

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES – September 02, 2020**

**CPC ITEMS:**

1. **Consideration:** Minutes from 08/19/20
2. **Consideration:** Design Review 125/20 (Site Plan Only)- This is a request for the renovation of a development over 40k sq. ft. and a parking lot with more than 10 parking spaces in a HM-MU district. (SS)

Motion for approval was made by Parks and Parkways which was seconded by DPW and approved unanimously.

3. **Consideration:** Design Review 128/20- This is a request for the facade renovations to an existing retail store within a CPC Character Preservation Corridor Design Overlay District. (TM)

Motion for approval was made by Parks and Parkways which was seconded by DPW and approved unanimously.

4. **Consideration:** Design Review 130/20- This is a request for an adaptive reuse of two existing structures into a family living center on a site within the EC overlay and on a site with greater than 40K sq. ft. of gross floor area.. (EH)

The assigned planner presented the proposal and described the scope of work. In addition, staff noted that the site requires an Institutional Master Plan, which was submitted in 2016 though it is unclear whether it was ever finalized and closed out. City Planning Commission staff clarified the IMP and questioned whether the applicant had a record of whether it was approved. The applicant's representative said that this proposal was included on the original IMP submitted several years ago and that their individual projects have been individually permitted. The Parks and Parkways representative asked what is driving the stormwater bioswales because, if installed, they would kill a number of magnolia trees and live oaks due to stress and noted that these trees are part of the experience of the Children's Hospital campus. The Capital Projects representative asked about the connection between two buildings, adding that it appears non-descript with a weird covered walkway. The applicant's response was that the Historic District Landmarks Commission did not want the connector to interfere with the historic integrity of the two buildings (HDLC rep not present). The Capital Projects representative also asked about the canopy walkway materials. The applicant said the underside of the ceiling will be wood and painted white with small structural steel columns. The Parks and Parkways representative asked about the windows of Building 5. The applicant said they are storefront windows that residents will be able to open and close and are not as deep in actuality as they appear in the rendering. The Parks and Parkways representative also asked about architectural elevations from Tchoupitoulas Street as none were submitted. The applicant said there is a wall blocking the view. The Parks and Parkways representative responded that the building is clearly visible from Tchoupitoulas Street and that a rendering should be included because

that is the front of the building. The submitted elevation does not provide an accurate rendering. The Capital Projects representative reiterated concerns about the building connector and covered walkway design, questioning whether HDLC is indeed satisfied. The applicant provided that HDLC specifically requested it not match. The Parks and Parkways representative indicated they likes glass connector but cannot see from Tchoupitoulas Street the distinct separation. The City Planning Commission representative said they are more in line with the Capital Projects representative's thinking. The Capital Projects representative asked if matching brick would be used. The applicant said it will be a different color (but as similar as possible) because it will be impossible to match the historic brick color. The confirmed that HDLC was fine with this choice. The Capital Projects representative said the submitted rendering is not an accurate assessment of color.

The Parks and Parkways representative made a motion for deferral to allow the applicant time to submit architectural elevations from the Tchoupitoulas Street side and a revised landscape/site plan that does not include the destruction of seven (7) trees. The Capital Projects representative added that they want to see photos of existing brick and proposed brick for the addition. The Capital Projects representative seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

#### **NON CPC ITEMS:**

5. **Consideration:** Design Review 129/20- Clarity Parks Lafitte Greenway Plaza

Motion for approval was made by Parks and Parkways subject to modifications to the bike pathway being adjusted and seconded by Capital Projects and approved unanimously.