

VIEUX CARRE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

LaToya Cantrell  
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Bryan Block  
DIRECTOR

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

The Vieux Carré Commission Architectural Committee's regularly scheduled meeting will take place on **Tuesday, November 7, 2023, in the 7<sup>th</sup> floor Conference Room A, City Hall, 1300 Perdido Street at 1:00 PM.** VCC staff recommends all attendees bring their own laptop or tablet to review meeting materials.

The order in which the applications will be discussed is subject to change without prior notice upon the discretion of the Architectural Committee. The names of property owners are automatically generated from City data sources and may not reflect recent changes in ownership and may be inaccurate on this agenda. We apologize for any confusion this may cause.

Please note that additional information on each application, including submitted plans, is available by following the link below each agenda item. **Additionally, please note that Architectural Committee approval does not constitute a permit; work may not begin until the applicant is in possession of all necessary permits from the VCC and Safety & Permits.**

At the Tuesday, November 7, 2023 meeting, the following items may be discussed.

**AGENDA**

**Old Business**

---

**908 St Peter St: 23-05952-VCGEN;** West Studio, applicant; Nancy H Averett, Jeanne M Broom, owner;

Proposal to modify and expand previously approved scope of work, per application & materials received 03/14/2023 & 10/23/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=965728>

---

**625 Chartres St: 23-21625-VCGEN;** Hunter Lapeyre, applicant; 625 Chartres LLC, owner; Review of proposed masonry repairs, including parapet removal and chimney stabilization, per application & materials received 08/07/2023 & 10/24/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=983831>

---

**914 N Rampart St: 23-23407-VCGEN;** Terrell Fabacher, applicant; Victorian House LLC, owner; Proposal to modify millwork and install mechanical wheelchair lift on side elevation, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *commercial* to *medical clinic*, per application & materials received 08/24/2023 & 10/25/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=985631>

---

**717 Orleans Ave: 23-23949-VCGEN;** Kim Hosch, applicant; DRH Bourbon Owner LLC, owner;

Proposal to renovate building and courtyard including converting courtyard facing windows to doors, per application & materials received 08/29/2023 & 10/17/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=986250>

**New Business**

---

**921 Chartres St: 23-17662-VCGEN;** Paradigm Investments LLC, applicant; Jennerson M Guillory, owner;

Proposal to install composite deck treads on existing flat roof for mechanical access, per application & materials received 06/29/2023 & 10/23/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=978152>

---

**541 Dumaine St: 23-23446-VCGEN;** Taylor Jennifer, applicant; William D Hoffman, owner;

Proposal to renovate the Dumaine elevation of the main building including installation of new structural ties and steel lintels, per application & materials received 06/29/2023 & 10/31/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=985711>

---

---

**224 Decatur St: 23-28614-VCGEN;** Diane Hickman, applicant; 214 Decatur Street Development LLC, owner; Proposal to replace existing overhead metal door with new wood doors on Clinton Street elevation, per application & materials received 10/17/2023.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=990901>

---

## Appeals and Violations

---

**620 Decatur St: 22-35988-VCGEN;** Bart Sutton, applicant; Wwtj LLC, Lawrence Allan Schlax, Louisiana CVS Pharmacy LLC Attn: Admin -Store 2728, Ms Jane Ann's Quarter Quarters LLC, Jph-One LLC, George L Jones Trust George L Jones AS Trustee, Peter S Escamilla, Michael D Krochak, Friday Properties New Orleans LLC, Syed N Assas Farhat F Abbas, Roy Investments Properties LLC, Bennet Lapidus, New Jax Commercial LLC, 820 Decatur LLC, Jph-Two LLC, William S Everitt, Jmr River Vieux 526 LLC, 416 Bourbon St LLC, Roy Investment Properties LLC, Nola Jax LLC, Jph-One LLC, Hugo Enrique Biedermann Montaner, Hugo Enrique Biedermann Montaner, Jph-One LLC, The Spruce Pine Trust, Walker S Kimball, Bosco Enterprises LLC, Syed N Farhat F Abbas, Jaxson Group Nola LLC, Micheal D Krochak, Rachael C Kinberger, Bisjo LLC, Sandbridge LLC, Walter Dickinson Liebkemann, Thomas J Ward, Harold A McLeod, owner;

Proposal to retain work completed in deviation of approved permit, including improper stucco and plastic mesh, per application & materials received 12/05/2022 & 10/24/2023, respectively.

<https://onestopapp.nola.gov/Documents.aspx?ObjLabel=Permit&ID=955916>

---

**518 Conti St: 23-23252-VCGEN;** Earl J LeBlanc, Jr, applicant; Llmv Properties LLC, owner; Appeal to retain hot water heaters installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 08/24/2023 & 10/25/2023.

---

**518 Conti St: 23-26643-VCGEN;** Charles J. Weckesser, applicant; Llmv Properties LLC, owner; Appeal to retain HVAC platform installed contrary to VCC stamped approved drawings, in conjunction with installation of mechanical equipment, per application & materials received 09/28/2023 & 10/25/2023.

---

**1009 Bourbon St: 23-29109-VCGEN;** Dillon Gregory, applicant; Gregory M Dillon, owner; Appeal to retain alcove gate installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 10/23/2023. **[Notice of Violation sent 04/08/2022, STOP WORK ORDERS posted 03/09/2022 & 04/04/2022.]**

---

Next AC Date:                      Tuesday, November 28, 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.

