

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES – July 21, 2021**

**CPC ITEMS:**

1. Consideration of Minutes from the 06/16/21 meeting.
2. **Reconsideration:** Design Review 043/21 – Request by Supreme Council 33rd Degree Freemasons LA to permit the new construction of a two-story 5,432 sq. ft. Social Club or Lodge (Freemason Hall) within a C-1 General Commercial District on a site with over 10 vehicular parking spaces along an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District. (JC)

This request was withdrawn.

3. **Consideration:** Zoning Docket 052/21 – Request by 1152 Magazine St, LLC to permit façade modifications to an existing building to be used by a wine shop and by an indoor amusement facility, in an HU-MU Historic Urban Neighborhood Mixed-Use District and on a site with frontage along an CPC Character Preservation Corridor Design Overlay District. (HD)

The applicant presented the project that consists of two separate approvals.

The applicants propose to ramp the public sidewalk to meet the building finish floor elevations for both 1150 and 1152 Magazine Street. To accommodate this, the applicants are proposing to replace the sidewalk in front of the neighboring property as well. The representative from Parks and Parkways expressed concerns about using the public sidewalk to provide ADA access to their development site, when this is typically accommodated on-site. The sidewalk is public property and it is the responsibility of the property owner to maintain the portion along their property line. The representative from Parks and Parkways pointed out that the proposed sidewalk grades may conflict with on-street parking as well as the neighboring off-street parking space. The application is missing sufficient details to review, including a grading plan and utilities plan. Although parkway trees are only required in the CBD and institutional campus districts, if changes are made to existing street trees, the applicant must submit a landscaping plan for approval by Parks and Parkways that must also demonstrate compliance with planting wells standards. The representative from the Department of Public Works noted they would require a letter of agreement from the adjacent property owner stating that they are okay with the sidewalk modification.

- A) Design review for an open-air addition to an existing two-story aluminum warehouse located at 1150 Magazine Street that is currently occupied by Merchant House for a site within a CPC Character Preservation Corridor Overlay District.

The proposal is to construct an 814 sq. ft. open air addition to an existing 7,688 sq. ft. two-story aluminum clad warehouse for the storage of plants and furniture. The existing warehouse floorplan is being modified to provide a total of 3 commercial spaces, unit # 1 on the ground floor, unit # 2 on the second floor, and unit # 3 in the rear. Unit # 3 is currently occupied by Merchant House and the addition would be its new entry.

The proposed open-air addition is a clad steel frame structure with a parapet condition in the front that is constructed of a combination of composite trim and smooth hardie panels. The openings are infilled with screen panels that are in a grid pattern and constructed of wire that is coated in PVC. There is a primary set of double door gates that open to Magazine Street and another gate to the right that provides access to the ADA ramp. The addition is setback approximately 10 ft. from the Magazine Street front property line and built to the Calliope Street property line.

- The HDLC representative commented that recessed covered openings attract people to sleep under, so they should be limited to the depth necessary for door openings or that security could be included in the programming.
- The HDLC representative suggested that the footprint shift toward the front property line because having a recess at a corner condition is not typical.
- The CPC representative alternatively suggested maintaining the setback but adding column/trellis elements that align with the front building line of the existing warehouse. He also commented that it seems very enclosed.

The applicants propose slight façade modifications to the existing warehouse, that are limited to adding a set of aluminum clad windows with a divided lite configuration. The Calliope St. side would maintain existing metal clad panels. Other repairs include conditioning and insulating the building and replacing the roof.

- The CPC representative commented that the addition seems tacked on/easily removed from the main structure and suggested more coherence by introducing architectural elements from the addition to the metal panel warehouse/ carrying over horizontal elements.
- The CPC representative requested that the applicant show details of the outdoor space in rear of structure that are well thought out and designed.
- The CPC representative suggesting adding color on the long warehouse façade.

The **PKWYS** representative moved to **DEFER** to allow the applicant time to resolve the access and site conditions as noted during the discussion and building design which was seconded by the **CPC** representative and the motion was unanimously adopted.

B) 1152 Magazine Street was previously considered by the DAC under Zoning Docket 090/18, a conditional use request for what the applicants describe as an “immersive theatre”. The applicants are now proposing to modify the previously approved plans

(under Zoning Docket 052/21) to also permit a standalone wine shop. This is being reconsidered by the DAC because of the proposed façade modifications to the existing brick warehouse.

