Vieux Carré Architecture Committee Meeting

Tuesday, October 27, 2020
Old Business
ADDRESS: 630 Royal
OWNER: M.S. Rau, Inc.
ZONING: VCC-2
USE: Commercial

DENSITY
Allowed: 7 Units
Existing: 0 Units
Proposed: No change

OPEN SPACE
Required: 1257 sq. ft.
Existing: 352 sq. ft.
Proposed: No Change

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

This 2-story masonry “French Quarter” style was constructed circa 1948 for M.S. Rau to house his antique emporium. The building stands on the site of the home of James Pitot, the first mayor of the city.

The Preservation Resource Center holds a façade easement on this and the other Rau properties in this block (622-24-26 St. Peter Street and 623-25 Toulouse Street).

Rating:
Main building: Yellow, or contributory to the character of the district
Courtyard addition: Brown, or of no architectural and/or historical importance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/13/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:
Permit # 18-39602-VCGEN
Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to temporarily remove existing storefront to allow for construction access and to replace existing window on the Chartres elevation with new mechanical intake louvers, per application & materials received 12/03/2018 & 10/20/2020, respectively.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

Following the deferral at the 10/13/2020 meeting, the applicant submitted additional information including details on the storefront removal, the rear windows proposed to be furred out on the interior, and specs on the products associated with that work. Staff has also had the chance to discuss the proposal with the PRC. The PRC’s primary concern is that the storefront windows be restored exactly to match existing and that those existing conditions are well documented prior to any work being done.

On the additional detail drawing, the storefront removal is shown as being limited to the actual window and the knee wall below. Again, this millwork would be replaced exactly following the construction work, a timeframe of about four months according to the applicant.

The windows on the rear elevation are now noted as being repaired and repainted and any Plexiglas covering removed as part of the work. The furr out details also notes that the interior materials will be vapor permeable to allow for any interior moisture to dry out. Staff notes that the owner will need to continue to monitor and maintain these windows into the future but staff is now much more comfortable with the proposed work.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:
Permit # 18-39602-VCGEN
Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to temporarily remove existing storefront to allow for construction access and to replace existing window on the Chartres elevation with new mechanical intake louvers, per application & materials received 12/03/2018 & 10/20/2020, respectively.
existing window on the Chartres elevation with new mechanical intake louvers, per application & materials received 12/03/2018 & 09/28/2020, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 10/13/2020

This application began back at the end of 2018 as strictly an interior renovation. As the plans evolved and developed, a few exterior elements joined the proposal. The first element, temporarily removing one of the storefront windows, is only being proposed to facilitate the interior renovation. Removing this storefront will allow for larger equipment and materials to be brought into the building. Once the work is nearing completion, the storefront is proposed to be rebuilt to exactly match the existing conditions.

Staff finds this element of the proposal generally approvable but questions if there is an estimate for how long the storefront would be removed.

The second aspect of the proposal occurs on the Chartres elevation where the applicant proposes to remove one existing window and install mechanical louvers in the same opening. The note for this work can be seen on sheet A011, detail 2 and the applicant has provided photographs of the window and view out from this area. The window overlooks some existing mechanical equipment on the flat roof and it appears that visibility into this area is limited to one neighboring window a couple properties away.

In reference to building equipment the Guidelines state that “vents and/or exhausts should be installed within the building envelope and where they are minimally visible from the public right-of-way” and also that “it is recommended that original doors, windows, or other architectural features that are removed be stored on-site for use by a future owner.” (VCC DG: 13-8)

Staff finds the mechanical louver location consistent with these Guidelines. Staff requests a detail of the louvers recommending that they be recessed in the opening as much as possible. Additionally, if approved, staff recommends that the window be stored on site consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines.

In reviewing the plans, staff noted that several other windows facing into the courtyard are proposed to be furred over on the interior side of the window. The detail provided notes a fluid applied, UV tolerant weather barrier applied to sheathing that would be attached to the existing window frame. Typically, if this type of detail is approved the VCC requires the interior material to be dark in color and non-reflective.