ADDRESS:	908 St. Peter St.	APPLICANT:	Studio West
OWNER:	Jeanne Broom	SQUARE:	89
ZONING:	VCR-1	LOT SIZE:	2,065
USE:	Residential		

### **ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY**

This building is a c. 1890 example of a double, frame shotgun cottage, made in the late Victorian, Italianate style. It is the twin of 912-914 St. Peter.

Rating: **Main and Service Buildings: Green**, of local architectural and/or historical significance.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/07/2023**

---

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/07/2023  
**Permit # 23-05952-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to modify and expand previously approved scope of work, per application & materials received 03/14/2023 & 10/23/2023, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

This project was initially reviewed and approved by the Architecture Committee back at the 03/28/2023 meeting. The plans were finalized and permits issued on 04/21/2023. Then, an inspection on 09/29/2023 revealed that the scope of the approved work had been greatly exceeded. This included reframing window openings, reframing exterior walls, adding sheathing, unpermitted foundation work, and completely removing the chimney from the rear building. The applicant noted that the original contractor is no longer working on this project, and they are searching for a new contractor.

Regarding the proposed work, the applicant is proposing to reframe the windows to their historic locations and sizes. Staff finds this aspect of the proposal approvable.

The applicant is proposing to install or retain exterior ½” plywood sheathing on the main building. Staff has typically not approved the addition of sheathing to the exterior of historic buildings that never had any as the additional material can have a sort of compounding effect on trim and corner details and window and door thickness. The plans show that the window trim would be mounted on top of the sheathing to maintain a similar reveal as before. Still, staff questions the appropriateness of this proposed addition.

It was also discovered that there had been some questionable work to the foundation of the main building including the addition of new piers. Staff requested that the applicant consult with a structural engineer regarding the overall structure and foundation. The engineer made a total of eight recommendations to address any structural concerns of the two buildings. The recommendations include re-constructing block piers if new piers are needed that meet code and VCC recommendations, reinforcing or replacing framing where needed, and tuckpointing existing masonry walls and piers. Staff finds the work recommend by the structural engineer approvable, provided the details of this work are consistent with Guidelines.

The applicant proposes to focus on the main structure only at this time with the chimney details and other work at the rear building to be submitted for a later meeting. This may be acceptable for a short timeframe but staff questions if the rear building has been made fully watertight. At the time of the inspection on 09/29, the hole where the previously existing chimney had penetrated the roof was fully open to the sky.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed addition of exterior sheathing to the walls of the main building. Staff recommends a limited timeframe regarding addressing the issues at the rear building and conceptual approval of the other aspects of the proposal.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/07/2023

**Architecture Committee Meeting of****03/28/2023****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

03/28/2023

**Permit # 23-05952-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate main and service buildings, including the installation of new mechanical equipment and front stair handrails, per application & materials received 03/10/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

03/28/2023

Materials have been submitted for an extensive renovation of this property. The majority of the exterior work appears to be general cleaning up of the buildings and repairs to match existing. Staff noted the following items in need of Architectural Committee review:

**Textured Stucco**

On sheets A141 and A401 there is a note about removing the textured stucco finish from the front masonry foundation wall. Staff notes that this same finish is seen on the sister building next door. Although it is not necessarily original to the building, staff suggests that this textured stucco has gained its own significance and recommends retaining the existing texture.

**Stoop Handrail**

At both entrance stoops, new metal handrails are proposed as seen on sheet A401 and detailed on A501. These rails are shown as simple square metal with several vertical pickets. The rails only appear at the bottom two steps to allow for the shutters at the entrance doors to remain operable. Staff finds the concept of simple rails in these locations conceptually approvable but recommends eliminating the vertical pickets to further minimize the rails.

**Roofing and Mechanical**

At the rear of the main building there is a low-sloped shed roof that currently features non-approvable asphalt shingles. The applicant proposes to remove this roofing material and to install a new standing seam aluminum roofing in an ash gray color. Staff has no objections to this aspect of the proposal.

This roof is also the location of one existing HVAC condensing unit. During discussions with the applicant, the idea of adding a second unit to this roof for the rear building was mentioned. Staff notes that the plans show a new unit to be installed on the balcony of the rear building but staff greatly prefers the alternative of installing a second unit on this roof.

**Rear Building**

At the rear building, existing window units, including one inappropriately installed in a transom window, will be removed and the millwork repaired or replaced.

The applicant plans to remove the first and second floor portions of the existing chimney, but support the top at the attic level so there will be no change to the exterior portion of the chimney. Provided that this can be done safely and successfully, there will essentially be no exterior work to this element.

**Summary**

Overall, staff is encouraged to see this property receive some much-needed attention. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal with the exception of the removal of the textured stucco and with the applicant to work with staff regarding details of the handrails and rear building mechanical equipment.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

03/28/2023

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Ms. West present on behalf of the application. Ms. West stated that there was no objections to retaining the texture, no objection to simplifying the handrails, and that she agreed with the mechanical equipment location on the rear roof.

Mr. Fifield inquired about the exact composition of the stucco, Portland cement or something else. Ms. West noted that it had been patched and repaired numerous times and that the building in general has experienced significant damage so it was difficult to tell.

There was no public comment.

