

ADDRESS: 600 Block of Conti Street,
Between Royal and Chartres

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **05/27/2020**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/27/2020

Review of proposed bollard installation for non-binding recommendation to the Department of Public Works.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/27/2020

The downriver side of the 600 Block of Conti Street, adjacent to the Louisiana Supreme Court building, is often subjected to vehicles parking on the slate sidewalk. This frequently causes obstruction to pedestrian traffic and requires continuous maintenance of the fragile paving material. The Department of Public Works has submitted drawings for a plan to install bollards to prevent vehicular parking on the sidewalk, and the VCC has been asked for a non-binding recommendation regarding this installation. Questions related to the proposal should be directed to representatives for the Department of Public Works and their consultants, while VCC staff can answer any questions regarding the VCC Design Guidelines.

The Committee moved to recommend that the Commission forward a **positive recommendation** to the Department of Public Works. At the 5/20/2020 hearing, public comment included concerns about the planters and benches shown in attached renderings, and the Committee requested further discussion surrounding these elements. Staff notes that no planters or benches are currently shown in the grading plan, utility design plan, or bollard design proposal; they are simply shown in the renderings. Staff contacted the engineer consulting on the project with Public Works, who clarified that the street furniture is shown only for representative purposes and is not included in the current scope of work.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 05/27/2020

Architecture Committee Meeting of **05/20/2020**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/20/2020

Review of proposed bollard installation for non-binding recommendation to the Department of Public Works.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/20/2020

The downriver side of the 600 Block of Conti Street, adjacent to the Louisiana Supreme Court building, is often subjected to vehicles parking on the slate sidewalk. This frequently causes obstruction to pedestrian traffic and requires continuous maintenance of the fragile paving material. The Department of Public Works has submitted drawings for a plan to install bollards to prevent vehicular parking on the sidewalk, and the Committee has been asked for a non-binding recommendation regarding this installation. Drawings for the proposal were provided to staff after the submittal deadline and have not been thoroughly reviewed by VCC staff; questions related to the proposal should be directed to representatives for the Department of Public Works and their consultants, while VCC staff can answer any questions regarding the VCC Design Guidelines. Overall, staff recognizes the need for street furniture in this location and generally supports a proposal to install bollards to prevent parking on the sidewalk.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: 05/20/2020

Ms. Vogt read the staff report with Mr. Kittok and Ms. Heymann present on behalf of the application. Mr. Kittok had no comments to add to the staff report. The Architecture Committee members likewise had no questions for the applicant. Mr. Block stated that the problem at this location was that the width of the sidewalk allowed for cars to pull up and park, thereby blocking the sidewalk to pedestrian traffic. He further stated that both DPW and staff were enthusiastic about the proposal. Satisfied, Mr. Fifield moved on to the next agenda item.

Public comment:

Brittany McGovern, FQBA

While the French Quarter Business Association supports the bollard installation along Conti Street (to deter vehicles from parking on the public right of way), we are concerned with the planters and public seating presented by the architects. Due to the nature of the French Quarter, the FQBA believes the street furniture would be more problematic than good. In the past, for example, N.O.P.D. has found that planters become places for drug paraphernalia and trash receptacles. Similarly, any benches would become a place gathering place for vagrancy.

Consider the removal of the street furniture in the project. If necessary, please reach out to the N.O.P.D.'s Eighth District command for their experiences and thoughts.

Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion to recommend support of the location for the bollard installation based on the need to protect the paving materials as well as to minimize the obstruction of pedestrian traffic and for further discussion to take place with regards to the planters, benches or other street furniture. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	937 Decatur	APPLICANT:	Darin Pierce
OWNER:	937 Decatur St LLC	SQUARE:	21
ZONING:	VCC-1	LOT SIZE:	2,700 sq. ft.
USE:	Commercial	OPEN SPACE:	
DENSITY:		REQUIRED:	810 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	4 Units	EXISTING:	610 sq. ft. approx.
EXISTING:	0 Units	PROPOSED:	No Change
PROPOSED:	No Change		

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Small two-bay, 2½-story masonry commercial building, which has a 20th century shop front on its ground floor. (Could this portion remain from the 1830 building shown on the 1833 Zimpel drawing?).

Main Building: Pink

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of**05/27/20****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

05/27/20

Permit # 20-12345-VCGEN**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to modify Decatur St. elevation including installing new transom windows, installing new copper awning, and modifying upper floor windows, per application & materials received 02/20/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/27/20

Photographs show that this building had an awning from at least the 1940s until the late 1990s. The applicant proposes to install a new standing seam copper awning which would be sloped at 4 in 12 and project out from the building 4'8". The historic photographs show a flat projecting awning that appears to extend over the entire sidewalk. Although the proposed new awning does not match the historic precedence, staff finds the proposed awning potentially approvable in this instance.

Another aspect of the proposed work is the removal of the existing storefront windows and the existing doors, adding new transom windows above all three of these openings, and installing new storefront windows and doors. Photographs indicate that the current storefront arrangement and doors were installed in the late 1990s, likely at the same time the awning was removed. As the existing storefront is not historically significant, staff finds the proposed modification of this element allowable per the guidelines.

Staff and the Architecture Committee had some questions regarding the addition of the transom windows, noting that there is no indication of transom windows ever existing on the first floor of this elevation, although staff admits that the first floor has been severely modified over time. The Architecture Committee noted that there may be significant structural elements hidden in the wall which may make the addition of transom windows more involved.

Still, as this building has been modified and the transom windows as drawn appear to work well both in the context of this building and when compared to the neighboring building, the Architecture Committee found the new transom windows conceptually approvable.

At the second floor, the applicant proposes to remove the existing stucco band from around the windows. The existing stucco bands are atypical, and staff is unsure if they are simply an early 20th century addition or if they hold some earlier and more significant importance. The Architecture Committee found the removal of this element approvable.

