

**Minutes of the Vieux Carré Commission meeting of Wednesday, June 3, 2015.**

- COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Nicholas S. Musso, Chairman  
Daniel C. Taylor, Vice-Chairman  
Leslie S. Stokes, Secretary  
C.J. Blanda  
Jorge A. Henriquez  
Michael A. Skinner
- COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Patricia C. Denechaud
- STAFF PRESENT:** Nicholas G. Albrecht, Building Plans Examiner; Erin Vogt, Building Plans Examiner; Erika Gates, Inspector; Melissa Quigley, Assistant City Attorney; Allison Church, Intern
- STAFF ABSENT:** Lary P. Hesdorffer, Director; Renee' Bourgogne, Architectural Historian
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Kenny, Dean Lacy, Brent Lemoine, Meg Lousteau, David McMurphy, Matt Perez, Andrew Scott, Peter Trapolin, Richard Volker, John Williams

**AGENDA****I. ROLL CALL**

Chairman Musso called the meeting to order at 1:55 PM due to a previous meeting in the Chambers running overtime. Ms. Vogt called the roll, noting the presence of a quorum with six (6) of the seven (7) seated Commissioners in attendance. Ms. Quigley noted that four (4) positive votes are needed in order to pass any action.

**II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2015 Vieux Carre Commission meeting, as distributed. Mr. Skinner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

**III. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Due to the late start of the meeting, Mr. Musso announced that he would not give a Chairman's report, nor would there be a Director's report in the absence of Mr. Hesdorffer. However, he did mention that the VCC's new Design Guidelines had been featured in an article in the current issue of *Preservation in Print*.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

1220 Dauphine St: Nicole Hill, applicant; BarDa Properties LLC, owner; Proposal to demolish main structure as well as miscellaneous additions, construct three new buildings and renovate existing rear wing, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *residential*, converting former Maison Hospitaliere site and building into a 6-unit condominium complex, per application & revised materials received 08/12/14 & 05/19/15, respectively. **[NOTE: this meeting marks the end of the 30-day layover period.]**

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Lemoine and McMurphy present as the applicants. Mr. Musso stated this application has been moving forward nicely.

Mr. Lemoine asked if the developers could proceed with the smaller demolitions that were previously approved for the 822 Barracks property prior to final construction document approval.

Ms. Quigley noted that in order to discuss any aspects of 822 Barracks, the Commission would need to suspend the rules to add 822 Barracks to the agenda, because that property had not been on the advertised agenda. Following her explanation, Mr. Taylor moved to suspend the rules for consideration of the demolitions of the connecting structures on the 822 Barracks property as part of the other work to be considered for 1220 Dauphine. Mr. Blanda seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Taylor moved to **approve** the select demolitions of the miscellaneous, non-historic connecting structures at 822 Barracks, as had been previously reviewed. Mr. Blanda seconded the motion which then passed unanimously.

Mr. Taylor moved to reinstate the rules, allowing the return to the regular agenda. Mr. Skinner seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Taylor moved for **approval** of the proposed demolition of the main building at 1220 Dauphine and the site redevelopment consistent with the staff analysis and recommendations of June 3, 2015 including the associated miscellaneous demolitions noted in the previous motions pertaining to the adjacent 822 Barracks property. Mr. Skinner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

---

#### V. **NEW BUSINESS**

217 Chartres St, 219 Chartres St, 221 Chartres St, 225 Chartres St, 223 Chartres St: Ashley King, applicant; SA Mintz, LLC, owner; Review of design for structural renovation including penthouses and new light wells in conjunction with proposed **change in use** from *vacant* to *commercial/residential*, per application & revised conceptual plans received 11/25/14 & 05/05/15, respectively.

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Mr. Trapolin present on behalf of the application. Mr. Blanda applauded the return of the property to residential use but expressed his concern about the proliferation of penthouse additions on existing buildings. Mr. Trapolin stated that the project had previously received conceptual approval at the January meeting and that the building, at a 65' rooftop, with a 72' height at the parapet, is already taller than most neighboring buildings. He went on to further explain the assembled additions and alterations. Mr. Blanda asked if the proposed rooftop additions would be visible from the street. Mr. Trapolin noted that they would not be visible.