Ms. DiMaggio moved for conceptual approval of the proposal with the exception of the removal of the stucco and incorporating the other staff recommendations. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	625 Chartres	APPLICANT:	Hunter Lapeyre
OWNER:	625 Chartres LLC	SQUARE:	42
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	3048 sq. ft.
USE:	Restaurant	OPEN SPACE	
DENSITY		Required:	914.40 sq. ft.
Allowed:	5 units	Existing:	480 sq. ft. (approx.)
Existing:	0 units	Proposed:	No change
Proposed:	No change		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Main building & service building: **Blue**, of major architectural and/or historic significance.

Altered c. 1795 2-story brick porte-cochere structure with semi-attached service building and a canopy balcony with wood rails on the street façade.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/07/2023**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/07/2023  
**Permit #23-21625-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Review of proposed masonry repairs, including parapet removal and chimney stabilization, per application & materials received 08/07/2023 & 10/24/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

The applicant has submitted revised details for parapet flashing and reconstruction of the chimney, both at the rear service ell. Staff seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding the appropriateness of the proposed structural work and parapet alterations.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/07/2023

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **10/10/2023****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**  
**Permit #23-21625-VCGEN**10/10/2023  
**Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to perform emergency masonry reconstruction and appeal to demolish chimneys, per application & materials received 08/07/2023 & 09/11/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 10/10/2023

[NOTE: This report and supporting materials are unchanged since preparation for the 09/26/2023 hearing, which was cancelled. The applicant was encouraged to conduct interior exploratory demolition and provide additional drawings, but no materials were received in advance of this meeting.]

Staff issued a permit on 07/24/2023 for installation of a new slate roof on both the main building and service building. Shortly after beginning work, the contractor contacted VCC staff to notify them that the chimneys were in unsafe condition, and the service ell parapet had partially collapsed after flashing was removed. Unfortunately, much of the masonry has been covered in roofing cement, which has contributed to its recent/imminent failure. Staff requested an engineer's report, which was provided by Mr. John Bose and identified the roofing cement as the cause for many issues:

- a. **Adhesion Issues:** Copper flashing relies on mechanical fasteners and a smooth, predictable surface for soldering or sealing. Roofing cement is uneven and does not provide a suitable surface for these adhesion methods. The adhesion between the copper and the cement would likely be weak, undermining the integrity of the flashing.
- b. **Different Expansion Coefficients:** Materials like copper and roofing cement have different coefficients of thermal expansion. Copper metal expands and contracts with temperature fluctuations more so than roofing cement. Over time, this can lead to a loosening of the seal, which compromises the flashing's ability to keep water out.
- c. **Chemical Reactions:** The combination of copper with the chemicals in roofing cement may lead to corrosion or other reactions that compromise the integrity of either or both materials.
- d. **Maintenance Complexity:** Over time, both copper flashing and roofing cement will degrade and require maintenance or replacement. Because they are incompatible materials adhered together, you can't easily repair one without affecting the other. This complicates long-term maintenance.

The report goes on to address three chimneys on the main building and one on the rear building, as follows (opinions below abridged from Mr. Bose's report; full report will be saved for the record):

Front chimney of main building: *appears to be original and is in good condition except where it penetrated the roof. Some of the bricks were pulled out of the chimney when the old flashing was removed. The bricks need to be replaced and then the chimney can be properly flashed by the roofer.*

Middle chimney of main building: *appears to have been added later, as the second floor framing does not show any penetration through the floor. However, it is in good condition and only needs to be capped.*

Rear chimney of main building: *appears to have been added later, as the side walls of the chimney were not knitted in to the main building walls. A slot was made in the wall and bricks placed without attachment. The framing was cut to accommodate the wall, and the chimney may have been constructed as a vent for the water heater. The bricks are resting on 1-1/2" thick boards on the flat. The chimney is completely covered in black roofing cement. The chimney should be removed since it was not original. To properly flash the sides of the chimney, the roofing cement would need to be removed. This would likely cause the bricks to shift or fall out of place, making it unstable. If removed, the slot in the wall could be repaired. If it cannot be removed, additional structural support will be needed in the attic.*

Chimney at rear service ell: *This chimney is in the middle of the roof and does not extend below the second floor. The framing is covered by sheetrock and not visible. The entire chimney is covered in black roofing cement. The roof would leak less if the chimney were removed below the roof. [Staff is unsure if this is a typo, since it appears to refer to interior work and not exterior]*

Parapet wall at rear building: *About fifteen feet of the top of the party wall had a brick parapet. The rest of the top of the party wall has roof decking stopping almost at the edge of the brick wall towards Canal. The parapet is only one wythe thick and in very poor condition. I am proposing the remaining brick of the parapet be removed and new roof deck extended to the edge of the roof, matching the rest of the roof.*

Staff finds the proposed work to flash and cap the front and middle chimneys at the main building to be **approvable**. Since the rear chimney is not historic and would require reconstruction due to roofing cement, and particularly given the assessment that it may have been added to serve as a water heater vent, staff likewise finds its removal **approvable**.

