation with the areas in need of work diagramed out.

Mr. Block motioned to allow the applicant to submit a scope of work to repair the bricks and to allow the retention of the slurry in order for it to deteriorate naturally. Mr. Musso seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

<u>Architecture Committee Meeting of</u>	04/23/19
<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	04/23/19
Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to stucco over exposed brick wall on the Royal St. elevation of the main building, per application & materials received 04/08/19. **[Stop Work Order posted 02/14/19]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 04/23/19

Following the Architecture Committee meeting of 02/26/19 staff again visited the site on 03/13/19 and found that the applied mortar/stucco will not be easily removed. The applicant submitted a new proposal to repoint the bricks and then apply a three coat stucco. As the applied parge coat cannot be feasibly removed staff sees two possible options moving forward. The first option would be to complete proper repointing of the masonry and allow the parge coat to weather and hopefully through the passage of time return to something similar to its previously existing condition. Staff notes that approximately the back third of the building has not been touched or had the improper coating applied. This portion of the building could be properly repointed and finished to match the previously existing exposed brick condition.

The second option would be to allow for the complete stuccoing of this wall as proposed by the applicant. Staff has some hesitations about this option as it is unclear how the stucco will interact with existing millwork and other details. Notably this wall previously had a clear indication of the earlier roofline of this building prior to the addition of the third floor. If the building is completely stuccoed that previous indication will be lost.

Staff seeks the advice of the Committee as to how to move forward but regardless of the future work suggests that staff perform regular inspections to insure that all details of the permit are being followed correctly including correct mixes and application techniques.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 04/23/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report. There was no one present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield stated that in this case less would be more and that passive weathering might be the answer to the problem. He moved to defer the application until the applicant could be present. He further stated that staff should proceed with a violation letter and adjudication proceedings. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

<u>Architecture Committee Meeting of</u>	02/26/19
<u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u>	02/26/19
Permit # 19-02566-VCGEN	Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Review of work done in deviation of approved permit. **[Stop Work Order posted 02/14/19]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 02/26/19

Staff initially posted a Stop Work Order on 01/22/19 when work was observed on the Royal St. elevation of the main building. The applicant subsequently filed for the permit and a permit was issued 02/05/19. A follow up inspection on 02/14/19 revealed that the masonry was not being repointed appropriately. Rather, mortar was essentially being rubbed on the wall and worked into the joints. This inappropriate technique resulted in mortar at least partially covering the majority of the wall, essentially covering the wall in a parge coat.

An inspection on 2/15/19 revealed that the contractor had attempted to clean up the bricks by grinding the mortar off of the brick faces. This work resulted in damage to the bricks and quite possibly removed several of the brick faces. It is likely that these damaged bricks will lead to future problems with moisture.

Staff is at a loss as to how to proceed with this application. Staff does not find additional attempts to clean up the wall by removing mortar from the brick faces to be appropriate as it doesn't appear this could be done without causing significant damage to the bricks. Staff also does not find it appropriate to continue the parge coat on the remaining portion of the wall. This portion should be properly repointed and the area that has already been treated with a parge coat should be left alone and hopefully through weather and time the mortar will wear off of the bricks.

Staff seeks commentary from the Architecture Committee if an alternative course of action should be considered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

02/26/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Duxworth present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso stated that he did not know of a way to save the wall and that the entire wall may have to be plastered.

Mr. Fifield moved to allow the applicant to perform a test patch, a 6'x6' square, of repointing to be inspected by staff prior to addressing the entire wall. Mr. Musso seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	327 Bourbon	APPLICANT:	Bob Ellis
OWNER:	327 Bourbon Street, LLC	SQUARE:	69
ZONING:	VCE	LOT SIZE:	5,472 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	1,641 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	9 Units	EXISTING:	1,679 sq. ft. approx.
EXISTING:	None	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.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **04/20/2022**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 04/20/2022
Permit # 21-34253-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**
Violation Case # 21-08733-VCCNOP **Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Review of unpermitted demolition of rear enclosed wood gallery, per application & materials received 12/09/2021. [Notices of Violation sent 07/14/2016, 04/22/2019, 04/28/2021, & 12/13/2021]

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 04/20/2022

Violations that included this rear portion of the building date back to 2016 with staff continually urging work be done to address the rear of the building as well as several other demolition by neglect issues around the building. Various permits have been issued since 2016 although only a small percentage of the permitted work was completed. A permit for the “emergency stabilization” of the rear of the main building was issued on 06/27/2019. It is unclear if any other work was done between the time of the emergency stabilization and the time of the unpermitted demolition in December 2021.

