

VIEUX CARRE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

LaToya Cantrell
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block
DIRECTOR

NOTE: The below minutes are a summary of actions taken. They are not a verbatim transcription of the meeting.

Minutes of the VCC Architectural Committee meeting of Tuesday, January 24, 2023 – 1:00 pm.

Committee Members Present: Stephen Bergeron, Rick Fifield

Committee Members Absent: Toni DiMaggio

Staff Present: Bryan Block, Director; Renee Bourgoigne, Deputy Director; Nicholas Albrecht, Senior Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Senior Plans Examiner

Staff Absent: Marguerite Roberts, Inspector

Others Present: Jerry Parr, Ralph Long, Jeff Collins, Dixon Jelic, John Williams, Joey Carlson, Nikki Szalwinski, Terry Jacobs, Michael Reid, Hannah Hubbell, Samantha Johnson, Erika Gates, Myles Martin, Colin Savoye

AGENDA

Old Business

1008 Dauphine St: 20-48257-VCGEN; Maple Ridge Architects, applicant; Angela C Johnson, owner; Review of millwork submittal for ongoing renovation, per application & materials received 12/08/2020 & 12/29/2022, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=866616>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Messrs. Carlson & Savoye present on behalf of the application. Mr. Carlson stated that he was unable to do an exact match because the historic materials had been thrown out, but he had looked through a millwork catalogue to try to match. He stated he needed insight on profiles and dimensions, and that he'd been trying to figure out the depth of the drip cap. Ms. Vogt added that the profiles chosen were not correct as they were ogee but not cyma reversa, and that she recommended consulting a specialist. Mr. Block stated that it was obvious the top and bottom bands were not the same profile. Mr. Fifield added that stock profiles might not have the same profile and dimensions of historic material. Mr. Carlson stated he had tried scaling it in CAD. Mr. Fifield recommended looking at similar buildings but that it probably wouldn't use stock materials, and that he needed to dig deeper to find something that worked. Mr. Bergeron acknowledged that this would be challenging and instructed "you should always save pieces." Mr. Fifield asked the general contractor "you saved nothing?" Mr. Savoye responded "no." Mr. Fifield asked if the wood was surface applied or recessed into the stucco. Mr. Carlson stated that he had drawn it as ¾" plywood, trimmed out. Mr. Fifield recommended looking at similar buildings. Ms. Vogt added that a mockup to be able to see the shadows created by various millwork profiles would help evaluating how well they matched, which Mr. Carlson agreed with. Mr. Fifield noted discrepancies in the drawings, the lintel returns, sash trim, brick mould, etc. and said the drawings needed to "not be approximate, exact."

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of French Quarter Citizens, stating that the whole project had been a mess using insufficient materials that appeared to be plastic and would not hold paint. She recommended staff require trim be saved.

Mr. Bergeron moved to **defer** the application, with the applicant to revise and develop the drawings per the discussion. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1009 Burgundy St: Michael Reid, applicant; Jeffery C Collins, owner; Proposal to construct new storage shed and install generator on roof, per materials received 04/12/2022 & 11/02/2022, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=924103>

Ms. Vogt read the report with Messrs. Collins and Reid present on behalf of the application. Mr. Reid stated that the owners had been at this address for almost 40 years. He agreed to remove the roof details that were not applicable and revise the awning. Regarding the stucco, he stated that they would be leaving the wall exposed brick so it could breathe, and would bear the new structure partially on the brown rated addition. He drew attention to the protection plan and Matterport provided. He added that they would be using a vibration isolation pad and that Generac had quoted the transmitted sound next door as 25dBL when reduced by 3 wythes of brick. He went on to say that a sound shield was not possible for this unit and they would only be powering half the home and only for emergency use. He stated that the owners intended to coordinate the 10 minute, 1/week exercise cycle with the generators at 1009 and 1017 St. Philip. He repeated that the party wall belongs to 1009 Burgundy and that there would be expansion joints at the foundation at roof, so they were minimizing the degree to which the new shed would touch the wall. Mr. Collins explained that they intended to “age into” the home and always stayed during hurricanes, and they were primarily concerned with refrigerated medication.