If this detail is approved, staff requests that the windows be properly repaired prior to the installation of the fur out and that the windows continue to be properly maintained in the future.

Finally, staff notes that there is a PRC Façade Easement on this building. Unfortunately, staff did not have a chance to discuss this proposal with the PRC prior to the preparation of this report but no permits will be issued without their full support.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 10/13/2020

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Baddour present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked the Committee if they had any questions or comments. Mr. Baddour stated that the construction duration should be about 4 months. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if he could report on any interaction with the PRC facade easement committee. Mr. Baddour stated that generally speaking they were usually in agreement with staff and SHPO, but that he had not heard any definite response as of now. Ms. DiMaggio asked the applicant if the furring out with insulation had a means for the condensation to evaporate. Mr. Baddour stated that they had gone through the same condition at least 40 times at the neighboring property and that they had worked with a water proofing specialist to come up with the detail presented. Ms. DiMaggio clarified her question by stating that she was referring to the window. Mr. Baddour stated that the fluid would be applied to a board on the inside of the window. Ms. DiMaggio questioned detail 3 on page 44. Mr. Baddour stated that she was right and that he needed to reexamine that sheet. Mr. Fifield asked what exactly the fluid was that would be applied. Mr. Baddour stated that it was a black coating. Mr. Fifield asked if it was silicone or latex. Mr. Baddour stated that he was unsure and would have to go back and check. Mr. Bergeron stated that it appeared a storm window was already installed. He asked the applicant if that window would be restored. Mr. Baddour stated that this was not currently in the plan. Mr. Bergeron asked if the storm sashes were to be removed. Mr. Baddour stated no, but that they could entertain that idea. He went on to say that they were trying to waterproof the inside only. Mr. Fifield stated that there seemed to be very little regard for the historic fabric. He went on to say that he was disturbed by the schematic nature of the drawings and that both
the architect and the owner had a responsibility to the exterior and that he did not see any evidence that the owner was taking that responsibility seriously. The Committee moved to the next agenda item.

Public Comment:
Discussion and Motion:
Mr. Bergeron made the motion for a deferral in order to give the applicant time to add the necessary details asked for at today's hearing. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.
729 Governor Nicholls
The buildings at this address are situated on a L-shaped lot which has existed in the present configuration since the early 1900s. A c. 1900 2-bay frame shotgun fronts on Gov. Nicholls; brown-rated construction is located behind the cottage. New construction, begun illegally and inappropriately designed, stands on the portion of the lot extending at a right angle at the back of the lot.

**Main Building – Green**

Previous Additions Demolished 2020, New Addition: Unrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture Committee Meeting of</th>
<th>10/27/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:</td>
<td>10/27/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit # 19-37797-VCGEN</td>
<td>Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal to modify and expand on previously approved plans including new proposed millwork, changes to courtyard fencing, and roofing material change, per application & materials received 10/15/2020.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

This property was extensively reviewed in the first half of 2020 for plans that included the reconstruction of the rear shed addition and restoration of various elements of the main building. The permit for that work was issued 08/05/2020. The applicant has been in touch with staff and has submitted materials for today’s meeting to make some changes and expand upon the previously approved plans. The items in need of review include millwork details for the main building, lighting at the main building, changes to the rear shed addition, and changes to the courtyard fencing and paving.

**Main Building Millwork**

The applicant has provided photographs from the interior showing that the existing front door is substantially shorter than the opening. The arched transom window above has been boarded over. It is unclear if any glazing remains in this opening. The applicant proposes to install a new door with or without a transom. The submitted door examples all show square top transoms. Staff recommends that the existing transom frame be salvaged and reused with an arch top transom. A single lite over a single panel door as shown in the example may be approvable but staff finds the submitted example of this door type has atypical ratios. Specifically, the lite is too tall pushing the lock rail too low on the door. There are many examples of this building type and age in this part of the district and certainly in other historic districts in the city. Staff recommends looking to these for inspiration for a restored front door and transom.

