**ADDRESS:** 732-34 N. Rampart, 1034 St. Ann  
**OWNER:** 732-34 North Rampart, LLC  
**ZONING:** VCC-2  
**USE:** Commercial/Residential  
**DENSITY:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOWED</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Units</td>
<td>1502.7 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>536 sq. ft. (approx.)</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDRESS:** 732-34 N. Rampart (lot 2B)  
**OWNER:** 732-34 North Rampart, LLC  
**ZONING:** VCC-2  
**USE:** Commercial  
**DENSITY:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOWED</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>1145.2 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>286 sq. ft. (approx.)</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDRESS:** 1034 St. Ann (lot 2A)  
**OWNER:** 732-34 North Rampart, LLC  
**ZONING:** VCC-2  
**USE:** Residential  
**DENSITY:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOWED</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>1145.2 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>286 sq. ft. (approx.)</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
<td>No change noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

732-34 N. Rampart: Main building: **Brown**, detrimental, or of no architectural and/or historic significance  
A c. 1910, brick commercial building.  
1034 St. Ann: Main building: **Green**, of local architectural and/or historic significance.  
The style of this small, c. 1893, frame cottage bridges the Queen Anne and Colonial Revival styles.

**Staff notes:**
Staff notes that the c. 1910 building at 732-34 N. Rampart, which extends to the Burgundy-side property line of 1034 St. Ann, prevents the lots from being restored to their historic configuration. The St. Ann lot was previously a key lot with an overall depth of 86'-2"; it will be reduced to 40'-3" so both existing buildings fall entirely on their own properties.
The preliminary report prepared by CPC staff states that the proposal satisfies all applicable requirements of the Subdivision Regulations and is consistent with the Master Plan; CPC staff intends to recommend tentative approval, including provisos requiring compliance with requirements from the Departments of Safety and Permits, Property Management, Public Works, Sewerage and Water Board, Entergy, and the Vieux Carré Commission. [Note: just as VCC staff recommendations do not always reflect the final decisions made by the Vieux Carré Commission, this should not be considered a final determination by CPC. The proposed subdivision is currently scheduled for CPC review on 1/4/2021.]

VCC staff considers shared history and property use when making recommendations for resubdivision to the Vieux Carré Commission. While this proposal does not restore the historic lot lines to their original configuration, staff finds the subdivision appropriate as it will separate two properties that had no historic relationship with each other prior to shared ownership in the 20th century.

Staff recommends the Commission forward a positive recommendation for resubdivision to the City Planning Commission for their consideration.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 11/18/2020
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
OPEN SPACE- 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.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of 11/18/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 11/18/2020
Permit #20-41920-VCGEN Lead Staff: Erin Vogt

Appeal to retain demolition of non-contributing rear addition, per application & materials received 09/29/2020. [Notice of Violation sent 07/20/2020]

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 11/18/2020

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, under previous ownership. 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.

The VCC Design Guidelines require Commission review and a 30-day layover period prior to final approval and permit for all demolitions. Considering the addition was built sometime after the 1940 Sanborn map and was non-contributing to the character of the District, the Committee recommends approval of the retention and waiver of the 30-day layover period. Per Committee motion, an engineer’s report confirming the structural viability and code compliance of the structural infill will be required prior to retroactive permit issuance.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 11/18/2020
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

Ms. Vogt presented the staff report with Mr. Carimi present on behalf of the application. Mr. Fifield asked if the decking remained after demolition, noting that it was heavily deteriorated; Mr. Carimi responded that it was existing, but they could replace it. Mr. Bergeron asked if the deck was installed on sleepers; Mr. Carimi responded that it was installed over a roofing material but had only been inspected from below. Ms. Vogt noted that her main concern was the framing below and ensuring that it had been properly installed. Ms. DiMaggio stated that the engineer’s report must verify that all building codes and requirements were met, as well as structural viability.

No Public Comment

Discussion and Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio moved to approve retention of the unpermitted demolition with the item to be forwarded to the full Commission with a recommendation to waive the 30-day layover period. In addition, she also requested an engineer’s report for the structural infill, requiring that it address not only structural stability but code compliance. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.