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

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:

05/27/20

Architecture Committee Meeting of**03/10/2020****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**
Permit # 20-21682-VCGEN

03/10/2020

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to modify Decatur St. elevation including installing new transom windows, installing new copper awning, and modifying upper floor windows, per application & materials received 02/20/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

03/10/2020

Photographs show that this building had an awning from at least the 1940s until the late 1990s. The applicant proposes to install a new standing seam copper awning which would be sloped at 4 in 12 and project out from the building 4'8". The historic photographs show a flat projecting awning that appears to extend over the entire sidewalk. Although the proposed new awning does not match the historic precedence, staff finds the proposed awning potentially approvable. Although the guidelines state that, "*the VCC encourages the installation of a retractable, rather than a fixed, awning*" (VCC DG: 12-8), staff finds the proposed fixed awning potentially approvable in this instance.

Another aspect of the proposed work is the removal of the existing storefront windows and the existing doors, adding new transom windows above all three of these openings, and installing new storefront windows and doors. Photographs indicate that the current storefront arrangement and doors were installed in the late 1990s, likely at the same time the awning was removed. As the existing storefront is not historically significant, staff finds the proposed modification of this element allowable per the guidelines.

In regard to the proposed new transom windows, staff is more hesitant regarding this aspect of the proposal as there is no indication of transom windows ever existing on the first floor of this elevation, although staff admits that the first floor has been severely modified over time. The guidelines state that, "*the arrangement, size, and proportions of a window and/or door openings are key components of a building's style and character. As a result, the modification or addition of a window or door opening is discouraged, particularly on a more prominent building facade.*" (VCC DG: 07-20) Still, as this building has been modified and the transom windows as drawn appear to work well both in the context of this building and when compared to the neighboring building, the Architecture Committee may find new transom windows conceptually approvable.

At the second floor, the applicant proposes to replace the shutters with new batten shutters, install new six over six windows, and to remove the existing stucco band from around the windows. The applicant states that currently there are no windows in the openings and photographs show that this may have been the condition for many years. Staff finds the proposed six over six windows appropriate.

The existing stucco bands are atypical, and staff is unsure if they are simply an early 20th century addition or if they hold some earlier and more significant importance. Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed removal of this element.

Overall, staff finds the proposal conceptually approvable but requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed new transom windows and the removal of the second floor stucco banding around the windows.

ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE ACTION:

03/10/2020

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Gille present on behalf of the application. Mr. Gille stated that he believed the area in question was the remaining 1/3 of the previously existing corner building. Mr. Fifield asked the applicant if they had done any exploratory demolition. He further stated that the issue would be where the lintel is currently located, but that he felt comfortable with the proposed modifications.

Mr. Bergeron moved for conceptual approval of the application. Ms. DiMaggio seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	1113 Chartres Street	APPLICANT:	Robert Cangelosi
OWNER:	Beauregard-Keyes Foundation	SQUARE:	50
ZONING:	VCR-2	LOT SIZE:	11,680 sq. ft.
USE:	Museum	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	3,550 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	19 units	EXISTING:	3,504 sq. ft. (approx.)
EXISTING:	2 units	PROPOSED:	No Change
PROPOSED:	No change		

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Ratings:

- Main house & rear service building: **Purple** - of National Architectural or Historical Importance
- Extensions of service building on both uptown & downtown sides: **Yellow** - Contributes to the character of the district

In 1826 architect Francois Correjolle, the son of refugees from Saint-Dominique, designed the Le Carpentier-Beauregard-Keyes House, a landmark from the French Quarter's transitional period between French and American building traditions. The extensions of the rear service building on both the uptown and downtown sides are of early twentieth-century construction.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of

05/27/20

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:

05/27/20

Permit # 20-34399-VCGEN

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to reconstruct rear balcony including replacing existing turned columns, replacing existing railing elements, and slightly modifying existing skirt board, per application & materials received 04/27/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/27/20

The proposed work all occurs at the balcony of the purple rated rear building and is primarily repairs of termite damaged elements. The work is primarily to match existing with some very minor changes. As this is a purple-rated building the work requires review by both the Architecture Committee and the Commission. The work that is not exactly to match existing is limited to:

- The use of an alternate wood species (Red Grandis) for the balcony decking. The decking will still be tongue and groove and all dimensions will match existing.
- The use of a shorter fascia board. The applicant noted that the existing fascia board is inappropriately tall and was extended to hide a gas line. As the gas line is being removed, the applicant proposes to install a new fascia board that is appropriately sized for the other balcony elements.

The only other proposed work that staff commented on during the Architecture Committee meeting is the total replacement of the turned columns rather than trying to make repairs to the existing. The applicant noted that these columns date to the 1950's restoration of the property and are not original. As such, the total replacement of the columns may be approvable but staff encourages the applicant to be sure that the replacement columns are of high quality.

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

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:

05/27/20

Architecture Committee Meeting of**05/20/2020****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**
Permit # 20-34399-VCGEN

05/20/2020

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to reconstruct rear balcony including replacing existing turned columns, replacing existing railing elements, and slightly modifying existing skirt board, per application & materials received 04/27/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/20/2020

The proposed work all occurs at the balcony of the purple rated rear building and is primarily repairs of termite damaged elements. The work includes the interior replacement of the second-floor flooring and floor joists, which project out to support the balcony. New Spanish cedar sleepers would be installed on the cantilevered elements. Staff finds this element of the work to match existing and approvable.

The applicant proposes to replace the existing balcony decking with new decking made from a species of wood called Red Grandis. Staff is not familiar with this type of wood but a quick search reports that it is considered similar to such species as mahogany and Spanish cedar. Provided that the individual boards are milled to match the existing dimensions and profiles, staff finds this aspect of the work approvable.

