

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES – April 22, 2020**

Committee Members:

Wheeler Manouchehri (CPC)	Stephen Kroll (CPC)
Danny McElmurray (Parks and Parkways)	Louis Haywood (Public Works)
Lindsay Glatz (Art Council of N.O.)	Rodney Dionsion (Capital Projects)
Eleanor Burke (Historic District Landmarks Commission)	

Attendees:

Robin Jones	Joseph Colon	Emily Hernandez	Travis Martin
Joanna Farley	Aspen Nero	Kelly Butler	Tracy Lucas
Ron Loesel	Nicole Webre	Cynthia Dubberley	Michael Tubre
Adam Salem	Brooke Morris	Ashlee Davis Kelso	Christopher Johnson
William Nemitoff	Emily Bullock	Sophie Vorhoff	Walt Marcus
Kriss Shull	Ashley Becnel	Edward Nickolaus	Floyd Waltman
Ian O’Cain	Dennis Ogan	Libby Creim	Lauren Jardell

CPC ITEMS:

- 1. Consideration: Design Review 111/17** – Request by Adam Salem to construct a new retail development located within the CT Corridor Transformation Overlay District and located within a major intersection in an overlay district. (AN)

The Senior City Planner summarized the proposal and indicated 5 deficiencies with the applicant’s proposal. The applicants have indicated a desire to apply through the Board of Zoning Adjustments to seek waivers of insufficient side yard setback and rear yard setback, a front build to line that exceeds 20 feet, and parking as the predominant element in the front of the site. The site is also deficient in a corner orientation. The applicant indicated the reasoning for the design and the requested variances are to create a better safety perception.

HDLC requested clearer facades which show better articulation of windows and doors. Capital Projects and Parks and Parkway had similar requests and also inquired about consistency between plans and asked for the doors to line up on each of the storefronts for balance. Parks and Parkway also requested major revisions to the landscape plan and asked for a new submission done by a landscape architect which shows smaller, more appropriate trees and enough space to put in a future sidewalk. The Department of Public Works had similar requests and asked that the landscaping area along the public right-of-way be shrunk to accommodate a sidewalk. The representative from Capital Projects requested revisions to the site to show the base flood elevations as the elevations will need to be increased for the building and site. Issues with the one parallel parking space along Read Boulevard were also raised and whether the space could fit with the correct drive aisle width for parking access. The representative from

Parks and Parkway made a motion to defer to rectify the major site issues and come back before the committee. Capital Projects seconded the motion which was unanimously approved by the committee.

- 2. Consideration: Design Review 051/20** – Request by Libby Creim for the renovation of a fast food restaurant with over 100 feet of frontage in an overlay district. (WLM)

Parks and Parkways made a motion of approval, which was seconded by Capital Projects and approved unanimously.

- 3. Consideration: Design Review 052/20** – Request by Libby Creim for the renovation of a fast food restaurant with over 100 feet of frontage in an overlay district. (WLM)

Parks and Parkways made a motion of approval, which was seconded by Capital Projects and approved unanimously.

- 4. Consideration: Design Review Docket 054/20** – Request by The Administrators of the Tulane Education Fund for the construction of a new dormitory with more than 40,000 sq. ft. of floor area. (EH)

The staff and applicant presented the project, describing the proposed location in the Middle Campus area of Tulane in the Bruff Quad, as well as overall scope of the project, use of the building (campus amenities on the ground floor and dormitories above). Staff also noted the previously approved Institutional Master Plan, which includes plans for a different building complex in that area. The current proposal constitutes a modification to this plan.

The Parks and Parkways representative asked about the proposed building materials, including whether they would match other materials used on the campus. The applicant responded that they would be red brick and an accent color with references to other buildings on campus. The Parks and Parkways representative also shared concerns over the proposed new paving in the critical root zones of five (5) trees on the McAlister Street side of the site and expressed an interest in limiting the amount of new paving. The applicant responded that they are planning on a similar approach as had been done with the business school—cantilever the stairs over the root zone of the trees. The Parks and Parkways representative followed up with a request for a separate tree protection plan highlighting the cantilever proposal. The applicant confirmed that they have developed this plan and would provide it. The Department of Public Works requested clarification amid concerns that Oak trees would be encased in planters. The applicant clarified that the Oaks are not actually encased in planters, alleviating DPW's concerns. A City Planning Commission staff member asked if there are internal ramps on the site because of the area on the site plan that appears like a terraced stairway. The applicant said it was just changes in material, not a stairway. The applicant noted that Bruff Commons is one of most underutilized quads on campus and responded to the Committee's question that 197 students would be housed in the new building. The