Mr. Bergeron noted that the proposal was very comprehensive and Mr. Block reminded the Committee that the Commission had approved the work, so only certain details were returning to the Committee.

Mr. Jacobs addressed the Committee, stating that the applicant had done roof work that had cut through the studs inside his building, that they did not know the conditions at his building, and it was not three wythes thick but varied between 1-3 wythes. He added that there was already extensive damage, and they were limited in the repointing they could do because of three structures built at 1009 without permits, and that they could feel vibration on the inside of their building. He added that it was an enormous lot, and the work could be located elsewhere. He requested the Committee defer the application.

Ms. Szalwinski stated that state law prohibited this construction and the wall was not a party wall. She also voiced concern over repointing and existing buildings at 1009. She mentioned that her attic vent was right around the corner and she was worried about fumes and worse. She went on to say the sound waves could hurt the soft red brick and that the survey showed the property line under the wall. She added that the wall was not three wythes and not fully owned by the 1009.

Mr. Fifield stated that the work had already been approved by the Commission. Ms. Szalwinski stated that it was based on faulty information, since the survey showed the property line in the middle of the wall. Mr. Fifield stated the survey showed the wall on 1009. Mr. Reid stated that their surveyor clarified that was correct. Ms. Szalwinski stated that there were multiple surveys with different information. Mr. Fifield stated that Ms. Szalwinski could appeal the approval to City Council but the Commission charged the ARC with reviewing the specific details. Ms. Szalwinski stated that the Commission could revoke approval based on new information. Mr. Block stated that the Committee was just now being presented with this information. Ms. Vogt clarified that the Commission has a mechanism for revoking their own motions, but it must be done at the Commission level, not by the Committee. Mr. Collins stated that he was not aware of any of the issues raised by Mr. Jacobs or Ms. Szalwinski except the vibration and noise until now, and that he had addressed those concerns.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval** of the details submitted for Committee review following Commission approval, with final review and approval at staff level. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Fifield went on to say that the neighbors had the right to appeal the Committee’s decision to the Commission, and that the Commission decision could be appealed to City Council.

816 St Philip St: 22-22761-VCGEN; Gates Erika, applicant; Marriner Properties LLC, owner; Proposal to structurally reinforce gallery, per application & materials received 08/30/2022 & 12/02/2022, respectively.
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=937336>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Gates present on behalf of the application. Ms. Gates stated that the engineer had no issue with the architectural drawings and had stamped them. Mr. Fifield agreed that staff’s concern with the added trim was reasonable. Ms. Gates stated that it had been proposed to improve appearance and match typical conditions in the district, and that the current joists were too thin. Mr. Fifield asked if it was dimensional lumber and only 1-1/2” thick; Ms. Gates responded yes, and very thin at the street side. She added that there were no issues with the connection at the building and that they did not want to fully remove it. Mr. Bergeron asked how deep they would be inserted into the wall; Ms. Gates responded “only a couple of inches.” Mr. Fifield asked about the damaged outriggers; Ms. Gates responded that they would be sistered. Ms. Vogt stated that she remembered at least one of the outriggers being replaced, per a previous submittal. Ms. Gates stated that she would confirm. She added that the trim had been proposed to hide the seam and would only be

applied. Mr. Bergeron asked if doubling the joists was required or if this would be easier; Ms. Gates responded that it reduced the invasiveness of the work and that they were concerned about joist removal since the issue was at the end, not at the wall.

Mr. Block stated that his primary concern with the added trim piece was how it would weather. He added that he was concerned about the added weight from sistering the structure. Ms. Bourgogne stated that the gallery was partially damaged from being struck by a truck. Mr. Bergeron stated that if it was sistered, it could not be allowed to have a gap at the wall. Ms. Vogt stated that that had been her concern too, which is why the detail showed the end of the joist being inserted into the wall past the stucco but not into the brick. Mr. Bergeron asked if the trim was necessary; Mr. Fifield stated that he preferred it not be used so it did not appear fake.