Mr. Taylor moved for **approval** of the proposal consistent with staff analysis and recommendations of June 3, 2015. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stokes and passed unanimously.

---

#### VI. **APPEALS AND VIOLATIONS**

910 Royal St: Lacey Wotring, applicant; Princess of Monaco, LLC, Royal Alice Properties, LLC, Johnson N II Barrett, Katherine K Fugate, owners; Appeal of Architectural Committee denial of proposal to install new elevator at rear service wing, per application & drawings received 02/03/15 & 04/07/15, respectively.

The staff report was presented by Ms. Vogt, with Mr. Williams and Ms. Wotring in attendance on behalf of the application. Responding to the Chairman's question, Mr. Taylor explained that the Architectural Committee recognized the significance of the property, including its blue rating as a building of major importance and felt the addition of the elevator to be detrimental to the overall character. Mr. Blanda asked who is to be served by the addition of the elevator. Mr. Williams noted that it is being requested by the building resident/owners and that all favor the proposal, including the restaurant owner. He went on to describe the intended treatment was focused on the exterior so as not to adversely affect any interior features but also that it could be undone without causing permanent harm to the exterior of the building.

Following the presentation, the Chairman asked for comments or motions from the Commission. Mr. Skinner asked if other architectural conditions had been considered. Mr. Williams responded that the Committee had looked at several proposals. Mr. Blanda asked whether consideration had been given to using French doors to clad the elevator enclosure in lieu of glass. Mr. Musso responded that a number of alternatives had been discussed, but that the Committee had said that if an exterior elevator was to be considered, it should not look permanent and it would be preferable if it looked as though it could be easily removed. Mr. Blanda asked if only the third or fourth floor resident would be served? Mr. Williams replied that the third floor resident had requested it but it would serve the second floor as well and that resident also supported the proposal.

Mr. Skinner, noting blue-rating on the building, moved to defer taking action saying he would like the Commission to see additional alternatives in elevator design before deciding on any one proposal. Mr. Henriquez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

---

810 Esplanade Ave: Matt Perez, applicant; Ibu and Bapak LLC, owner; Appeal of Architectural Committee denial of proposal to install non-cement, synthetic slate-type shingles, per application received 04/27/15.

Ms. Vogt gave the staff presentation with Messrs. Perez and Scott present as the applicants. Dr. Robert Kenny, a neighbor, spoke in favor of the use of *Inspire* shingles, based on both its appearance and performance. Mr. Perez commented that he understood that VCC guidelines do not allow the use of synthetic slate on a green-rated property, but would prefer to use *Inspire* over a cement slate-type shingle, believing it to be a superior product. Mr. Perez then pointed out another green-rated property, 823 Barracks, where *Inspire* shingles were installed, and claimed that the Architectural Committee must have permitted its use in the past. Staff explained that the *Inspire* roof system at 823 Barracks had never been permitted, and that it exists as a violation.

Mr. Skinner asked if denial was the only ruling possible by the Committee, considering *Inspire* is not allowed for this property based on the VCC's Design Guidelines. Mr. Musso stated that the Guidelines allow some flexibility by the Architectural Committee and the Commission, and that alternative roofing materials have been allowed but on lesser rated buildings. The Chairman also commented that some of the synthetic shingle roofs that were permitted in the past failed, but that a number of them failed to be successful. Staff pointed out that *Inspire* is currently allowed on buildings of yellow, orange, or brown ratings. Mr. Musso went on to say that the Commission has the ability to override guidelines if they feel it is justified, without risk of setting precedent. Mr. Blanda asked if *Inspire* had ever been tested by the Architecture Committee. Mr. Musso stated that the VCC does not have the funds or manpower to conduct material studies of that magnitude, and that manufacturer testing would judge different criteria than the Commission would require for significant buildings that are part of an historic district.