Capital Projects representative stated that the first floor layout seems weird and that the proposed landscaping would not get any light. Parks and Parkways responded that there are trees that will grow in the proposed courtyard situation. Because it is elevated, it is possible to control soil and water levels and that shade growing can be done (e.g. windmill palms). The Department of Public Works noted the strange angle of the exterior wall near the Wall Street and Willow Street intersection. Additionally, they noted that the bike racks will project about six (6) feet into the walkway and that the wide stairway that leads past the bike racks would result in congestion. The applicant responded that a door at the Wall Street and Willow Street corner of the site is an emergency egress from lecture hall and that wider stairs are preferred to utilitarian ones. The Parks and Parkways representative asked about the space utilization plan and whether the uses on the ground floor meet those needs. The applicant was not familiar with the plan. CPC staff also requested a brief summary of the changes from the approved Institutional Master Plan and the current proposal, which the applicant largely attributed to financial limitations.

The **Parks and Parkways** representative made a motion to **approve** the proposal with a request for detailed information on the streetscape, particularly around Live Oaks and a tree protection plan, subject to PPWs approval. The **Capital Projects** representative **seconded** the motion, which was **unanimously approved**.

5. **Consideration: Design Review 055/20** – Request by Webre Consulting to construct a car wash with over 100 feet of frontage in a EC Enhancement Corridor. (KGB)

Design Review 055/20 is a request for a new drive through car wash located at 2900 Gentilly Boulevard. The site is located within the MU-1 Mixed Use Medium Intensity District, an HUC Historic Urban Use Restriction Corridor, and an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay. The plans were submitted for preliminary review by the Design Advisory Committee prior to submitting an application for a conditional use to permit a car wash in an MU-1 District and HUC Overlay District. After hearing the City Planner and applicant's summary of the proposal, the Committee provided comments. The Capital Projects representative commented that the massing of the car wash building seemed appropriate in terms of massing along Gentilly Boulevard, but had concerns about the rear of the site behind the car wash building in terms of design and screening. The representative wants to see more detail on the canopy over the vacuuming areas and more elements on the back side of the site to pop out the corners. The representative from the HDLC stated the parapets should wrap around the buildings. The representative from Parks and Parkways stated that the applicant should submit a revised landscaping that includes a tree protection plan for existing trees in the public rights of way, additional interior and exterior landscaping, particularly along Touro Street, and inclusion of all trees currently located in the public right of way. The DPW representative said the site plan needs to include sidewalks and the existing bus stop on Gentilly Boulevard near Touro Street needs to be on the plans. The City Planner questioned the use of faux shutters and whether they could be made functional as that is a requirement of the CZO.

The representative from the HDLC made a motion to approve, subject to the comments made by the Committee. The motion was seconded by the representative of the Department of Parks and Parkways and adopted unanimously.

- 6. Consideration: Design Review 058/20** – Request by Webre Consulting to renovate an existing structure in a CT Corridor Transformation Overlay District with over 100 feet of frontage. (RJ)

The City Planning staff summarized the request, noting that the existing development on the site dates back to the late 1970s and reflects compliance with the zoning ordinance that was in effect at that time. CPC staff stated that the site had no bicycle parking but was corrected by the applicant who referred the group to a more recent version of the site plan than CPC staff had originally had access to. The committee queried the applicant about the possibility of extending the front walking path such that it led and connected to the front entrance area. Doing so would require the loss of one parking space in front of the building; however, it would result in improved pedestrian connectivity, especially for residents whose mobility may be reduced. By eliminating the need to maneuver between parked cars, walking between the path and the front entrance will be a safer and more aesthetically pleasing experience.

CPC made a motion for approval, subject to modifications to the site and landscape plans as required by the CZO and as recommended by the committee to add better pedestrian access points to the walking paths. This motion was seconded by Parks and Parkways and passed unanimously.

