

# CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

## DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES – December 21, 2022

#### CPC ITEMS:

1. The **CPC** representative made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the December 21, 2022 meeting, which was seconded by the **DPW** representative and unanimously adopted.
2. **Consideration:** The **PKWYS** Representative recommended moving the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month meetings in November and December of 2023 be moved to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of both months to accommodate for holidays in 2023. The **PKWYS** representative made a motion to approve the 2023 DAC meeting calendar, which was seconded by the **CPC** representative and unanimously adopted.

#### CPC ITEMS:

3. **Consideration:** Design Review 056/22 for a new construction, 4-story, 70-unit low income, multi-family apartment building located in an CT Corridor Transformation Design Overlay District. (VG)

**Location:** 2440 Guadalcanal Street

**Submitted by:** Trapolin Peer Architects c/o Alan Wold

**Contact:** [awold@trapolinpeer.com](mailto:awold@trapolinpeer.com)

The applicant is proposing a 70-unit, low-income housing development to be marketed for seniors. The property is located at Federal City within Algiers. The proposal includes 70 off-street parking spaces with 15 ADA spaces. With the exception of the ADA spaces, all proposed parking is permeable. The applicant added they Will consider making the ADA spaces permeable as well. To provide the required parking space, the applicant's proposal includes removing (3) Live Oak trees. The **PKWYS** representative voiced concerns about the removal of significant trees. The **CPC** representative recommended considering an alternate building shape to preserve the trees and create courtyards. **PKWYS** also recommended planting Live Oak Trees in lieu of Virginias and pointed out that the 18 required trees to be planted are not currently on the landscape plan. The **RTA representative** commented 70 parking spaces—especially for seniors—may be excessive.

The **CPC** representative moved to **APPROVE** the request subject to the recommendations discussed. The motion was seconded by the **PKWYS** representative and adopted unanimously.

*Provisos:*

1. Explore possibility for a reduction in proposed parking due to proximity to transit stop and/or AMI level.
  2. Revise curb cut locations and/or share of driveways.
  3. Incorporate courtyards.
4. **Consideration:** Design Review 058/22 – Design review for the renovation of an existing restaurant in a CPC Character Preservation Corridor Design Overlay District. (BW)

The applicant is proposing interior renovation of the ground floor and minor exterior modifications of a restaurant in a HU-B1 Historic Urban Neighborhood District. The building's ground floor will be retained as a restaurant. Minor exterior modifications include replacing the existing round 'porthole' windows with new rectangular storefront wood windows to preserve the rhythm of fenestration found throughout the area. The existing wood awning is proposed to be either clad with new canvas fabric awning consistent with other properties in the area, or to be retained and repainted. The applicant stated that the posts were originally cantilevered and would like to simply repair and paint the posts, or alternatively leave the structure in place adding a fabric awning over the structure. No expansion of the footprint of the building is indicated.

Question - Would this project need to come before the DAC due to encroachments in the right of way?

Response – CPC stated that as an existing structure it would not, however it may require a lease.

Questions – Is the proposed restaurant sign at the same height as the previous signage?

Response – Applicant stated that the Juan’s Flying Burrito sign was lower than the intended sign and squarer in shape than the previous signage.

Questions – Is there handicap access onsite?

Response – Applicant stated that there is a handicap ramp at the rear of the building intended for use.

The **HDLC** representative responded via e-mail that they have no issue with the proposed storefront windows indicated in the drawings and think they are more appropriate for the building.

The **CPC** representative moved to **APPROVE** the request subject to comment from absent committee members via e-mail. The motion was seconded by the **DPW** representative and adopted unanimously.

5. **Consideration:** Design Review 059/22 - Administrative design review for Brother Martin Batting Facility, a recreational facility ancillary to a secondary educational facility, on a site with over 100 ft of frontage in an EC overlay. (BD)

**Location:** 4401 Elysian Fields Avenue

**Submitted by:** Kevin J Morris

**Contact:** [swilliams@brothermartin.com](mailto:swilliams@brothermartin.com)

The Brother Martin Batting Facility is a proposed 3,745 SF enclosed facility which will be located on the Southeastern facing Gentilly Boulevard and Mandeville Street corner of the property. The site features a chain link fence surrounding the existing recreation field and between the proposed batting facility structure and the Public Right-of-Way. Estimates to relocate the powerlines has been considered at a cost of approximately \$30,000. There is no additional parking required for the proposed development.

Question - Will the applicant improve sidewalks in the Public Right-of Way?

Response - Restoration of the Public Right-of-Way is not included in the current proposed development budget. **DPW** state the Comprehensive Master Plan accounting for the EC overlay District confirms that property owner is responsible for providing functional sidewalks and general upkeep of the Public Right-of Way, however, Mandeville Street is included in the upcoming Streets Projects for improvements starting in 2024-2025.

The **PKWYS** representative inquired about the applicant's maintenance of Gentilly Boulevard, to which the **DPW** representative reiterated that Brother Martin is responsible for maintaining its sidewalks and corner improvements in accordance with City of New Orleans Code of Ordinance guidelines. In response to the discussion, the applicant requested a defined scope for Gentilly Boulevard. **DPW** noted that improvement requirements will be noted in the applicant's current building permit.

**PKWYS** requested the reestablishment of the live oak canopy along Gentilly Boulevard, however, **CPC** representative noted that this is not included in the scope of this review nor does the proposal trigger landscaping review. The **CPC** made a motion for **APPROVAL** and the motion was seconded by the **DPW** representative and unanimously adopted. The **HDLC** representative and **CPA** representative were absent.

**NON-CPC ITEMS: N/A**