New doors and transoms are also called for at the side porch (Doors 02 and 10). An interior photograph of door 02 shows an atypically short opening in this location with a door and no transom. Staff is in full agreement that the millwork in this opening should match the existing exterior opening and shutter height. The proposed door for these openings again has atypical ratios with an atypically tall door lite, a low lock rail, and a very short transom window. As the existing side door appears to have significant age, staff recommends some exploratory demolition above this door to see if the framing provides clues to this opening, such as the previous existence of a transom window. Staff also notes that there is an existing side door (Door 05) that may serve as a model for these other door openings.

**Main Building Lighting**

The second aspect of the proposal for the main building is the installation of four decorative fixtures above the side porch. These are shown centered on each of the four side porch bays. As the Guidelines recommend limiting the number of decorative fixtures and locating them near a focal point (VCC DG: 11-7) staff suggests that only one decorative fixture located in the bay closest to Gov. Nicholls would be more in line with the Guidelines. The remaining bays could receive recessed or simple lights to provide consistent lighting.

**Shed Addition**

The approved plans called for the roof of the rebuilt shed addition to be a standing seam metal roof. The applicant proposes to upgrade this material to a standing seam copper. Gutters and downspouts throughout the property would also be upgraded to copper. Staff has no objection to this change.
The applicant also proposes to add a window to the rebuilt structure. The window is proposed for the Royal St. elevation of the rear shed addition and is shown as 3’ wide by 1’-6” tall. As this rear portion is being completely rebuilt, staff finds the Guidelines for additions to be the most appropriate reference in this instance. The Guidelines state that, “windows and doors on additions should be of similar size, shape, design, proportion, spacing, and placement to those in the existing building. Windows should be proportionally and functionally similar, and have comparable muntin or grid patterns as the existing windows.” (VCC DG: 14-14) Staff questions if the proposed window meets these Guidelines.

At the landing at the rear door of the addition the applicant now proposes to add wood rails on both sides of the previously shown open landing. It appears these rails would match the existing rails at the side porch. Staff has no objection to this change.

**Courtyard Fencing and Paving**

The final aspect of the proposal in need of review is proposed changes to the fencing and paving. The fence behind the addition was approved to be a new CMU wall. The applicant now proposes this to be a seven-board fence. The previously proposed sliding gate separating the driveway and the smaller parking area has been eliminated in favor of a 10’ wide opening. Staff has no objection to these changes.

In an email the applicant mentioned adding structural pilasters to the rear CMU wall but these details do not appear to be in the current set. Still, provided they are consistent with typical details, staff does not object to the introduction of pilasters at the wall.

Finally, the applicant proposes to change the paving material from the previously approved brick set in sand to a combination of permeable, stamped concrete at the driveway and smaller parking area and pea gravel at the larger parking area. Regarding paving the Guidelines state that, “the VCC recommends minimizing the amount of paving on a site; using traditional stone or brick at an area of new paving; avoiding the installation of gravel or other loose, small-scale paving that can become airborne in the event of a wind storm;” and “the VCC does not allow installing stamped concrete paving or concrete pavers except with possible exception of new construction.” (VCC DG: 10-8)

Staff does not find either the proposed stamped concrete or pea gravel paving details approvable as submitted.

**Summary**

Staff recommends deferral of the overall application based on the items noted in need of revisions at the various areas of the property and requests commentary from the Committee regarding the questions noted in the report.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 10/27/2020
625-637 St Philip
ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY
This address includes a 2-1/2 story c. 1840 Greek Revival house, the ground floor openings of which have been obliterated. Next door to it stands a non-historic 20th c. one-story building (Ruffino's Bakery) with a service structure at the rear.

Ratings: Chartres Street side, one-story building and rear building—brown, Objectionable or of no architectural/historic importance; Royal Street side – green, of Local Architectural or Historic importance.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 10/27/2020
Permit # 20-42223-VCGEN

Proposal to install new ground floor door opening connecting this building with the courtyard of 1006 Royal St. and elevator penthouse on rear building, per application & materials received 10/01/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 10/27/2020

Staff met with the applicant following the 10/13/2020 meeting and also received an answer from the Zoning Department regarding the hotel use. The Zoning Department stated that in regard to 1006 Royal and 625-637 St. Philip, “It is evident on the Assessor site that both lots have been under same ownership and currently licensed as a hotel.”