Mr. Bergeron moved to **approve** sistering the structure, excluding the proposed trim. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

616 Conti St: 22-31816-VCGEN; Terri Dreyer, applicant; Conti Street Holding LLC, owner; Proposal to construct new rear addition in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *restaurant (standard)*, per application & materials received 10/21/2022 & 1/10/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=949420>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Johnson and Ms. Hubbell present on behalf of the application. Ms. Johnson stated that they had already addressed the street tree with CPC and they removed that requirement. She added that the tiebacks might be an oversight with the engineer, and they would revise. Mr. Fifield asked for public comment.

Ms. Szalwinski, on behalf of French Quarter Citizens, addressed the applicants and begged them to work with neighbors and not make assumptions about the neighbor's buildings. She stated that damage at property line buildings was an issue.

Mr. Fifield stated that he found the work consistent with the previous Committee and Commission approvals. Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval** and forwarded the application to the Commission. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

434-40 Bourbon, 732 St Louis St: 23-00612-VCGEN; Diane Hickman, applicant; MDK 440 Bourbon Real Estate LLC, owner; Proposal to demolish Brown rated structures and construct new three-story building with double gallery, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *bar* to *bar/residential*, per application & materials received 01/09/2023 & 01/11/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=958572>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Long present on behalf of the application. Mr. Long stated that he had worked with staff and the neighborhood organizations to develop and improve the proposal to expand the building. Mr. Bergeron asked if the one-story structure at St. Louis was historic; Ms. Vogt responded that there might be remnants remaining of 19th century structures and that the buildings had been through lots of changes and probably could not be "upgraded if properly restored," per a Pink rating. Mr. Block agreed that the structure was probably not contributing. Mr. Fifield asked for public comment.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee, stating that the new construction was a bad idea and would damage the surrounding buildings and have a detrimental impact. Mr. Long responded that the buildings would be new; Ms. Szalwinski stated that she was worried about the neighboring foundations. Mr. Fifield stated that the applicant was a professional and she was speculating about neighboring conditions. He instructed the applicant to work with an engineer. Mr. Long stated that they would do exploratory work to discover foundations at the property line. Mr. Fifield stated that the current review would consider preliminary concerns such as massing, etc. He stated that they had asked the applicant to look at the figure-ground of the proposal and save the windows on the rear of the Green rated building. He noted that they were giving these features some space with the proposed lightwell. Mr. Long stated that they had stepped back from the Green rated building per staff direction. Mr. Bergeron asked about open space; Ms. Vogt stated that there was none now, but if the existing building was demolished they might lose their non-conforming status, she stated she was unsure. Mr. Fifield stated that the proposal did not adequately show context and that he had questions regarding the street front and openings. Mr. Long stated that they were not developed yet and were still in flux.

Mr. Fifield asked if the mechanical equipment for the entire site would be located as shown, or only the equipment for the new construction; Mr. Long responded that it would include all of it. Mr. Fifield noted that that unburdened the historic building. Mr. Block stated that he appreciated the applicant's response to the Committee and staff concerns, and that he found the application to be moving in the right direction.

Mr. Bergeron moved for conceptual approval of the massing and siting, with the applicant to allow for a staff inspection of the site and return to the Committee for further review. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Erin Holmes of VCPORA asked to address the Committee on the record, as she had missed the public comment portion of the hearing, acknowledging it would not affect the outcome of the Committee's decision. Mr. Fifield yielded the floor. Ms. Holmes stated that she was happy the applicant returned to the Committee. She acknowledged that new construction was difficult and appreciated the applicant allowing for an additional site visit, and that the review was in the appropriate hands to ensure a good outcome.