Aerial photographs taken several days after Hurricane Ida show the rear portion in place with no noticeable changes compared to before the hurricane. The same bracing that was installed in 2019 was still in place as seen in photographs provided by the applicant. Staff then discovered in December 2021 that the entirety of the rear portion of the building had been demolished without any benefit of VCC review or approval. The applicant stated that the rear of the building was in imminent danger of collapse, but no notice of the conditions was provided to staff until after staff discovered the unpermitted demolition.

Staff notes that this portion of the building was not a later addition but was originally an open-air gallery attached to the rear of the building as seen in some of the historic photographs. The space was enclosed over the years, but staff considers this portion to have the same blue-rating as the rest of the property.

Staff has been working in good faith with the applicant and met with the applicant concerning this and several other properties back in September 2019. Still, there has been extremely slow progress in submitting requested materials or doing the most basic weatherizing of the building. Staff requests that immediate action be taken, or the most recent violation case will proceed directly to adjudication.

VIEWUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 04/20/2022

ADDRESS:	530-34 Bourbon	APPLICANT:	Myles Martin
OWNER:	Akm Acquisitions LLC	SQUARE:	62
ZONING:	VCE	LOT SIZE:	5632 sq. ft.
USE:	Various	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-ALLOWED:	9 units	REQUIRED:	1689 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	None	EXISTING:	Unknown
PROPOSED:	No change	PROPOSED:	No change

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Main building: **Orange**, post-1946 construction
 Service buildings: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historical significance.

2-story modern (1948, by I. William Ricciuti) "replacement" for an 1848 building, known popularly as the "Chinese Exchange". Although this earlier building was demolished in 1947, the late 1848 service building remains.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of 04/20/2022

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 04/20/2022
Permit #22-06941-VCSGN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to install double-sided neon sign in conjunction with **change of use** from *vacant (bar)* to *retail*, per application & materials received 03/08/2022.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 04/20/2022

The applicant is proposing to install a double-sided neon sign at 534 Bourbon, reading “Gumbo Ya Ya” and measuring 3’-5” x 3’-5”. The sign is approvable at staff level but has triggered a change of use hearing.

Article 2.10 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance states that:

The Vieux Carré Commission shall have no jurisdiction over use, except as provided in the paragraph below.

[...] Where any change in exterior appearance is contemplated, the Vieux Carré Commission shall hold a hearing, and if it approves such change, it shall issue a special permit to continue the same use, or for any other use not otherwise prohibited in the district, subject to the following conditions and safeguards:

- 1. The historic character of the Vieux Carré shall not be injuriously affected.*
- 2. Signs which are garish or otherwise out of keeping with the character of the Vieux Carré shall not be permitted.*
- 3. Building designs shall be in harmony with the traditional architectural character of the Vieux Carré.*
- 4. The value of the Vieux Carré as a place of unique interest and character shall not be impaired.*

This address has illegally changed use several times since 2019, when it was operating as a t-shirt shop. It is staff’s understanding that it was a legal, non-conforming use at that time. However, the t-shirt shop, which operated under several business names, underwent interior demolition without permits and a bar was illegally open and operating as of March 2020 without first undergoing a change of use hearing. By March 2021, the bar had closed, and the address was vacant for more than six months. A new retail business opened under the name “Zydeco” as of 3/3/2022; no sign application was submitted, but a sign was hung. This circumvented the required change of use hearing. By 3/15/2022, the Zydeco sign was gone and a temporary “Gumbo Ya Ya” sign was installed.

Staff recommends that the Commission forward a **negative recommendation** to the Director of Safety and Permits, as this business has been cited by the Zoning Department for operation as a prohibited t-shirt/souvenir shop (22-01489-ILGUS).

This property also has many outstanding violations that were permitted for correction by VCC staff on 02/17/2022; staff is unsure if any of the work has been completed but notes that violation permits expire if work does not begin within 30 days.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 04/20/2022