Staff’s biggest concern with the overall proposal is still the proposed new wall opening at the property line. The 1940 Sanborn map does not indicate any wall openings between these two properties. Staff was able to locate some photographs from 1982 but unfortunately, they do not definitively show this wall. A photograph from 2008 appears to be the first definitive VCC record of this opening. As there was historically not an opening between these two properties, staff questions the appropriateness of adding additional connections between the two properties.

If the Architecture Committee does find the concept of adding a new opening between the two properties approvable and the proposal is approved by the BBSA, staff finds the design of the door appropriate for such an opening. The applicant provided a section indicating that the new door would be recessed in the wall approximately 10-3/4”, the millwork would match an existing opening. A roof plan has been submitted which shows the penthouse essentially flush with the rear, Ursuline elevation and set in only the width of the existing parapet on the Royal St. elevation. The penthouse is shown clad in a painted wood weatherboard with a low sloped mod. bit. roof. The penthouse would rise 4’ above the existing roof. Photographs indicate that this construction would be visible to a few neighboring properties although it would not be visible from the street. Given the small size of the penthouse, staff is not overly concerned regarding the visibility to neighboring properties.

Staff’s biggest concern is still the creation of a new opening atypically at the back of a courtyard and across a property line. Other than this aspect of the proposal, staff finds the work mainly approvable. Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 10/27/2020
Proposed courtyard door would cross the property line between 1004 Royal St. and 637 St. Philip building. The penthouse is shown as rising 4’ above the roof surface and being about 7-1/2’ wide. It is unclear from the submittal if the penthouse would be constructed right at the building’s edge or if it would be setback slightly from the exterior walls. No information was included on finish materials for the penthouse.

The applicant provided 360-degree photos from the approximate location of the penthouse which show that there would be some visibility to neighboring properties, but it does not appear there would be any visibility from any public right of ways. The Guidelines state that, “the VCC strives to make a rooftop addition, including an elevator and mechanical equipment ... as unobtrusive and minimally visible as possible.” (VCC DG: 14-17)

The elevator penthouse may be conceptually approvable, but staff requests more information regarding the exact location on the roof as well as the finish materials. Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed new door opening as well as the elevator penthouse but recommends that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to submit additional information, for staff to research the zoning implications of the proposal, and to allow for the proper address of 625-637 St. Philip to be advertised.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Jelich present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked if a deferral would be in order until all information was available to staff. Both Ms. DiMaggio and Mr. Bergeron agreed. Mr. Fifield moved to the next agenda item.

Public Comment:
Nikki Szalwinski, FQ Citizens
We support the staff recommendation and that of the committee. We request the applicant supply plans with ACCURATE measurements for all changes so that the public can more thoroughly understand the effects. While we sympathize with the hotel operator the elevator penthouse is concerning as it relates to site lines and vistas from other properties.
As to the submission address issue, this seems to be a common practice with this particular firm which is concerning. It is confusing to the public, difficult to track both through VCC and OneStop and at times seems deliberate due to the nature of some of these requests.

**Discussion and Motion:**

Mr. Jelich asked to be heard prior to the reading of the staff report for 623 Toulouse. Mr. Jelich stated for clarification that the proposed paneled door had to be fire rated and that there was another door in the courtyard to they tried to match it as closely as possible. He went on to say that the penthouse would not be visible from the street. As for the mix up on the addresses, Mr. Jelich stated that all the addresses, 1006 Royal and 625-31 St Philip, are technically all the Royal Hotel. Mr. Fifield stated that the application should be under the historic address.