The chimney at the rear service ell is more complicated, as it is likely original, but the interior structure (if any) and framing cannot be inspected without interior exploratory demolition. The chimney's current state covered in roofing cement is concerning, as it is likely that much of the masonry cannot be reused. The Design Guidelines state that "the VCC approves the removal of a historic chimney only if it is structurally deficient." Reconstruction of a historically appropriate chimney can be handled at staff level (however, the structural details do still require Committee review), but removal of a chimney requires Commission approval. Staff suspects that removal of the sheet rock to inspect the framing would support Staff's assumption that this chimney is historic. Since it is structurally insufficient and covered in roofing cement, it should be reconstructed with appropriate masonry to exactly match the existing conditions. Staff recommends **deferral** regarding this chimney, with exploratory demolition to be undertaken, and full scaled and dimensioned drawings to be submitted which document the existing conditions and show the new interior structure.

Regarding the parapet, staff finds the photos of the existing conditions to be very unusual. It is clear from the existing rafters that this building originally had a barrel tile roof, which is unsurprising given it is a c. 1795 Blue rated structure. Staff is unsure if a one wythe thick brick parapet would typically be present with a barrel tile roof, giving it something to die into. Staff seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding the proposal to finish the roof system without restoration of the partial one-wythe thick parapet, particularly given that the current roof system is slate and has been for many years.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

10/10/2023

ADDRESS:	914 N. Rampart Street	APPLICANT:	Terrell Fabacher
OWNER:	Victorian House LLC	SQUARE:	104
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	3072 sq. ft. (approx.)
USE:	Unknown		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Main building & service building: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.

A 2-story, frame, late Victorian dwelling.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** 11/07/2023

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/07/2023  
**Permit #23-23407-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to modify millwork and install mechanical wheelchair lift on side elevation, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *commercial* to *medical clinic*, per application & materials received 08/24/2023 & 10/25/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

Following conceptual approval at the Committee level on 9/12/23, the Commission on 10/18/23 moved for approval and returned the application to the Committee for final review of millwork details. The applicant has submitted more complete plans, with notable aspects as follows:

- Notes call for the St. Philip side “window and frame to be reinstalled to clean finish conditions.” Staff is unsure if the head, jamb and sill will be able to be relocated, so the existing details should be studied and drawn in case the window sashes are the only viable material for reuse.
- The new door is shown swinging out, with two vertical lites and a single wood panel below. The stiles are thicker than is typical, with a 5” reveal. Since the door and window already will not align due to the use of a transom above, a single lite with no vertical muntin may be more appropriate. Staff recommends the stile reveals be reduced to a more typical 3-1/2” – 4”.
- A section through the new door and transom shows it mounted in the same plane as the outer face of the wall, due to its swing out. In order to avoid a surface mounted appearance and reduce the chance of water intrusion, staff recommends the door and transom be designed to be set deeper into the wall while still swinging out, with a more prominent transom bar. Preferably, the door should be in the same plane as the adjacent window.
- The wheelchair lift landing is shown with two footers on the St. Philip side and is supported by the building framing on the other. The joists are supported by hangers attached to a new treated 2x12 ledger. Since this would eliminate the need for a foundation where the landing meets the historic building, staff finds this attachment preferable to a fully independent landing structure.
- At the rear dependency porch, the applicant proposes to retain the existing concrete steps and install a new lamb’s tongue rail. Staff encourages the applicant to consider wooden steps as they would be more appropriate than concrete.
- Specs have been submitted for the ADA door signal, which is to be installed at the street and is visually unobtrusive but easily recognizable, and the door hardware, which is a standard lever available in three finishes but is shown in what appears to be a brushed aluminum. While this finish is typically not approvable, it may be less objectionable since this is a discrete installation for ADA compliance.

Overall, staff finds the work **approvable**, with revisions to be submitted to staff for final review and permit.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/07/2023

ADDRESS:	717 Orleans	APPLICANT:	Kim Hosch
OWNER:	DRH Bourbon Owner, LLC	SQUARE:	59
ZONING:	VCE	LOT SIZE:	34,923 sq. ft.
USE:	Commercial	DENSITY-	
		ALLOWED:	58 Units
		EXISTING:	0 Units
		PROPOSED:	No Change
		OPEN SPACE-	
		REQUIRED:	6,984 sq. ft.
		EXISTING:	Unknown
		PROPOSED:	No Change

**ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

In 1965 after a prolonged preservation battle, the two-story masonry structure known as the Orleans Ballroom was renovated and incorporated into new hotel construction. The new building is subordinate to the historic building, which was constructed by architect William Brand, following the design of B.H.B. Latrobe's Ballroom that was destroyed by fire in 1816. The Society of the Holy Family acquired the property facing Orleans, Bourbon and St. Ann in 1881 and used the ballroom and other buildings, which were constructed for the Society in the 1890s, as a convent, orphan asylum and school. All the buildings except the Ballroom were torn down to make room for the hotel.

The Orleans Ballroom structure is rated **blue**, of major architectural and/or historical importance, and the remaining hotel structures are rated **orange**, or post-1946 construction.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/07/2023**

---

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/07/2023  
**Permit # 23-23949-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate building and courtyard including converting courtyard facing windows to doors, per application & materials received 08/29/2023 & 10/17/2023, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

This proposal was reviewed at the 10/10/2023 Architecture Committee meeting where the Committee approved the majority of the work with the exception of all proposed modifications to pool deck openings. The applicant has returned with a revised proposal for these openings.

For the conversion of two existing windows on the rear of the Bourbon St. portion of the building to new doors and the conversion of one window on the rear of the Orleans portion of the building to doors, the proposal is mostly the same as the previously reviewed one. The one change occurred at the proposed lite pattern for the new doors and sidelights where the previously proposed eight lite panels have been reduced to four lites. This creates a lite size more typical to others on this building.