- 7. Consideration: Design Review 063/20** – Request by Douglas Cook for the new construction of a fast food restaurant in a C-3 Heavy Commercial District and a CT Corridor Transformation Design Overlay District on a site with over 100 feet of frontage. (JF)

The City Planning staff summarized the request, stating that there were deficiencies noted in the plans submitted that the applicant was made aware of and there were other documents still needed as part of the full package of plans. Parks and Parkways noted there were insufficient public trees shown in the landscaped plan. HDLC commented that there appeared to be excessive asphalt. DPW suggested that the 24 foot drive aisle could be reduced. The applicant did not appear at the meeting to make any comment.

Parks and Parkways made a motion for approval, subject to revised site plan, landscape plan and all other required submittals showing compliance with the CZO. This motion was seconded by Capital Projects and passed unanimously.

- 8. Consideration: Design Review 065/20** – Request by Timothy Terrell for the renovation of an existing structure located in an EC Enhancement Corridor and on a site with over 100 feet of frontage. (EH)

The staff and applicant presented the project, describing the scope of the project, which includes renovations to the upper 2.5 floors and the addition of a ninth floor for use as a boutique hotel. Staff noted that this location had come through DAC previously but that this constituted a change to the previously submitted proposal.

The Department of Parks and Parkways representative questioned why there is not a Downtown Development District brick sidewalk. The Department of Public Works representative answered that brick sidewalk installation is not triggered by building renovations. The applicant stated that they are open to installing the brick if City Planning would like to see it there. The Capital Projects representative clarified whether the whole building is under renovation and expressed confusion about the proposed boutique hotel use because plans show each unit with three or four bedrooms. The applicant clarified that the use is an “all-suites” hotel, and their customers like multiple bedrooms. The Capital Projects representative also asked for information about the parking requirement. Staff confirmed that hotels have a unique off-street parking requirement but that uses in the CBD zoning districts are exempt from parking. The Committee also discussed the street tree proposal, with the Parks and Parkways representative noting that the proposed area seems too tight for a tree. The Parks and Parkways representative suggested a larger tree well but noted that they are not opposed to no tree associated with this project because there is no other place for one. Additionally, the representative asked the Department of Public Works representative to check on whether N. Rampart Street requires a brick sidewalk, reiterating that he thinks a brick sidewalk is required in that location. A City Planning Commission staff member clarified whether the proposal included any exterior work. The applicant responded that it was just for repairs and painting and that this is historic tax credit work. There would be no modifications to the exterior look of the building.

The **Parks and Parkways** representative made a motion to **approve** the proposal, subject to the noted site plan revisions (street tree, brick sidewalk). The **Arts Council** representative **seconded** the motion, which was **unanimously approved**.

9. **Consideration: Design Review 066/20** – Request by Edward Nickolaus for the new construction of a mixed use structure in a CPC Character Preservation Corridor. (TM)

The Senior City Planner summarized the request and the applicant also gave a summary of the project. The representative from HDLC took issue with the height and massing of the structure and suggested that the 3rd floor be setback to reduce the effect that the building’s height may have on the street below. HDLC also mentioned that a balcony could be added to the 3rd floor to bring it more in line with the second floor. The representative from Parks and Parkways added that a more modern design might better suit the proposed layout of the structure, but that the recs from HDLC should help to address these concerns. The representative from Public Works requested a plan showing the public right-of-way in front of the building and that the plan show all slopes and grades of the proposed elevated sidewalk section. DPW requested that the clear

sidewalk include 6' clear of handrails within what appears to be an 8' sidewalk (including curb) along Magazine Street.

HDLC made a motion for deferral in order to revise the massing and sidewalk issues. This motion was seconded by P&PW and passed unanimously.

NON-CPC ITEMS:

10. **Consideration: Design Review 071/20** – Request by The Arts Council of New Orleans for an art installation

Capital Projects made a motion for approval, which was seconded by Parks and Parkways and adopted unanimously.

ANY OTHER MATTERS:

11. **Consideration: Design Review 041/20** – Request by Cynthia Dubberley for facade modifications to an existing structure in a CPC Character Preservation Corridor. (WLM)

Parks and Parkways made a motion subject to the screen wrapping fulling around the structure, which was seconded by Capital Projects and adopted unanimously.