The applicants propose to remove the existing openings on the ground floor and to infill them with storefront windows to establish a vestibule entry at the center of the building. The door heights are going to be in an even line. The small door at the end will be maintained as a remnant of the historic utilitarian use of the building, although it might not be operable. Additionally, the two smaller windows on the upper level would be replaced with windows that are mullied together to give a warehouse-feel. The DAC had no objections aside from the sidewalk improvements as already mentioned.

The **PKWYS** representative moved to **APPROVE** the proposal subject to sidewalk design being approved by DPW and PKWYS which was seconded by the **DPW** representative and the motion was unanimously adopted.

4. **Consideration:** Zoning Docket 063/21 – Request by Greenway Ventures, LLC to grant a conditional use to permit a bar and an outdoor amusement facility in an MU-1 Medium Intensity Mixed-Use District and with over 100 feet of frontage in an EC Enhancement Corridor Overlay District, GC Greenway Corridor Design Overlay District, and AC-1 Arts and Culture Diversity Overlay District. (R)

Although the subject property features more than 100 feet of frontage along an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District, its location in the GC Greenway Corridor Design Overlay District is the more salient reason for its requiring DAC review: the GC overlay district has no frontage parameters or other conditions that trigger need for DAC review.

The applicant gave a brief overview of the project’s main design features, including a “sawtooth” roof system designed and oriented to catch and redirect sound to the venue’s seating area instead of toward surrounding properties. A CPC staff member requested clarification regarding the seating area’s surface; the applicant responded, stating that the surface is—and will be—“610 limestone.” The applicant’ architect also addressed the issue of permeability by stating that except for areas that are under-roof, the entire site is intended to be developed with a pervious surface material. The applicant also mentioned that the proposed stormwater management system will ensure that stormwater will be retained on-site.

Another CPC staff member requested and received confirmation from the applicant that the proposal is a wholesale redevelopment of the site, and also requested information on what is currently on the site. The applicant described a shipping container that was used (during the Broadside’s temporary operations) for ticket sales and a 20-foot “concession trailer” where concessions are sold to patrons. The applicant also noted the use of portable toilets for patrons’ use. CPC staff also inquired as to the site’s pedestrian and bicycle access, noting that most people would be approaching the site from North Broad Street but that there’s no clear bicycle or pedestrian access from that approach. The applicant’s response was that covered bicycle parking will be available on the Lafitte Avenue side of

the site. CPC noted that the interior of the site (green spaces, building design, and overall site plan) were well designed, but that the exterior of the site needs improvement in keeping with the site's location in two design overlay districts. CPC staff also questioned the location of the food truck bays (from the perspective of cyclists and pedestrians) and suggested that a "major" redesign might be called for.

A third CPC staff member requested clarification about how the site design promotes pedestrian circulation within the site; specifically, the amount of connectivity between the proposed parking lot and the rest of the site.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) suggested that some of the (on-stie) vehicle parking be replaced by a "corral" feature for bicycle parking. Also, the location of the on-street loading zone—right front of the food truck bays' access to the site from Lafitte Avenue—raised questions, with the consensus being that DPW and the applicant would work on a suitable solution.

CPC inquired as to the possibility of redesigning the parking lot to have one-way access rather than the two-way access points at both Toulouse Street and Lafitte Avenue. The applicant conceded that a one-way configuration would open up the possibility of angled parking. CPC also questioned the need for as much off-street parking as is shown on the site plan, and suggested that parking should not be as prominent a feature on the site as it appears to be.

The question of whether the food truck bays' access was a driveway versus an on-street loading zone arose. The applicant responded, saying that the access is a "mountable curb" that they intended to leave as-is for the trucks' access to the bays. The applicant also addressed the food truck bays' location, stating that it is adjacent to the main customer entrance and signage, and that moving it to the other side of the site (the Toulouse Street side) would eliminate that visual and functional connectivity. The applicant also touched briefly on some of the operational aspects of the food truck bays, specifically, that one of the two bays is intended to be more-or-less "permanently" occupied by a single operator, with the other bay being available for short-term use by different vendors. CPC suggested that the driveway-versus-loading-zone question would likely require a determination from Safety and Permits.

CPC asked for details about Phase II of the project. The applicant stated that it will likely be a two- or three-story building that likely will feature commercial uses at ground level and perhaps residential units above.

The **PKWYS** representative moved to **APPROVE** the design, subject to provisos to address a revised parking plan, street trees, submission of a landscape plan, a determination regarding the driveway-versus-loading-zone question, improved bicycle and pedestrian access to the site that comply with Greenway requirements, submission of a traffic-flow diagram, and a redesign whereby vehicle parking is not a dominant feature. The **CAPITAL PROJECTS** representative seconded the motion, and it was unanimously adopted.