The next aspect of the proposal is to replace six (6) existing turned wood columns with new Spanish cedar columns to match existing. Staff is more hesitant regarding this element of the proposal and questions if the total replacement of these elements is warranted. Photographs appear to show that at least some of the columns have had repairs performed near the base and that these repairs may be failing. Still, staff is reluctant to recommend for the removal of viable historic fabric, suggesting that a completely replaced column may be of lesser quality than the historic columns. Staff recommends for partial replacement and repairs to the existing if viable rather than complete replacement.

The applicant also proposes to replace the railings to match with new Spanish cedar. Provided the replacements are a good match and good quality staff finds this element of the proposal approvable.

Finally, the applicant proposes to replace the existing fascia board with a new fascia board that does not match the existing. The proposed new board is noted as being 7/8" thick by 8-1/5" tall, made from Spanish cedar, and with a bottom bead. Staff is not necessarily opposed to this change but questions if it is based on any evidence. The HABS drawings for this building do not appear to have this element dimensioned.

Overall, staff finds the proposal generally approvable but recommends against the wholesale replacement of the columns if it can be avoided and seeks clarification regarding the requested fascia board change.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

05/20/2020

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Cangelosi present on behalf of the application. Mr. Cangelosi stated that the columns were changed in the 1950s with repairs at the bottom due to termite damage. He went on to say that they rebuilt all the structure at the same time. He further stated that at some point someone had widened the fascia to conceal a gas pipe behind it and that they were changing the fascia back and removing all gas from the building. Mr. Fifield stated that he was ok with the Red Grandis and was curious to know how it would hold up. He then asked the Committee if they had any other comments. They replied no. Mr. Fifield moved on to the next agenda item.

Ms. DiMaggio moved for the approval of the use of the new RED GRANDIS wood material, the railings and the smaller fascia board with the proviso that the applicant would retain materials where at all possible. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 538 North Rampart
 OWNER: 538 N. Rampart LLC
 ZONING: VCC-2
 USE: Residential (vacant)

APPLICANT: HBSA II
 SQUARE: 99
 LOT SIZE: 1,848 sq.ft.

DENSITY-
 ALLOWED: 1 unit
 EXISTING: Vacant
 PROPOSED: 4 units

OPEN SPACE-
 REQUIRED: 554 sq.ft.
 EXISTING: 336 sq. ft.
 PROPOSED: No change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Rating: Main & service ell – Blue, of Major Architectural or Historical Importance

This property is one in an imposing row of four circa 1854 late Greek revival townhouses, located at 532-540 North Rampart.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **05/27/20**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/27/20
Permit # 20-25024-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to install new rooftop HVAC equipment, per application & materials received 03/04/2020 & 05/12/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/27/20

Extensive renovations were reviewed for this property in 2015-2016 and initial permits issued in 2017. Those approved plans indicated that the mechanical equipment for both this building and the neighboring 540 N Rampart would be located on a roof rack anchored to the existing parapet wall above the service ell of the 538 building. The applicant has revised this aspect of the plans and now proposes to install a total of seven (7) mechanical units on a roof rack located in the valley between the two main roof of 538 and 540 N Rampart.

Staff had an opportunity to visit the site including gaining access to the roof below where the units are proposed. Seeing the conditions in person, staff found the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and preferred when compared to some other options.

In order to provide access to the rooftop units the applicant is proposing to modify an existing fourth floor window opening by side hinging a window and combining the window with a side hinged stucco panel. This opening would provide access to the low sloped roof of the service ell. A new ladder fixed to the rear wall would then provide access from the low sloped roof to the roof of the main building.

Staff has consulted with a member of the City's Mechanical Department who noted that the roof rack would need to be significantly more substantial than what is proposed. In order to meet mechanical code the roof rack will require that:

- each unit has a 30" x 30" flat work space adjacent to the unit
- access to the units would need to be permanent including a fixed ladder and catwalk on any sloped roof surfaces
- guardrails are installed on all platforms and catwalks

Despite the addition of these code required elements, staff still finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and the Architecture Committee recommended conceptual approval of new rooftop mechanical equipment. Staff notes that the final design of the platform, including the code required elements, may return to the Architecture Committee if it becomes apparent that the overall design will be overly visible. Provided that the final design of the rack and equipment is similar with what was discussed at the last Architecture Committee meeting, staff recommends approval of the proposal with the final details to be worked out at the staff level.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 05/27/20

Architecture Committee Meeting of**05/20/2020****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**
Permit # 20-25024-VCGEN

05/20/2020

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to relocate HVAC equipment from previously approved location, per application & materials received 03/04/2020 & 05/12/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/20/2020

Staff had an opportunity to visit the site following the 04/29/2020 Architecture Committee meeting including gaining access to the roof below where the units are proposed. Seeing the conditions in person, staff finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and preferred when compared to some other options.

Staff also had a representative from the City's Mechanical Department look at the proposal and he stated that some aspects would need to be modified in order for the proposal to meet mechanical code. Specifically, that each unit would require a 30" x 30" flat work space adjacent to the units, that access to the units would need to be permanent including a fixed ladder, catwalk on any sloped roof surfaces, and guardrails on all platforms and catwalks. Despite the addition of these code required elements, staff still finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable. Although some elements of the permanent access may be visible from the public right of way, the units themselves should not be.

In order to provide access to the rooftop units the applicant is proposing to lower the sill of one of the existing fourth floor window openings and side hinge a window to operate as a door. This opening would provide access to the low sloped roof of the service ell. A new ladder fixed to the rear wall would then provide access from the low sloped roof to the roof of the main building. Note that the applicant proposes to modify an existing window of the 540 N Rampart building in the same manner but this modification appears to be only to maintain symmetry between the two buildings. Staff recommends the window of the 540 N Rampart building not be modified.

Given the proposed modifications at the rear of the building and knowing that the Mechanical Department will require additional platforms, catwalks, and guardrails, staff questions if a better access would be in the form of a roof hatch immediately adjacent to the rooftop mechanical platform.