937 Dumaine St: 23-00999-VCGEN; John C Williams, applicant; 937 Dumaine Street LLC, owner; Proposal to install intercom at front entrance, per application & materials received 01/11/2023.
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=958961>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Jelich and Mr. Williams present on behalf of the application. Mr. Jelich stated that they had done a lot of work to restore the building, including all new millwork. He explained that the jambs were paneled to match the sister buildings in the row and that the intercom could be much larger, but they had restricted it to only the options that were needed. He added that this was the only location that avoided the millwork. Mr. Fifield stated that the choice was between old masonry and new millwork. Mr. Jelich stated that it would be difficult to make the hardware look right in the jamb, and that it would be flush with the masonry and look cleaner than if it were in the approximately 7" deep jamb.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of VCPORA, stating that the millwork was new and that the applicant should not want the hardware on the front elevation, since it would be pressed by drunk passersby.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the photo made the jamb look deeper on the right; Mr. Jelich stated that the jambs were the same depth, and that it would fit but it would chop up the trim and likely hold water. Mr. Fifield asked why this was not handled earlier so it could be integrated into the design; Mr. Jelich responded that it had been brought to the Committee earlier but deferred, and they had not wanted it to hold up approval of the other items. Mr. Fifield stated that the Committee needed to see if it could fit inside the panel and how it would be integrated. Mr. Block stated that the review could come back for the next meeting.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval** of the hardware at the front entrance in the jamb, with final review at staff. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Fifield stated that the review could return to the Committee if a solution could not be found at staff level.

Appeals and Violations

421 Burgundy St: 22-31875-VCPNT; Ernest Goodwin William, applicant; Gay Lynn Marchand Jones, Richard P Keating, Jeffrey W Moore, William E Goodwin, Mark E Nelms, Kenneth A Bowen, owner;
Review of details for installation of DaVinci Inspire synthetic slate shingles approved for installation by the Commission at the 01/18/2023 meeting, per application & materials received 10/21/2022.
<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=949479>

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Parr present on behalf of the application. Mr. Parr stated that there was currently a piece of flashing up there now at the edge of the existing slate roof of 429 Burgundy that they would flash over for the new roof. He went on to say that they had removed the old roof, put down new decking and made it watertight. He then explained the detail as to how the two roofs would connect.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Albrecht asked if it was the same condition at the lower rear roof. Mr. Parr stated yes. Ms. Bourgogne asked Mr. Parr to email the detail to Mr. Albrecht. Mr. Bergeron asked if he was ok with that. Mr. Parr stated yes.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion to approve the DaVinci installation with the details to be handled at the staff level. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

601-07 Chartres St: 22-35074-VCGEN; Bob Ellis, applicant; Apasra Properties LLC, owner; Proposal to address demolition by neglect and work without permit violations, including relocation of rooftop hood vent, appeal to retain mechanical equipment, and structural work on the rear dependency, per application & materials received 11/20/2022 & 12/28/2022, respectively. [Notices of Violation sent 07/06/2012, 11/18/2013, 05/16/2014, 10/02/2017, 11/09/2018, 06/11/2019, 08/09/2019, 09/06/2019, 12/15/2019, 12/14/2020, 06/30/2021, 09/27/2021, & 04/28/2022. STOP WORK ORDERS posted 08/09/2019 & 08/21/2019]

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=954742>

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Ms. Gates and Mr. Martin present on behalf of the application. Mr. Martin stated that there was a long record of violations that they were trying to bring into compliance, and that the intent of the repairs would resolve them all. He was unsure about the fan windows; Ms. Gates noted that a lot of the millwork was c. 1920s and not original. Mr. Bergeron asked if they were willing to work with staff; Mr. Martin stated that they were, and that the main focus had been on the balcony damage but they were now working on the whole project.

Ms. Szalwinski addressed the Committee on behalf of VCPORA, stating that they should address all violations and go back to what was historically there.

Mr. Fifield stated that using the millwork below the fanlight as a reference would not work as the proportions were wrong. He found the A-B-B-A arrangement fine but that the lites were atypical. He emphasized that this was an important element that must be gotten right. He stated they should not mimic the transom below, as it was not useful, and that the header must be gotten right. He went on to say that detail 3 was not the way to go, as there were too many pieces of wood exposed. He suggested the applicant refine their details and that the Committee would need to see the millwork and header before fabrication.

Mr. Bergeron moved for **conceptual approval**, with exceptions and revisions as recommended by staff, and with the millwork to be revised and return for further review at the Committee level. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Next AC Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023

Upon request, a sign language interpreter for the hearing impaired will be available at the meeting. To place a request for sign language interpreter services, please call TDDY at (504) 658-2059 or 1-800-981-6652.