5. **Consideration:** Design Docket 075/21 (DAC Only) – Request by Audubon Nature Institute to permit the renovation to an outdoor amphitheater inside of the Audubon Zoo within an OS-R Regional Open Space District on a site with over 40,000 square feet.

The applicant introduced the project by outlining the original postmodern design of the outdoor amphitheater and that the goal of the proposal is to try to modernize, remove antiquated wood, etc.

The **PKWYS** representative moved to **APPROVE** the which was seconded by the **CPC** representative and the motion was unanimously adopted.

6. **Consideration:** Design Docket 076/21 (DAC Only) – Request by the City of New Orleans' Capital Projects Administration to permit an addition of an elevator to the Tremé Recreational Center within an OS-R Regional Open Space District and Protect Tremé Interim Zoning District.

The applicant introduced the project by explaining the 2nd floor is a mezzanine and that the ideal location for the elevator is where they have proposed as there is a locker room for pool underneath. They did cite that this proposal would remove a building entrance but it's justifiable as some people use it but it's a very few amount. They added that they meet the life safety code requirements even with removal of this means of egress and that pile caps on either side of the opening that would have presented a challenge.

The PPW representative inquired why the elevator is not sited in between the stairs to which the applicant said that there was a practice room for music that has since been located above. PPW worried about removal of an entrance that is the address for the building. They proposed that the elevator could be to the right of stairwell in playground area as there hasn't been sufficient justification why it can't be there. They articulated that the existing structure has a strong architectural form from the 1970s with a distinct façade and the proposal ignores that and closes it off. They also questioned if there was an internal lift option that could be instituted? The CPC representative asked if there was an elevation, and the applicant confirmed there was on page 17. The HDLC representative commented that the Committee needs to see drawings so the materials can be understood as well as the proposal's impact on the elevation. The CPC co-chair posited if there was another location for an addition for the elevator to which the applicant expressed that they felt limited to this spot or a mirrored spot on the rear of building, in addition to mechanical location considerations.

The **PKWYS** representative moved to **DEFER** subject to 2 provisos, which was seconded by the **CPA** representative and the motion was unanimously adopted.

*Provisos:*

1. placing elevator at different exterior location or supplying sufficient justification in site, floor, and egress diagrams why it must be there
2. Submission of full set of elevations of and floor plans

7. **Consideration:** Design Docket 077/21 – Request by St. Andrews Episcopal Church to permit an addition of an accessory structure (shade structure) over an existing basketball court within a HU-RD2 Historic Urban Two-Family Residential District on a site with frontage along an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District. (AN)

This request is located within a full control HDLC District, Carrollton Historic District and received approval for the overall design from HDLC. As the site is located within a full control district, CPC only reviews the site and not the design of any proposed structures.

8. **Consideration:** Design Docket 078/21 (DAC Only) – Request by the City of New Orleans’ Capital Projects Administration to permit the construction of a new aquatics facility inside of Behrman Memorial Park within a OS-N Neighborhood Open Space District.

This request was withdrawn.

9. **Consideration:** Request by the City of New Orleans’ Department of Parks & Parkways to permit site and landscaping improvements to a public known as A. P. Tureaud Civil Rights Memorial Park within a HU-B1 Historic Urban Neighborhood Business District.

The CPC co-chair introduced the project as non-CPC item. The applicant introduced the project by explaining the existing conditions constituted broken panels and paving and that they would be reconstructing the site in the same configuration including with a low wall where statue will be site. They added that the plaques with additional civil rights leaders, that the low walls would be made of pre-cast coping and concrete, and that all new site furniture – as specified by PPW. The PPW representative clarified that existing site furnishing will be reused/repurposed on the same site and that the proposal will not be losing any trees as any removed will be replanted.

The CPC representative asked for readability purposes, what height and what font size would the surrounding plaques be at? The applicant answered that is was 9” high, quarter inch font size to which CPC stated it should be done from a position standing up. CPC expressed concerns of that plaques are too low, that it would be interesting if there was a vertical element to identify plaques, and that the inclusion of visual elements on plaque to break up wall of text (such as of the respective civil rights leader, etc.) would make the proposal more successful. The applicant responded to each respectively that the plaques are waist high, PPW interjected A.P. Turead is what brings people in, and that they could include photos on plaques.

The CPC representative moved to **APPROVE**, with the suggestion to ameliorate the plaques, which was seconded by the **PPW** representative and the motion was unanimously adopted.