On the Bourbon St. elevation of the building that fronts on St. Ann St. (2 on Sheet A-203), the applicant still proposes to significantly enlarge three existing door openings and install a series of new doors in the larger openings. The proposal has been revised, however, to maintain a bit more vertical alignment with the openings above. The left side of the first opening and the right side of the third opening would maintain vertical alignment with the openings above while the three openings all enlarged toward the center, creating a series of three large openings.

Staff notes that these openings are rather diminutive, measuring just over 7' tall. This small size combined with the orange-rating of the building and being concealed within the courtyard may offer some room for changes. Still, the Guidelines generally discourage modifications to the size of window and door openings. (VCC DG: 07-20)

There are two openings to the left of the ones proposed to be enlarged that are essentially concealed within an alleyway between buildings that are actually proposed to be reduced in size. Previously, one of these openings was shown as receiving new millwork but the opening itself being unchanged. The other opening was not even shown in the drawing. Staff questions why these two openings would be reduced in size but again noting the conditions here, the proposed changes would not be very significant.

Finally, two existing flat panel doors on the far right of the elevation are noted as being removed and the area infilled with matching brick. These existing doors seem out of place compared to the rest of the very unified elevation. Again noting the conditions present with this building and location, staff does not find this aspect of the proposal objectionable.

Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposal.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/07/2023

**Architecture Committee Meeting of****10/10/2023****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**  
**Permit # 23-23949-VCGEN**

10/10/2023

**Lead Staff: Nicholas Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate building and courtyard including partial removal of gallery at the orange-rated building, reducing size of existing pool, and converting courtyard facing windows to doors, per application & materials received 08/29/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

10/10/2023

The proposed work occurs on the Orleans elevation of the orange rated building and, more extensively, in the courtyard of the property.

**Gallery Removal**

At the orange-rated building, the existing gallery wraps the entirety of the three street faces of this large building. On the Orleans elevation, the gallery actually wraps around the end of the orange-rated building above an alcove between the two buildings. The applicant proposes to demolish this portion of the gallery only so that the gallery ends even with the end wall of this building. The existing railing would be salvaged and modified for use in the new end of the gallery. This would open the space above the alcove to the sky.

Generally, the Guidelines require maintaining balconies and galleries but given this is such a small and somewhat atypical portion on an orange-rated building, staff finds the proposed removal potentially approvable.

The alcove space currently features a gate at the front of the alcove. Staff questions if any work will be done to this gate as part of the proposal. Staff would encourage maintaining the gate in this location to help prevent undesirable activity in the alcove space. Staff also notes that there is existing lighting on the underside of this portion of the gallery and questions if alternative lighting will be proposed.

**Courtyard Work**

The proposed courtyard work is more extensive, but only involves orange-rated portions of the property. The applicant lists four items in need of Architecture Committee review.

**Paving**

All the existing paving in the courtyard area is noted for removal. The existing material is a beige flagstone in various sizes. Staff does not object to the removal of this material as it dates to no earlier than the 1960s construction of the hotel but encourages the applicant to attempt to recycle the material, rather than simply disposing of it.

The proposed new paving consists of a checkerboard pattern of 13" x 13" pavers as seen detailed on sheet A-301. The plans call for these to be alternating between a beige cream color and a shale grey color but submitted samples are coastal white and sterling grey. Staff seeks clarification from the applicant regarding the proposed colors but does not object to either proposed option. Either submittal appears to be approvable per the Guidelines.

**Pool Size Reduction**

The applicant proposes to reduce the size of the existing pool down to a size of 30' long and 20' wide. The basic shape of the pool would be similar in the reduced size. A new pool lift is noted with the reduction but no other changes are seen. Staff has no objections to the pool size reduction.

**Window to Door Conversions**

The next aspect of the proposal in need of Architecture Committee review is the conversion of two existing windows on the rear of the Bourbon St. portion of the building to new doors and the conversion of one window on the rear of the Orleans portion of the building to doors. The work would include removal of the large windows, measuring approximately 7-1/2' tall by 10' wide, below the existing fanlights and installation of new millwork.

On the rear of the Bourbon St. portion (detail 7, A-201 and detail 2, A-301), the proposed new doors are shown as out swinging with fixed sidelights. On the proposed Orleans rear door (detail 4, A-201 and detail 2, A-301), bi-folding doors are shown, also out swinging.

The Guidelines generally discourage this type of window to door conversion but given this location and the rating of the building, staff finds the concept potentially approvable.

**Door Opening Enlargement and Replacement**

Finally, on the Bourbon St. elevation of the building that fronts on St. Ann St. (Sheet A-202), the applicant proposes to significantly enlarge three existing door openings and install a series of new doors in the larger

openings. The plans note, “Proposed new doors. Details to match existing adjacent wood doors” but in elevation these appear to be possible accordion style doors. The Guidelines state that, “*the modification or addition of a window or door opening is discouraged, particularly on a more prominent building façade.*” This “*includes increasing the size of a door opening to provide a larger opening for a display window, garage, or other use.*” (VCC DG: 07-20)

Although this is a courtyard facing elevation of an orange-rated building, staff is concerned that this modification is somewhat extreme and would significantly change the way this building is perceived from the courtyard. The existing door opening are vertically aligned with the openings above, while the proposed condition would create much more glass at the first-floor level and eliminate that order. Still, this floor level is quite short, noted as only 8’3” tall, so the change may not be particularly jarring compared to the much larger openings on the other buildings facing the courtyard. Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding this aspect of the proposal.