The applicant has also modified and resubmitted plans to install units on the balconies at the second and fourth floor. At the second floor the units are proposed to be split units on wall mounted brackets with louvered shutter screening. At the fourth floor, traditional sized condensing units are shown in the same balcony location as previously proposed but with the addition of screening. Staff still does not find these proposed locations approvable even with the addition of screening.

When staff met with the applicant on site, the possibility of locating units in the alley at the rear of the service ell was also discussed. These could be at grade or wall mounted below the second floor. Staff finds this alley location greatly preferred over the proposed balcony locations.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed mechanical rack on the main building but requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed access to the rack and the mechanical code requirements. Staff recommends denial of the proposed balcony units with the applicant to work with staff on an approvable location such as the rear alleyway or flat roof of the 540 N Rampart building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

05/20/2020

538 and 540 N Rampart were heard as one application.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Marcello and Mr. Carlson present on behalf of the application. Mr. Carlson stated that if the minisplits on the rear building were relocated behind the parapet you would not see them. Mr. Block stated that he agreed with Mr. Carlson's assessment and this proposed location. Mr. Marcello stated that on 538 the second and third floor units could be at ground level, or on the wall. He went on to say that the access door would retain its historic look of a window with a panel underneath to open that would not be visible. Mr. Block stated that proposed drawing was misleading and that when you were on site the panel was very discreet. Mr. Marcello stated that the panel was seamless. Ms. DiMaggio stated that all of her comments/ questions were adequately addressed. Mr. Fifield stated that is main concern was the additional construction to meet mechanical code. Mr. Block stated that he believed this could be very minimal.

Public comment:**Nikki Szalwinski, French Quarter Citizens**

FQ Citizens supports the staff recommendation of denial of the units on the balcony and agrees that they should be located in more discreet locations. We ask that the applicant consider the impact on adjacent

properties when considering HVAC equipment.

Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for the approval of the units located on the roof of the building, incorporating the applicant's comments regarding the placement that most optimally minimizes the visibility of all components, the single modified window with access panel below and the denial of the balcony locations, with the recognition that the applicant has indicated that there are alternate locations. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of

04/29/2020

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:
Permit # 20-25024-VCGEN

04/29/2020

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to relocate HVAC equipment from previously approved location, per materials received 03/05/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

04/29/2020

Extensive renovations were reviewed for this property in 2015-2016 and initial permits issued in 2017. Those approved plans indicated that the mechanical equipment for both this building and the neighboring 540 N Rampart would be located on a roof rack anchored to the existing parapet wall above the service ell of the 538 building. This location was shown as housing a total of five units with no other mechanical units shown on the plans. Staff notes that this rooftop location would have very limited visibility.

The applicant has submitted a revised proposal that eliminates the rooftop rack from the service ell roof and instead proposes to place mechanical units in various locations around the two buildings. For this building, this includes one unit on the second floor balcony at the rear of the service ell, one unit on the balcony of the fourth floor at the rear of the service ell, and four units attached to the parapet above the roof of the main building for a total of six mechanical units for this building.

Although the previously approved plans included rooftop mounted equipment and staff believes the proposed location on the roof of the main building would have limited visibility, staff is hesitant regarding this location. The existing roof is flat so the new sloped roof will be a restored element of the building. Staff would find it unfortunate if this restored element was lessened by the addition of the mechanical rack. Additionally, staff suspects that the requirements of the mechanical department will result in the rack in this location needing to be significantly larger than what is shown. Given these reasons, staff prefers the service ell rooftop location for mechanical equipment.

Staff does not find the proposed balcony locations at the second and fourth floor approvable. If these two units are being proposed in their current locations in order to be closer to the spaces they service, staff suggests that locations at the roof of the service ell or in the courtyard space below would be more in line with the recommendations of the guidelines.

Staff recommends denial of the two proposed balcony mechanical units and requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposal rooftop equipment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

04/29/2020

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Carlson, a representative of Harry Baker Smith Architects, and Mr. Marcello, the building owner, present on behalf of the application. 538 N Rampart and 540 N Rampart were heard as one agenda item. Mr. Marcello stated that the idea was to move some units to the main roof, which seemed like a better location than the current location as they would not be seen from the street. He went on to say that they had shifted some units from one building to the other because they are two separate buildings and should be treated as such. Mr. Marcello also clarified that the proposed balcony units would be mini-splits rather than full size. Mr. Fifield asked if the Committee members had any comments or questions.

Ms. DiMaggio stated that she appreciated the explanation but that the VCC should take all views into consideration because the guidelines stated that the VCC has control over everything that weather touches. She then asked staff if they had been on site for an inspection. Mr. Albrecht responded that he had and that while the units would be visible at some angles, it would be very minimal. Mr. Block stated that if there was a visual concern, staff and the Committee must be sure before approval and permitting.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant how/ where was the access for maintenance and if that access meet OSHA requirements. Mr. Marcello stated that the access was in the penthouse, a window that was actually a door. Mr. Carlson explained that the access door could be seen on page A1.3 of the drawing set. Mr. Fifield then asked if the mechanical division had approved the access route yet. Mr. Albrecht stated that he had reached out to mechanical but had not heard back by the time of the meeting. Mr. Fifield stated

that not hearing from mechanical was a problem and that the Committee could not approve something that Safety and Permits would not allow. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she was not comfortable with the units on the balcony because of the building rating and that she felt that the owner was sacrificing the view from the whole for the view from one unit. With nothing more to discuss Mr. Fifield moved on to the next agenda item.

After a 30 minute recess the following public comments and motion were made:

Public Comment:

Nikki Szalwinski, French Quarter Citizens

We are thrilled to see these building renovated after falling into disrepair. However, we would like to see the applicant keep the mechanical in a more discreet location.