Mr. Bergeron made the motion for a deferral in order to allow the applicant time to detail the proposal and for the Commission to advertise the proper address. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.
ADDRESS: 619-21 Royal
OWNER: 619 Royal Street LLC
ZONING: VCC-2
USE: Unknown
DENSITY: Unknown

APPLICANT: Trapolin Peer Architects
SQUARE: 61
LOT SIZE: 4,186.5 sq. ft.
OPEN SPACE: Unknown

ALLOWED: 6 units
REQUIRED: 1255 sq. ft.
EXISTING: Unknown
EXISTING: Unknown
PROPOSED: Unknown
PROPOSED: Unknown

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

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

This brick 3-story masonry Creole style building with carriageway, as well as the adjoining twin building at 619-21 Royal, was built by General Jean Labatut, c. 1795. Beginning as a 1-story building, a second floor was added for the General in 1821 by builders Pinson and Pizetta. Then a third floor was added later in the 19th century.

Architectural Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 10/27/2020
Permit #20-30797-VCGEN
Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Review of proposed structural reinforcement for conceptually approved rear sunroom reconstruction, per application & materials received 06/09/2020 & 10/20/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 10/27/2020

The applicant is currently working with a structural engineer to evaluate the existing building and plan reinforcement as needed. They have submitted revised drawings for the reconstruction of the sunroom, located at the rear of the main building on the second floor. The existing sunroom was built directly on top of the second-floor balcony decking, and the Committee has reviewed details to build up the floor on the interior and keep the bottom of the reconstructed sunroom from being soffited. The applicant is proposing to reinforce the structure by installing additional outriggers in this space instead of adding structure on the outside/bottom of the sunroom, below the purlins.

Detail drawings show three new 3x6 beaded purlins, spanning the depth of the sunroom. The level of the purlins and tongue-and-groove decking are dropped by 2-1/2” to accommodate the depth of new steel channels, penetrating the brick wall and bolted to the existing wooden joists.

Staff appreciates that this proposal does not add unsightly structural reinforcement on the exterior of the building but notes that several architectural details will need additional study or revision. The fascia must extend below the purlins, and the relationship between the sunroom structure and balcony structure should be studied further where they intersect. Staff notes that the applicant is unable to proceed with further design development until structural reinforcement is found conceptually approvable by the Committee.

Overall, staff finds this compromise to be preferable to adding visible support below and is confident that detailing can be finalized during design development. Barring any additional concerns from the Committee, staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed structural revisions, with final details to be presented to the Committee during design development.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 10/27/2020
New Business
931 St Louis
ADDRESS: 931 St. Louis
OWNER: William Mudd
APPLICANT: William Mudd
ZONING: VCR-1
SQUARE: 90
USE: Residential
LOT SIZE: 7,513 sq. ft.
DENSITY-
ALLOWED: 8 Units
REQUIRED: 2,253 sq. ft.
EXISTING: Unknown
EXISTING: 3,600 sq. ft.
PROPOSED: No Change
PROPOSED: No Change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:
Rating: Green: Of Local Architectural or Historical Importance.

This address features a c. 1900 rendition of a 1 1/2 story dormered cottage (brick construction) in the Queen Anne style.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020
DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 10/27/2020
Permit # 20-43711-VCGEN Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to demolish garden stone tower, pond, and planter materials in preparation for future construction of pool and building, per application & materials received 10/13/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 10/27/2020

The tower, pond, and garden area proposed for demolition are located on the Dauphine side of the building roughly 100’ back from the front property line. The tower is approximately 12’ tall with the existing plant material hiding the pond located at the base of the tower. Staff does not find that the stone tower has any historical significance. The earliest photo staff located of the tower dates to 1985. Looking at the 1940 Sanborn map does not indicate any structure in this location leading staff to believe the tower was constructed between 1940 and 1985 as simply a garden folly.

Although no plans have been submitted to date, staff has discussed with the applicant future phases of work if the tower is demolished. The applicant plans to construct a pool and small supporting structure in the space near the rear property line behind this tower. Having met with the applicant on site to discuss these plans, staff feels that a future pool proposal will be approvable.