Mr. Scott, representing the owners, commented that the current material on the roof is one of those approvable, cement-based, slate-type shingles (Fire Free), and that slate would be his only option if he chooses to not use another cement slate-type shingle. Mr. Blanda explained that slate is the authentic roof material of the French Quarter, and that its quality is time-tested despite the initial expense. Mr. Scott said that it was not just a matter of expense, but that the Commission needs to reevaluate approvable roofing materials because the cement slate-type shingles are failing at such a high rate. Mr. Scott asked if synthetic slate was approved elsewhere in the quarter. Mr. Musso answered that it is approvable but on lesser rated buildings, as had been stated by staff.

Mr. Skinner then moved to **deny** the request to install the requested *Inspire* shingle roof, consistent with the staff recommendation of June 3, 2015. Mr. Blanda seconded the motion. Mr. Musso confirmed that the motion was to **deny** the installation of the proposed material. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Quigley noted that the applicants would have 30-days from the date of written notice of the decision in order to file an appeal with the City Council.

---

403 Royal St: John C. Williams, applicant; Cloud Nine llc Royal, owner; Proposal for selective exploratory demolition in order to establish waterproofing scope of work, per application & drawings received 05/29/15. **[STOP WORK ORDER issued 07/12/11]**

Ms. Vogt gave the staff report on the proposal to execute exploratory demolition in order to address waterproofing needs for the building. Ms. Corinne Morrison spoke representing the neighboring property owner, Ida Manheim, and a desire to see the remainder of improper and unapproved roof-mounted ductwork and equipment addressed as part of the corrective measures being sought for many long-standing violations related to Stop Work Orders on the building and numerous needed repairs and corrections. Mr. Musso reiterated that the intent of the Architectural Committee has been to get comprehensive specifications, drawings and details about the proposed methods to be used for waterproofing the building.

Mr. Williams said that the intent is to move with speed to correct all the violations but that until the Stop Work Order is lifted, no work can proceed; but that also includes the requested exploratory demolition as well. Mr. Taylor noted how extensive the areas indicated for stucco removal would be and asked how quickly that work could be completed. He voiced additional concern about what time frame would be used to correct/complete this work since years have now passed without taking care of the long-standing violations. Mr. Taylor moved to approve the staff recommendation and analysis of June 3, 2015 and a limited lift of the Stop Work Order

---

to allow for the exploratory demolition only, that the proposal for the complete waterproofing and finishing be brought to the Architectural Committee within 30 days, and that failure to apply for subsequent work, which would include both the repair of the selected exploratory sites as well as the other enumerated violations, would subject the property to be scheduled adjudication hearings. Mr. Musso asked if Mr. Taylor's motion anticipated any work being undertaken before the Architectural Committee had reviewed the noted specs and details. Mr. Taylor answered only the areas of selected exploratory demolition. Mr. Blanda seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Williams asked if he could proceed with redoing the problematic, roof-mounted ductwork which was not included as an approved element in Mr. Taylor's motion. He added that he didn't know why he couldn't begin to address that work which has been a concern for Ms. Morrison and Ms. Manheim. Mr. Musso stated that he should provide those details separately as a means of documenting exactly what is to be done so that it can be considered by the Architectural Committee at its next meeting. Further discussion indicated that the waterproofing specifications, techniques and details were to be viewed for the most immediate action, addressing the results of the exploratory demolition, and then the other violations and corrective work (noted on a list of 17 items) would be addressed by the Architectural Committee so long as the clear and precise detailed materials are provided. Mr. Taylor reiterated that his motion allows for the architect to submit work within 30 days for all of the waterproofing details and that all of that work, along with the remaining remedial items will probably be considered together for approval by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Williams asked if that could be done before the next VCC meeting. Mr. Taylor replied that would be to the Mr. Williams as architect and applicant to submit it as quickly as he was able.

---

**VII. RATIFICATION** of Architectural Committee and Staff actions since the Wednesday, May 06, 2015 VCC meeting.

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Blanda seconded, to ratify the actions taken by the Architectural Committee and Staff since the Vieux Carré Commission meeting of May 6, 2015. The motion passed unanimously.

With no further business to be considered, Mr. Taylor moved for adjournment. The motion, seconded by Mr. Blanda, passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:53 PM.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Leslie Stokes, Secretary

NOTE: These minutes are a summary of actions taken and are not a verbatim transcription of the meeting.