Susan Klein, neighbor at 1020 Toulouse

As the neighbor behind this property, I would prefer the location towards N. Rampart.

Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio moved to deny the units proposed for the balcony locations. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. DiMaggio made a second motion to defer the proposal regarding the rooftop units to allow the applicant to return with a more developed proposal including information regarding the visibility or lack thereof in locating the units and associated construction at this location on the roof. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 540 North Rampart
 OWNER: Minacore Investments LLC APPLICANT: HBSA II
 ZONING: VCC-2 SQUARE: 99
 USE: Commercial & residential LOT SIZE: 1771 sq.ft.

DENSITY-		OPEN SPACE-	
ALLOWED:	2 units	REQUIRED:	354 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	3 units	EXISTING:	approx. 37 sq. ft.
PROPOSED:	No Change	PROPOSED:	No Change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Rating: Main & service ell – Blue, of Major Architectural or Historical Importance
 Courtyard infill - Brown

This property is one in an imposing row of four circa 1854 late Greek revival townhouses, located at 532-540 North Rampart.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **05/27/20**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/27/20
Permit # 20-25024-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to install new rooftop HVAC equipment, per application & materials received 03/04/2020 & 05/12/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/27/20

Extensive renovations were reviewed for this property in 2015-2016 and initial permits issued in 2017. Those approved plans indicated that the mechanical equipment for both this building and the neighboring 538 N Rampart would be located on a roof rack anchored to the existing parapet wall above the service ell of the 538 building. The applicant has revised this aspect of the plans and now proposes to install a total of seven (7) mechanical units on a roof rack located in the valley between the two main roof of 538 and 540 N Rampart.

Staff had an opportunity to visit the site including gaining access to the roof below where the units are proposed. Seeing the conditions in person, staff found the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and preferred when compared to some other options.

In order to provide access to the rooftop units the applicant is proposing to modify an existing fourth floor window opening by side hinging a window and combining the window with a side hinged stucco panel. This opening would provide access to the low sloped roof of the service ell. A new ladder fixed to the rear wall would then provide access from the low sloped roof to the roof of the main building.

Staff has consulted with a member of the City's Mechanical Department who noted that the roof rack would need to be significantly more substantial than what is proposed. In order to meet mechanical code the roof rack will require that:

- each unit has a 30" x 30" flat work space adjacent to the unit
- access to the units would need to be permanent including a fixed ladder and catwalk on any sloped roof surfaces
- guardrails are installed on all platforms and catwalks

Despite the addition of these code required elements, staff still finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and the Architecture Committee recommended conceptual approval of new rooftop mechanical equipment. Staff notes that the final design of the platform, including the code required elements, may return to the Architecture Committee if it becomes apparent that the overall design will be overly visible. Provided that the final design of the rack and equipment is similar with what was discussed at the last Architecture Committee meeting, staff recommends approval of the proposal with the final details to be worked out at the staff level.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION: 05/27/20

Architecture Committee Meeting of**05/20/2020****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**
Permit # 20-25024-VCGEN

05/20/2020

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht

Proposal to relocate HVAC equipment from previously approved location, per application & materials received 03/04/2020 & 05/12/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/20/2020

Staff had an opportunity to visit the site following the 04/29/2020 Architecture Committee meeting including gaining access to the roof below where the units are proposed. Seeing the conditions in person, staff finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable and preferred when compared to some other options.

Staff also had a representative from the City's Mechanical Department look at the proposal and he stated that some aspects would need to be modified in order for the proposal to meet mechanical code. Specifically, that each unit would require a 30" x 30" flat work space adjacent to the units, that access to the units would need to be permanent including a fixed ladder, catwalk on any sloped roof surfaces, and guardrails on all platforms and catwalks. Despite the addition of these code required elements, staff still finds the proposed rooftop location potentially approvable. Although some elements of the permanent access may be visible from the public right of way, the units themselves should not be.

In order to provide access to the rooftop units the applicant is proposing to lower the sill of one of the existing fourth floor window openings and side hinge a window to operate as a door. This opening would provide access to the low sloped roof of the service ell. A new ladder fixed to the rear wall would then provide access from the low sloped roof to the roof of the main building. Note that the applicant proposes to modify an existing window of the 540 N Rampart building in the same manner but this modification appears to be only to maintain symmetry between the two buildings. Staff recommends the window of the 540 N Rampart building not be modified.

Given the proposed modifications at the rear of the building and knowing that the Mechanical Department will require additional platforms, catwalks, and guardrails, staff questions if a better access would be in the form of a roof hatch immediately adjacent to the rooftop mechanical platform.

The applicant has also modified and resubmitted plans to install units on the balconies at the second and fourth floor. At the second floor the units are proposed to be split units on wall mounted brackets with louvered shutter screening. At the fourth floor, traditional sized condensing units are shown in the same balcony location as previously proposed but with the addition of screening. *Staff notes that the second floor balcony on this building is adjacent to and only slightly above the flat roof of the first floor infill. This is seen in drawing 1 on Sheet A3.4. Staff suggests this unit could be moved to this flat roof area rather than being located on the balcony.* **(Italicized portion is the only difference with this report and the neighboring 538 N. Rampart)** Staff still does not find these proposed balcony locations approvable even with the addition of screening.

When staff met with the applicant on site, the possibility of locating units in the alley at the rear of the service ell was also discussed. These could be at grade or wall mounted below the second floor. Staff finds this alley location greatly preferred over the proposed balcony locations.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed mechanical rack on the main building but requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the proposed access to the rack and the mechanical code requirements. Staff recommends denial of the proposed balcony units with the applicant to work with staff on an approvable location such as the rear alleyway or flat roof of the 540 N Rampart building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

05/20/2020

538 and 540 N Rampart were heard as one application.