### **Summary**

Staff finds the gallery portion removal, paving, and pool size reduction all conceptually approvable with the few points of clarification noted in the report. Staff requests commentary from the committee regarding the proposed courtyard facing door work.

### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

10/10/2023

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Gowland present on behalf of the application.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for the conceptual approval of the work with the exception for the bi-fold doors and all pool deck openings to be revised and to come back to the ARC. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	921 Chartres Street	APPLICANT:	Paradigm Investments
OWNER:	Multiple Owners	SQUARE:	48
ZONING:	VCR-2	LOT SIZE:	12,172 sq. ft.
USE:	Residential	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	3,651 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	20 Units	EXISTING:	2,397 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	24 Units	PROPOSED:	No Change
PROPOSED:	No Change		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: Green - Of Local Architectural or Historical Importance  
 Orange - Extreme rear building - Unrated 20th Century Construction

From the early 1800's, there was a complex at this address that also housed a bakery, and later a livery. Since there was a two-story store on the property as early as the 1820's and since there is an 1841 contract to remodel the roof by the addition of an "a la Francaise roof" and two dormers, it is possible that the existing large 2-story brick double building, divided by a large carriageway, is an earlier building that was remodeled in the 1840's. It today has a Greek Revival appearance, including pilasters on the ground floor and granite lintels on the upper floors. There are still attached stable wings which create the large inner court but the historic rear stable (at the extreme rear of the property) has been replaced by 20th c. construction.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of****11/07/2023****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/07/2023

**Permit # 23-17662-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to install composite deck treads on existing flat roof for mechanical access, per application & materials received 06/29/2023 & 10/23/2023, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/07/2023

The applicant proposes to install simple wood framing and synthetic deck boards on a small flat roof near the back corner of this large property. This one-story structure sits between the green-rated service ell and the orange-rated rear building. The applicant states that the decking would be installed in order to provide a more robust walking surface for maintenance of the two HVAC condensers that sit on this roof.

Staff's concern is that currently this roof is accessed by a standard exterior door directly from the living area of the rear building. There is nothing to limit use of this decking to maintenance purposes only and it very possibly could become a roof deck for residential living space.

If evaluated as a rooftop deck, staff finds that this proposal is potentially approvable. The deck would be on a rear building with seemingly little to no visibility from neighboring properties. Staff notes that there is no railing included in the proposal. As staff recommends that this be evaluated as a rooftop deck for residential use, a code compliant railing should be included in the proposal.

Regarding the synthetic decking proposed, the applicant is proposing AZEK decking, noting that it has been used elsewhere on the property. Staff found that there was an Architecture Committee review in 2019 regarding synthetic decking that had started to be installed on the property without VCC review or approval. That decking was denied for retention but the Committee did conceptually approve the installation of Aeratis synthetic decking. If AZEK or another brand of synthetic decking remains on the property, it would be considered in violation. Regarding the current proposal, staff finds the use of Aeratis or similar synthetic decking approvable, but staff is unaware of a AZEK product that meets the requirements of the VCC.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal provided that a revised proposal is brought into code compliance as a roof deck, including appropriate railings, and that other potential violations on the property are addressed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/07/2023

ADDRESS:	541-543 Dumaine St.	APPLICANT:	Donald Maginnis
OWNER:	Will Hoffman	SQUARE:	21
ZONING:	VCR-2	LOT SIZE:	1,472 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	442 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	2 Units	EXISTING:	362 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	Unknown	PROPOSED:	352 sq.ft.
PROPOSED:	No Change		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: Main and service building: Green, or of local architectural or historical importance;

The Vieux Carré Survey places the construction date of 543 Dumaine, as well as 541 Dumaine and the adjoining building at the corner of Chartres and Dumaine, to the 1880s. There is some evidence, however that the structures predate that year.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** 11/07/2023

<b><u>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</u></b>	11/07/2023
<b>Permit # 23-22947-VCGEN</b>	<b>Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht</b>
<b>Violation Case #23-03487-DBNVCC</b>	<b>Inspector: Marguerite Roberts</b>

Proposal to renovate the Dumaine elevation of the main building including installation of new structural ties and steel lintels, per application & materials received 06/29/2023 & 10/31/2023, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

The majority of the proposed work to clean up this elevation of the main building is staff approvable, including replacing balcony decking to match, repairing stucco, and repairing woodwork. Items in need of Architecture Committee review are the proposed addition of wall ties and installation of new steel lintels.

Four new wall ties are shown just under the second-floor gallery level. Two are shown near the outside walls of the building and two are more centrally located. These are detailed on Sheet A-3 and feature a 10” round steel plate on the exterior wall. On the interior, a steel plate is shown, presumably to be bolted to the existing joists. Staff finds the proposed wall plates typically sized and discretely located and only questions if there is an engineering report that can be included with this proposal.

The second aspect of the proposal is the installation of two new steel angle lintels above each of the five ground floor openings. These are detailed so that the steel would be concealed within the wall and there should be no change to the appearance of the openings. Staff also finds this proposed detail typical with similar work at other buildings.

