

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES – May 19, 2021**

CPC ITEMS:

1. Consideration of Minutes from the 04/07/21 meeting.
2. Consideration of Minutes from the 05/05/21 meeting.
3. **Reconsideration**: Design Review 043/21 – Request by Supreme Council 33rd Degree Free Masons LA to permit the new construction of a two-story 5,432 sq. ft. Social Club or Lodge (Free Mason 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)

The staff planner summarized the request, noting that while this case had been reviewed as previous DRs and BZAs, planners can only review the parameters of the case at hand, based on what the applicant provides. The planner also pointed out that they appear to be violating parking in between the frontline of the building and front yard line (Article 22, Section 22.8.B.2.b) and asked the applicant to itemize the changes from the previous reviews. The applicant clarified that the existing proposed design is more in line with the budget than previous iterations.

The Parks and Parkways (PPW) representative said that the current plan shows glaring deficiencies as it relates to street trees, as a previously PPW approved plan showed the minimum amount required. PPW also reiterated the parking standard to which the CPC staff confirmed compliance with that standard would necessitate major site revisions. The Capital Projects Administration (CPA) representative asked the applicant about the purpose of the fence and the Department of Public Works (DPW) if the sidewalks should be completed? The applicant replied that the fence is for decoration, not security, and would be 8 ft. along rear yard; DPW answered sidewalk along Florida and Frey streets should be lengthened the full width of the entire site, to which PPW offered the note that Frey dead-ending into parking lot makes it harder, with DPW acquiescing that it would be up to S&P; Florida Avenue extension of the sidewalk should be done regardless. PPW further added that based on the site design, visitors would have to use public sidewalks to circulate around the building. The Historic District Landmarks Commission representative commented on the building design saying that there is very small window to wall ratio, more architectural attention needs to be developed, at least in front yard, that the previous proposal had design gestures that avoided that permitted wall ration, and asked what the proposed materiality was? The applicant detailed that the materiality is corrugated metal paneling with stone veneer at bottom and CPC staff added that transom/clearstory windows could help

avoiding large blank walls, as well as with architectural gestures, interests, undulations, etc. PPW questioned if the proposed building had a flat roof or parapet wall, and the drainage system thereof, which the applicant confirmed was a sloped roof with a parapet that would have internal roof drains. CPA recommended that the applicant needs to mitigate the impacts of façades by responding to context, with PPW adding the main view is coming from Florida Avenue or river-view from St. Bernard Avenue and with that context, landscaping is potential method to achieve better design. PPW inquired if the proposed structure was built flat or the site built up to BFE with CPA inquiring about stormwater compliance. The applicant FEMA replied that the site is in Flood Zone X (i.e. none) but the City has a standard and it is a S&P question and also that the applicant is still putting SWMP together.

The **Parks and Parkways** representative moved to **DEFER** the proposal, subject to 3 provisos, which was seconded by the **Arts Council** representative and the motion was **unanimously adopted**.

Provisos:

1. Inclusion of Street trees
2. Parking and pedestrian circulation revisions.
3. Façade revisions to have architectural interest