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Marcello and Mr. Carlson present on behalf of the application. Mr. Carlson stated that if the minisplits on the rear building were relocated behind the parapet you would not see them. Mr. Block stated that he agreed with Mr. Carlson's assessment and this proposed location. Mr. Marcello stated that on 538 the second and third floor units could be at ground level, or on the wall. He went on to say that the access door would retain its historic look of a window with a panel underneath to open that would not be visible. Mr. Block stated that proposed drawing was misleading and that when you were on site the panel was very discreet. Mr. Marcello stated that the panel was seamless. Ms. DiMaggio stated that all of her comments/ questions were adequately addressed. Mr. Fifield stated that his main concern was the additional construction to meet mechanical code. Mr. Block stated that he believed this could be very minimal.

Public comment:**Nikki Szalwinski, French Quarter Citizens**

FQ Citizens supports the staff recommendation of denial of the units on the balcony and agrees that they should be located in more discreet locations. We ask that the applicant consider the impact on adjacent properties when considering HVAC equipment.

Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio made the motion for the approval of the units located on the roof of the building, incorporating the applicant's comments regarding the placement that most optimally minimizes the visibility of all components, the single modified window with access panel below and the denial of the balcony locations, with the recognition that the applicant has indicated that there are alternate locations. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of**04/29/2020****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

04/29/2020

Permit # 20-25022-VCGEN**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to relocate HVAC equipment from previously approved location and to install new hood vent exhaust, per materials received 03/05/2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

04/29/2020

The proposed mechanical equipment for this building is similar to the proposal for 538 N. Rampart (see 538 N. Rampart for additional information) with two units proposed for installations on the balconies and three units proposed for the rooftop rack above the roof of the main building.

In addition to these units the proposal for this building includes two units and a makeup air intake on the flat roof of the one-story infill construction located in the Toulouse and Burgundy corner of the building. Finally, a hood vent exhaust is proposed to be installed through the wall on the Burgundy elevation of the building at the first floor. The proposed hood vent exhaust utilizes an inline kitchen hood grease exhaust fan located on the interior of the building to virtually eliminate the outdoor presence of the equipment. The only manifestation of the exhaust would be louvered vents measuring approximately 2' square located on the Burgundy elevation at the first floor. These louvers are shown recessed a minimum of one wythe of brick in the wall. Staff finds this proposed vent installation minimally impactful on the building and a prime example that should be emulated for new installations at other buildings.

Consistent with the recommendation for the 538 N. Rampart, staff recommends denial of the two proposed balcony mechanical units and requests commentary from the Committee regarding the proposal rooftop equipment. Staff finds the one-story infill roof a preferred location for equipment and recommends approval of the proposed equipment in this location. Staff encourages the applicant to put additional equipment in this location if feasible. Staff recommends approval of the proposed kitchen exhaust louvers.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

04/29/2020

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Carlson, a representative of Harry Baker Smith Architects, and Mr. Marcello, the building owner, present on behalf of the application. 538 N Rampart and 540 N Rampart were heard as one agenda item. Mr. Marcello stated that the idea was to move some units to the main roof, which seemed like a better location than the current location as they would not be seen from the street. He went on to say that they had shifted some units from one building to the other because they are two separate building and should be treated as such. Mr. Marcello also clarified that the proposed balcony units would be mini-splits rather than full size. Mr. Fifield asked if the Committee members had any comments or questions.

Ms. DiMaggio stated that she appreciated the explanation but that the VCC should take all views into consideration because the guidelines stated that the VCC has control over everything that weather touches. She then asked staff if they had been on site for an inspection. Mr. Albrecht responded that he had and that while the units would be visible at some angles, it would be very minimal. Mr. Block stated that if there was a visual concern, staff and the Committee must be sure before approval and permitting.

Mr. Fifield asked the applicant how/ where was the access for maintenance and if that access meet OSHA requirements. Mr. Marcello stated that the access was in the penthouse, a window that was actually a door. Mr. Carlson explained that the access door could be seen on page A1.3 of the drawing set. Mr. Fifield then asked if the mechanical division had approved the access route yet. Mr. Albrecht stated that he had reached out to mechanical but had not heard back by the time of the meeting. Mr. Fifield stated that not hearing from mechanical was a problem and that the Committee could not approve something that Safety and Permits would not allow. Ms. DiMaggio stated that she was not comfortable with the units on the balcony because of the building rating and that she felt that the owner was sacrificing the view from the whole for the view from one unit. With nothing more to discuss Mr. Fifield moved on to the next agenda item.

After a 30 minute recess the following public comments and motion were made:

Public Comment:**Nikki Szalwinski, French Quarter Citizens**

We are thrilled to see these building renovated after falling into disrepair. However, we would like to see the applicant keep the mechanical in a more discreet location.

Susan Klein, neighbor at 1020 Toulouse

As the neighbor behind this property, I would prefer the location towards N. Rampart.

Motion:

Ms. DiMaggio moved to deny the units proposed for the balcony locations. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. DiMaggio made a second motion to defer the proposal regarding the rooftop units to allow the applicant to return with a more developed proposal including information regarding the visibility or lack thereof in locating the units and associated construction at this location on the roof. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS:	336-40 Chartres Street	APPLICANT:	Kurt Werling
OWNER:	Mercier Realty & Investment Company	SQUARE:	29
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	approx. 4042 sq. ft.
USE:	Commercial	OPEN SPACE	
DENSITY		Required:	808 sq. ft.
Allowed:	6 units	Existing:	3034 sq. ft.
Existing:	None	Proposed:	4042 sq. ft.
Proposed:	No change		

ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

Vacant four story, masonry and wood frame structure, with its one exposed wall being the cement plaster elevation that faces Conti Street. Sanborn maps show a building in this location as early as 1876. The remainder of the property is a paved surface parking lot.