Staff notes that although 541 and 543 Dumaine are technically separate properties, they share common ownership and the drawings address both buildings. 543 Dumaine lost its metal cornice back in early 2020. A permit was issued in March 2020 to replace the cornice to match but to date this work has not been completed. There are no notes on the current set of plans regarding this cornice. Staff questions the current status of this cornice.

Regarding the current proposal, staff recommends approval with any final details to be worked out at the staff level.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/07/2023

ADDRESS:	222-224 Decatur		
OWNER:	214 Decatur Street Development LLC	APPLICANT:	Kirk Fabacher
ZONING:	VCE-1	SQUARE:	86
USE:	Mixed	LOT SIZE:	2040 sq. ft.
DENSITY		OPEN SPACE	
Allowed:	2 Units	Required:	612 sq. ft.
Existing:	None	Existing:	0 sq. ft.
Proposed:	6 Units	Proposed:	0 sq. ft.

**ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Rating: Decatur elevation: Green, of local architectural and/or historical importance,  
 Clinton elevation: Pink, or detrimentally altered. Could be upgraded to blue or green if restored.

4-story red brick, granite post-and-lintel type commercial building, one in the original c. 1835 row. It retains its original appearance, as documented by a plan book drawing of 1866. It originally had double-hung windows and iron shutters.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of**

**11/07/2023**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/07/2023

**Permit # 23-28614-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to replace existing overhead metal door with new wood doors on Clinton Street elevation, per application & materials received 10/17/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/07/2023

In order to provide a usable secondary means of egress for interior retail space, the applicant is proposing to eliminate the existing roll down door on the Clinton elevation in favor of a new wood door. The door would be 36" wide with fixed side panels on either side. In plan, the door is shown as swinging out into the alley. Staff located a 1975 photograph of this portion of the building which shows similar wood millwork in this opening. By 1980, that millwork had gone in favor of metal garage door.

Although still a far cry from the original configuration of the ground floor of this elevation, which is documented as featuring three arched openings, as seen in the neighboring buildings, staff finds the proposal a great improvement over the existing conditions. This wall appears to be extra deep so there may be some question of where this new millwork should sit. In plan it appears to be shown close to surface mounted, which is atypical, but mounting it at the interior plane of the wall may create almost an alcove space. Staff recommends that the doors be set at a depth similar to what is seen at the neighboring buildings.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal with any final details to be worked out at the staff level.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/07/2023

ADDRESS: 620 Decatur  
 OWNER: New Jax Commercial, LLC, et al      APPLICANT: Bart Sutton  
 ZONING: VCS      SQUARE: 5E  
 USE: Commercial/residential      LOT SIZE: 116,955 sq. ft.

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY**

Rating: **Green** - of local architectural/historical importance

The Jackson Brewery (1891) stands as a fine example of both the work of the German immigrant architect, Dietrich Einsiedel, and of brew house architecture in late nineteenth century New Orleans. Major additions made in 1902 and alterations made during 1984 somewhat changed the original 3-story design. Further building-wide alterations (including fenestration changes) occurred in 2012.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of**

**11/07/2023**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/07/2023

**Permit # 22-35988-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht  
 Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to retain work completed in deviation of approved permit, including improper stucco and plastic mesh, per application & materials received 12/05/2022 & 10/24/2023, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/07/2023

A permit was issued originally in December 2022 and then re-issued in August 2023 to make minor repairs to wood trim and stucco and to repaint the building to match the existing colors. An inspection on 10/23/2023 revealed that extensive stucco repairs were being made with pre-mixed materials that were not previously approved as well as synthetic mesh. The applicant provided spec sheets for two products used: Master Builders Solutions StuccoBase and Senergy Senerflex.

The StuccoBase product is described as “Factory-blended mixture of Portland cement, reinforcing fibers, and other proprietary ingredients.” There is no mention of lime in the stucco mix at all. The stamped approved materials for this work included the VCC stucco recipe including the Portland cement ratio not to exceed one part in 12 with the majority of the mix being sand and lime.

The other product used on this building was the Senergy Senerflex. This material appeared to have the finish wall color integrated into it and was used as a skim coat on the building. This product is described on the spec sheet as a, “Factory-mixed, 100% acrylic polymer finish coat.”

Staff finds that this is one of those unfortunate situations without a direct path forward. These products could not be removed from the building without causing significant damage. If retained, the products used are not compatible with the historic materials and will likely create problems sometime in the future. Staff’s only recommendation would be that any areas that have not had either of these products applied receive repair as per VCC standard details and the different areas can be documented and compared over time.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding this proposal.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/07/2023

ADDRESS:	518 Conti Street		APPLICANT:	Earl J LeBlanc, Jr
OWNER:	Llmv Properties LLC		SQUARE:	29
ZONING:	VCC-2		LOT SIZE:	1266.6 sq. ft.
USE:	Mixed		OPEN SPACE:	
DENSITY:			REQUIRED:	380 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	2 Units		EXISTING:	Unknown
EXISTING:	Unknown		PROPOSED:	No change
PROPOSED:	2 Units			

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Main building: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.

Four-story building with arched openings on ground floor, one in a row of buildings constructed for the Baron de Pontalba by architect-builders Gurlie and Guillot.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/07/2023**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/07/2023

**Permit #23-23252-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain hot water heaters installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 08/24/2023 & 10/25/2023.