Staff has no objections to the proposed demolition and recommends approval of the application as submitted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 10/27/2020
905 Governor Nicholls
ADDRESS: 905 Gov. Nicholls
OWNER: Daniel Raines
APPLICANT: Daniel Raines
ZONING: VCR-1
USE: Residential
SQUARE: 82
LOT SIZE: 2,646 sq. ft.
DENSITY- OPEN SPACE-
ALLOWED: 2 Units
REQUIRED: 794 sq. ft.
EXISTING: 510 sq. ft. approx.
PROPOSED: No Change

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

The lot once formed part of the grounds to 913 Governor Nicholls. This building and its twin (901 Governor Nicholls) were constructed c. 1840 by Correjolles for Gustave Soniat. Its exposed brick, 2½-story design is emblematic of a typical, American-style townhouse, with frieze windows and pilastered entrances. The post-supported, cast-iron gallery replaced an earlier balcony at some point between 1876 and 1896. See 913 (909-917) Governor Nicholls.

Main and Service ell – Green
Rear porch enclosure and garage building -- Brown.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: Proposal to apply stucco "apron" to the Burgundy elevation to a height of either 22" or 33" above grade, per application & materials received 10/06/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant proposes to apply stucco to the bottom either 22" (to match the front of 905 Gov. Nicholls) or 33" (to match the front of 901 Gov. Nicholls) to the Burgundy elevation of the building. There is a small area of existing stucco apron on this wall on the portion closest to Gov. Nicholls at the 22" height. The applicant has confirmed that at either height the stucco would be below any windows on this elevation and there are no doors on this elevation. The applicant noted that the existing apron on the Gov. Nicholls elevation features a simple bevel at the top of the stucco and they would match this detail if new stucco is approved.

Staff was unable to locate any historic photographs showing the base of this wall but notes that the addition of stucco would contribute to the long-term preservation of the building while having a very minimal impact on the visual appearance of the building. Provided that any stucco is mixed and applied per the standard VCC details, staff finds this application approvable. Staff recommends the 22" height to match the height of the existing apron on the Gov. Nicholls elevation of 905 Gov. Nicholls.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 10/27/2020
Appeals and Violations
1316 Burgundy
ADDRESS: 1316 Burgundy
OWNER: 1316 Burgundy LLC
APPLICANT: David Carimi
ZONING: VCR-1
USE: Residential
SQUARE: 81
LOT SIZE: 1,800 sq. ft.
DENSITY-
ALLOWED: 1 Unit
REQUIRED: 360 sq. ft.
EXISTING: Unknown
EXISTING: Unknown
PROPOSED: No Change
PROPOSED: No Change

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Main and rear building -- yellow;
C. 1900 2-story frame residence, which has an asymmetrical façade, a cast iron balcony, and infill construction on the ground floor.

Architecture Committee Meeting of 10/27/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 10/27/2020
Permit #20-41920-VCGEN Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Appeal to retain demolition of non-contributing rear addition completed without benefit of VCC review and approval, per application & materials received 09/29/2020. [Notice of Violation sent 07/20/2020]

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 10/27/2020

Staff observed from satellite imagery that a second-floor rear addition was no longer present at the property, and issued a violation notice for demolition without a permit. The current owner applied to retain the existing conditions, and staff was able to inspect the rear of the site on 10/14/2020. Inspection of the site and further review of satellite imagery indicates that the rear of the building burned in 2008 and was reconstructed without permits in 2012. The addition was not rebuilt, and the structure covering the first floor was infilled. It is now in use as a roof deck for the second-floor unit. Staff is concerned that the structure was patched without permits and requests an engineer’s report to verify that the existing conditions are structurally sound.

Staff notes that demolition typically requires Commission review and a 30-day layover period prior to final approval and permit. Considering the addition was built sometime after the 1940 Sanborn map and was non-contributing, staff recommends that the Committee approve the retention and forward the appeal to the Commission with a positive recommendation, with the 30-day layover period to be waived and an engineer’s report to be provided prior to retroactive permit issuance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 10/27/2020