Rating: **Yellow** - contributes to the character of the district.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of **05/27/2020**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION: 05/27/2020
Permit # 20-26023-VCGEN **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to demolish infill structure, in conjunction with staff recommended proposal to lower building rating from “yellow” to “brown,” per application & materials received 04/21/2020. **[Will require 30-day layover period and additional review]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION: 05/27/2020

The applicant is proposing to demolish the unusual infill building, which remains on the site after the corner structure was lost in the 1940s. The remaining narrow building is completely surrounded by adjacent structures on three sides, and cannot meet building code requirements for egress or occupancy. It has been vacant since at least the 1980s, is missing a significant portion of its roof, and was deemed unsafe for full inspection by a licensed engineer in 2014. Significant water intrusion issues have also been observed in several of the adjacent structures.

While staff regrets the loss of any historic structure, the structure is not viable for future use and staff does not consider it to “contribute to the character of the district,” which is the definition of a yellow-rated building. The condition of the building, its status as a remnant of a historic structure, and the extreme limitations for rehabilitation and occupancy, have led staff to recommend a downgrade from “yellow” to “brown,” which is defined as “detrimental, or of no architectural and/or historic significance.” VCC Director, Bryan Block met with the applicant on-site for a cursory inspection. Mr. Block agrees that the advanced deterioration of the building, and the roof structure in particular, gives credence to the proposal and recommendation for complete demolition.

The Design Guidelines state that “*when reviewing a demolition application for a building or structure on a property, the VCC uses the following criteria in its evaluation:*”

- *The historic or architectural significance of the building or structure as designated by its color rating*
- *The importance of the building or structure to the tout ensemble*
- *The available alternatives to demolition that have been evaluated and explored by the applicant*
- *The special character and aesthetic interest that the building or structure adds to the streetscape, site, or District*
- *The difficulty or impossibility of reproducing such a building or structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or construction*
- *The condition of the building or structure*
- *The future utilization of the site*
- *The proposed mitigation measures such as, but not limited to, continued maintenance, fencing and/or landscaping.*

[...] If the applicant believes the building is structurally unsound or a hazard, they are encouraged to provide documentation of the unsound condition prepared by a licensed structural engineer or architect. The only instance in which demolition is allowed without formal VCC approval is when required by the Department of Safety and Permits because the building, monument or structure is in imminent danger of collapse.

A demolition application that does not meet the imminent danger of collapse criteria will be considered by the AC and then the Commission at public hearings. After initial review, the Commission typically requires a 30-day layover period for a demolition application. This allows further investigation by Staff and the Building Inspector, particularly as to the historic importance and current condition of the

resource, and provides an opportunity for public comment. The VCC requires the submission of redevelopment plans concurrently with the demolition application and requires conceptual approval of the proposed redevelopment project prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

If the Commission approves a demolition application, a permit will be issued for the work after all conditions of the VCC's approval have been met. No demolition or relocation work may begin until the VCC has approved a permit and the applicant has obtained all other necessary permits from the applicable City agencies, including the Department of Safety and Permits.” (VCC DG: 14-20)

The applicant has submitted an engineer's report from 2014 which stated that the building was at risk of imminent collapse at that time, as well as surveys from 1956 that indicate that the Chartres and Decatur-side walls are not party walls. Photos also show some space between the walls of 340 and the surrounding buildings. The applicant proposes to install a brick fence with double gate on the Conti elevation to prevent unauthorized access to the portion of the site where the building currently sits.

Given the state of the structure, the risk it poses to surrounding buildings, and the inability of this building to be redeveloped to meet contemporary building code, the Committee is forwarding a **positive recommendation** for the proposed demolition, with the application to return to the Commission following the 30-day layover period. In conjunction with the demolition, staff recommends a **downgrade** in rating from “yellow” to “brown” to more adequately reflect the lack of contribution to the architectural and historic significance of the district, as well as its detrimental status. Additional materials will be required for further review at the Committee and Commission levels, including demolition plans, an updated engineer's report, a current survey of the property, and confirmation that the demolition of the building will not compromise the adjacent structures. Staff also recommends that the requirement for submittal of future development drawings be waived in the interest of timely intervention, as no building could be reconstructed on this footprint and the corner portion of the site has been vacant since the 1940s.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:

05/27/2020

ADDRESS:	311 N. Peters Street/308 Decatur Street		
OWNER:	Soconomo, LLC	APPLICANT:	John C. Williams
ZONING:	VCE-1	SQUARE:	8
USE:	Mixed-Use	LOT SIZE:	3,287 sq. ft.
DENSITY-		OPEN SPACE-	
ALLOWED:	5 Units	REQUIRED:	986 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	4 Units	EXISTING:	0 sq. ft.
PROPOSED:	No Change	PROPOSED:	No Change

ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:

Rating - Green: Of Local Architectural or Historical Importance.

Peter Middlemiss was the builder of this fine c. 1860 three-story industrial building in the Italianate style, which in the 19th century was part of a rice mill complex. An identical structure was built on the downriver side of this structure at the same time, which also housed part of the mill complex.

Vieux Carré Commission Meeting of**05/27/20****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

05/27/20

Permit # 19-15606-VCGEN**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht****Violation Case #19-00530-VCCNOP****Inspector: Anthony Whitfield**

Appeal of Architecture Committee denial of proposal to retain storefront windows and display platforms installed without benefit of VCC review or approval, per application & materials received 05/14/19.

[Notice of Violation sent 01/24/19]

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/27/20

The renovation of this building was extensively reviewed in 2013 and 2014 with permits being issued both in 2013 and 2014 for work. The stamped approved plans that accompanied the permit issued in 2014 showed the doors on the N. Peters side of the building as being refurbished and repaired. These doors were shown as bi-folding into the building.

Less than two weeks after the 2014 VCC permit was issued a new application was filed for a renovation of the tenant space per the attached plans. These revised plans included reversing the hinging on the existing doors to create bi-folding doors, installing a new storefront system immediately behind the doors, and a new platform for mannequin display. The building department issued a permit for this work on 12/24/14 although the details of the permit note that "Interior Work Only work approved" and "No exterior".