**Permit #23-26643-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain HVAC platform installed contrary to VCC stamped approved drawings, in conjunction with installation of mechanical equipment, per application & materials received 09/28/2023 & 10/25/2023.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/07/2023

Following review on 10/24/23, the architect for the renovation submitted a revised courtyard plan seeking retention of the hot water heaters in their existing location on the Chartres-side courtyard wall, and retention of the wood platform, as built. The platform is shown with the existing condenser for the retail unit, two new 1.5-ton mini-splits, and a new 3.5-ton condensing unit for the residential units above. Staff notes that the mini-splits will need to be rotated so each can be serviced, since one unit is blocking access to the other, as shown.

**Permit #23-23252-VCGEN:** Staff notes that the Design Guidelines discourage mounted mechanical equipment whenever possible. However, if the heaters are utilizing existing wall penetrations, the current location may be the least damaging option. Staff seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding retention of the heaters.

**Permit #23-26643-VCGEN:** Staff finds the proposed mechanical equipment and platform **conceptually approvable**, as the units are typical in size and noise output, with the proviso that the mini-splits must be rotated 90 degrees, so both are accessible for repair. Staff still suggests that the top of the platform be rebuilt using expanded mesh metal to prevent deterioration.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/07/2023

ADDRESS: 1009 Bourbon Street  
 OWNER: Gregory M Dillon APPLICANT: Gregory Dillon  
 ZONING: VCR-1 SQUARE: 77  
 USE: Residential LOT SIZE: irreg=3136.4 sq.ft.

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Main building & detached kitchen: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.

This c. 1849, 2½-story, 3-bay brick side-hall plan Greek Revival townhouse has an attached service ell and a larger detached 2-story kitchen, which is attached to the service ell by a narrow catwalk.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/07/2023**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/07/2023  
**Permit #23-29109-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain alcove gate installed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 10/23/2023. [Notice of Violation sent 04/08/2022, STOP WORK ORDERS posted 03/09/2022 & 04/04/2022.]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/07/2023

On 10/12/2023, staff noted that a new gate had been installed at the front alcove of the property without permit. On 02/26/2022, the applicant submitted an application to install a gate in this location, but only diagrammatic renderings were provided; no dimensions or notes of materials were included in these images. Staff requested full drawings to schedule the application for Committee review, but none were ever submitted, and the application expired after six months of inactivity.

While staff is sympathetic to the need for alcove gates and many have been approved in recent years, the Committee looks very carefully at the appearance of the gates in order to ensure they are compatible with each individual building. Full elevation drawings are typically required so all materials are identified, and ornamental elements are usually excluded so the gate does not a) appear historic, and b) distract from the building itself. Solid pickets with simple points rather than finials are also required, and square pipe frames are generally rejected in favor of more slender, elegant materials. Fishhooks are generally not allowed, and the top of the gate and/or finials are usually aligned with the height of the transom bar. Staff does not find this alcove gate to be considerably designed for this Green rated building and would have suggested significant revisions if submitted for review in advance. Staff does not object to installation of an appropriate alcove gate but does not consider this gate approvable for retention and recommends **denial**, with the applicant to submit full drawings for an alternate design which meets the criteria listed above.

An exterior metal grille is only permitted at a doorway with an exterior vestibule at least 18-inches in depth. The VCC does not allow the installation of a metal grille on the exterior of any window or any door alcove with a depth of less than 18-inches. If a property owner would like to install a metal grille on a window or a door, it must be installed at the interior of the window sash or doorway and it is recommended that the bars or grille should be properly sized to fit the opening and align with the frame opening and muntin configuration.

Abandoned security tape on windows should be removed.



**WINDOW & DOOR SECURITY GUIDE**

**THE VCC RECOMMENDS:**

- Utilizing historic security devices such as shutters and night blinds
- Minimizing the size, number and visibility of modern exterior security devices
- Removing an abandoned modern security device such as reflective metal security tape at a window

**THE VCC DOES NOT ALLOW:**

- Installing an exterior metal security grille on a window or door (except a door with an exterior vestibule or alcove at least 18-inches deep)
- Exposing exterior wiring, conduit or junction box associated with a security or similar device

Window & Door Security Review	
Install an appropriate or unobtrusive security device	<b>1 2 3</b> Staff
Install an exterior bar, grille or other security device	<b>1 2 3</b> Architectural Committee

Staff notes that several applications have been submitted for this property in recent years that were not followed up on with additional materials for review and permit, and violations remain outstanding

without proposed resolution. A March 2021 application was submitted to address demolition by neglect violations and to apply a waterproofing sealant to the rear building masonry. Staff requested additional information, including spec sheets for the desired product, in order to schedule it for Committee review, but this was never provided. On 05/06/22, the owner submitted a proposal that included abatement of some violations along with miscellaneous courtyard work, but additional information and a more detailed scope of work was needed. Staff met with the applicant at the site on 06/14/2022 to answer questions but was not able to access the full property. The additional materials requested were not provided, and that application also expired. It is not clear if any of this work may have been done without permit. Given the pattern of incomplete permit requests that are allowed to expire, and ongoing violation cases and STOP WORK ORDERS posted at the property, staff requests a full inspection of the site and that the applicant submit a complete application for all work done in the last several years for retroactive review. If these issues are not addressed, the property may be forwarded to administrative adjudication.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/07/2023