Staff notes that not only was the modifications to the existing doors exterior work but following the installation of the storefront system the doors essentially became night blinds and the storefront became the new exterior millwork. Staff cited the property for working without a VCC permit and the applicant is now applying to retain the storefront as installed. Staff fears this style of building out immediately behind existing historic millwork could set a very bad precedent. Staff does not believe that a storefront system would have been approved behind the existing doors if this work had been properly reviewed prior to the work being done.

The guidelines states that, "*the VCC does not allow introducing a new storefront or element that alters or destroys a historic building material or where none existed*"; "*the VCC does not allow installing an inappropriate building material at a storefront*"; and "*the VCC does not allow altering the size or shape of a major building form, such as a window, door, or transom opening, or altering a door to swing out unless required by the Building Code.*" (VCC DG: 13-12)

At the 10/22/19 Architecture Committee meeting, the Committee approved a proposal to remove the glass from immediately behind the doors but to retain the secondary storefront, provided that the doors be fixed shut. The applicant has appealed that decision and is seeking to retain the unpermitted conditions as-is, noting that tenants have had difficulty as they have lost their street front presence.

Since that last Architecture Committee meeting staff was able to locate photographs as early as 1962 and as late as 1992 which show that this elevation used to consist of similar bi-folding doors in one bay and larger, more storefront style windows in the other two bays. Staff encouraged the applicant to take this historic precedence and make a new proposal based off the previously existing conditions. Rather, the applicant is proposing to retain the as-installed storefront and door hinge changes. As the installed storefront is inappropriately proportioned, made from inappropriate materials, and could set a bad precedent for similar "interior" work directly behind historic millwork, staff recommends denial of the proposed retention of the storefront system but would welcome proposals based off previously existing conditions.

VIEUX CARRÉ COMMISSION ACTION:

05/27/20

Architecture Committee Meeting of **10/22/19****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

Permit # 19-15606-VCGEN
Violation Case #19-00530-VCCNOP

10/22/19

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht
Inspector: Anthony Whitfield

Proposal to modify storefront system installed without benefit of VCC review or approval, per application & materials received 10/15/19.

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

10/22/19

A previous proposal to retain the doors and storefront system as installed was denied at the 05/28/19 Architecture Committee meeting. Following that denial, the applicant met with staff and discussed some possible alternatives. The applicant has submitted an option that would eliminate the storefront located immediately behind the bi-folding doors but would retain an existing secondary storefront located approximately 2'6" within the building. The bi-folding doors are shown as remaining with their modified out swinging function.

Staff finds the retention of the secondary storefront set 2'6" within the building potentially approvable but would prefer the function of the doors in the two outer bays to be converted back to their original in-swinging function. As the doors are still hung at the interior side of the door jamb, this change should be relatively easy to accomplish.

Alternatively, staff would be open to a proposal to remove the existing millwork from the outer bays and to install a more traditional fixed window with divided lites. This would accomplish a similar "storefront" appearance but in a more traditional way.

Staff requests commentary from the Architecture Committee regarding the treatment of these two openings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

10/22/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Williams present on behalf of the application. Ms. DiMaggio moved to approve the proposal to remove the glass from immediately behind the doors and to retain the secondary storefront system provided that the doors be fixed closed. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Architecture Committee Meeting of**05/28/19****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

Permit # 19-15606-VCGEN
Violation Case #19-00530-VCCNOP

05/28/19

Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht
Inspector: Anthony Whitfield

Proposal to retain storefront windows and display platforms installed without benefit of VCC review or approval, per application & materials received 05/14/19. **[Notice of Violation sent 01/24/19]**

STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:

05/28/19

The renovation of this building was extensively reviewed in 2013 and 2014 with permits being issued both in 2013 and 2014 for work. The stamped approved plans that accompanied the permit issued in 2014 showed the doors on the N. Peters side of the building as being refurbished and repaired. These doors were shown as bi-folding into the building.

Less than two weeks after the 2014 VCC permit was issued a new application was filed for a renovation of the tenant space per the attached plans. These revised plans included reversing the hinging on the existing doors to create bi-folding doors, installing a new storefront system immediately behind the doors, and a new platform for mannequin display. The building department issued a permit for this work on 12/24/14 although the details of the permit note that "Interior Work Only work approved" and "No exterior".

Staff notes that not only was the modifications to the existing doors exterior work but following the installation of the storefront system the doors essentially became night blinds and the storefront became the new exterior millwork. Staff cited the property for working without a VCC permit and the applicant is now applying to retain the storefront as installed. Staff fears this style of building out immediately behind existing historic millwork could set a very bad precedent. Staff does not believe that a storefront system would have been approved behind the existing doors if this work had been properly reviewed prior to the work being done.

The guidelines states that, "the VCC does not allow introducing a new storefront or element that alters or destroys a historic building material or where none existed"; "the VCC does not allow installing an inappropriate building material at a storefront"; and "the VCC does not allow altering the size or shape of a major building form, such as a window, door, or transom opening, or altering a door to swing out unless required by the Building Code." (VCC DG: 13-12)

If the applicant can demonstrate that a storefront previously existed in this location, staff suggests that the Committee may consider an application to restore a previously existing storefront. As the installed storefront is inappropriately proportioned and made from inappropriate materials, staff recommends denial of the proposed retention of the storefront system.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

05/28/19

Mr. Albrecht read the staff report with Mr. Williams present on behalf of the application. Mr. Williams stated that the owner had a building permit, but that apparently the plans never made it to VCC staff. Mr. Musso stated that that excuse was unacceptable. Mr. Fifield stated that the swing of the doors had changed, clearly exterior work. Mr. Fifield moved for the denial of the retention of the doors installed in deviation of the permit. Mr. Musso seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.