



# Vieux Carré Commission Architecture Committee Meeting

Tuesday, November 22, 2022



# Old Business



528 Wilkinson

ADDRESS:	528 Wilkinson St	APPLICANT:	Zach Smith Consulting & Design
OWNER:	C 4 Holding LLC	SQUARE:	26
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	3798 sq. ft.
USE:	Residential	OPEN SPACE:	
DENSITY:		REQUIRED:	1139 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	7 units	EXISTING:	No change
EXISTING:	1 unit	PROPOSED:	No change
PROPOSED:	Unknown		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

Main building: **Yellow**, contributes to the character of the district.

C. 1900 early 20th c. warehouse constructed by Jackson Brewery Co.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/22/2022**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/22/2022  
**Permit #22-32145-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to install new HVAC equipment on roof, per application & materials received 10/24/2022 & 11/07/2022, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/22/2022

Staff notes that this work is in conjunction with the roof deck repair and reconstruction that was conceptually approved by the Committee on 11/09/2022. Unfortunately, these materials were submitted after the deadline, too late for public notice to be amended to include the installation of the HVAC equipment. The applicant proposes to install a 4-ton mini-split under the new stair leading from the roof deck of the main building to the roof deck above the addition. An exact dimension is not provided, but it appears to put the mini-split approximately 6’-8’ from the Decatur property line, since the stair is being relocated as part of its reconstruction.

The 4-ton unit measures approx. 16” x 52” x 42”. The manufacturer’s brochure states that the sound rating is “as low as 51 dB,” but does not provide a range or maximum. However, staff finds it unlikely that a mini split is likely to have an objectionable noise output. Staff finds the location discrete and recommends **approval**.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/22/2022



# New Business



229 Royal

ADDRESS:	229 Royal	APPLICANT:	John Williams
OWNER:	229 Royal Street, LLC	SQUARE:	65
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	3485.73 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant	OPEN SPACE	
DENSITY		Required:	1045.7 sq. ft.
Allowed:	5 units	Existing:	0 sq. ft.
Existing:	Unknown	Proposed:	0 sq. ft.
Proposed:	None		

**ARCHITECTURAL / HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY**

Rating: Green, or of local architectural and/or historical significance.

This four-story brick with plaster store is part of a ca. 1856 row of five buildings built by Jamison and McIntosh, builders for Romanzo Warwick Montgomery. Originally, the detailing of these Italianate style stores had iron shutters on their upper openings, heavily bracketed cornices, cast iron pilasters and shop doors on the ground floor, casements on the second, double hung sashes on the third and fourth floors, and an iron gallery supported on iron posts (a feature which extended across all five buildings). The first and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors of this particular building were “modernized” most likely circa 1950.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of 11/22/2022**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/22/2022  
**Permit #22-32379-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to modify millwork and construct new rooftop deck and pool, in conjunction with a **change of use** from *vacant* to *hotel accessory*, per application & materials received 10/26/2022.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/22/2022

The applicant is seeking a renewal for work permitted in 2018 that will connect this building to the neighboring hotel and convert 229 Royal into a new restaurant, meeting rooms, and spa. The plans include a restoration of the Royal St. elevation, including the removal of the fire escape. A connecting structure will be added at the second floor, Bourbon elevation. The proposed rooftop addition consists of a pool, raised decking and planters, restrooms, an elevator, and two stair penthouses. The proposed elevator override is the tallest feature above grade, with the roof topping out at 69’4”. The drawings appear to be unchanged in comparison with the stamped materials approved in 2018.

Staff notes that aspects of this review are outside of VCC jurisdiction, including BZA review of height waivers for rooftop elements in excess of the existing building height, and whatever cross-easements may be necessary with the adjacent Hotel Mazarin properties. If subdivision is required, the Commission will have to review the proposal to make a recommendation prior to City Planning consideration.

**ROOFTOP ADDITIONS**

**THE VCC REQUIRES:**

- Compliance with the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO) – A rooftop addition shall not require a variance for height limit or floor area ratios
- Review of all exterior items located on a roof surface including paving, railings and built-in furnishings

**THE VCC DOES NOT RECOMMEND:**

- A rooftop addition on a Green, Pink or Yellow rated building
- A rooftop addition on a building of less than three full stories in height

**THE VCC DOES NOT ALLOW:**

- A rooftop addition on a Purple or Blue rated building
- A rooftop addition on a building originally constructed as a residential building
- A rooftop addition on a roof with a pitch greater than 3-inches vertically in 12-inches horizontally and an existing parapet less than 18-inches in height – Except at a camelback shotgun
- A roof addition greater than one story and/or 12’-0” in height or with a roof form other than a flat or low-sloped roof – Excluding an elevator override

The work was found approvable by the Committee and Commission when last reviewed, as most of the Guidelines for Rooftop Additions are met. While a BZA waiver is required for the elevator override, the rooftop addition elements fall below the existing parapet height. The property meets requirements for building height, roof type, historic use, etc. The only criteria not met is the building rating, as the property

is Green rated. However, given the fact that the roof has already been modified to be flat, and the proposed work will result in the restoration of a long-vacant structure, the previous Committee and Commission found the project approvable.

Staff recommends **conceptual approval**, with review of the proposed work and **change of use** to be forwarded to the Commission after any required hearings for variances or waivers with other departments, such as the BZA, have been completed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/22/2022



**730 Bienville**

ADDRESS:	730 Bienville	APPLICANT:	John C. Williams
OWNER:	730 Rue Bienville, LLC	SQUARE:	65
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	14,512 sq ft
USE:	Commercial (Hotel)	OPEN SPACE	
DENSITY		Required:	4353 sq ft
Allowed:	24 units	Existing:	3465 sq ft
Existing:	0 units	Proposed:	
Proposed:	No change	Canopy Open:	3465 sq ft
		Canopy Closed:	1651 sq ft

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: **Orange** - Twentieth Century Construction.

Before being occupied by the St. Louis Hotel, the property at 730 Bienville was first the site of two buildings, a one-story frame dwelling and a two-story masonry one, and later several structures which served as the bottling house for the Regal Brewery, which was torn down in 1969 to make way for the existing hotel. Myrlin McCullar, architect of the new hotel which was completed in 1971, based his design on Parisian models and arranged the small-scale hotel around a central courtyard.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

07/09/13

Proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & drawings received 06/25/13.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

07/09/13

A suspended vinyl canopy is currently in use over the courtyard of this orange-rated building at the 2nd floor level. The only documentation in the VCC files for this canopy is in the form of violation reports and a violation letter dated May and June of 1991, respectively. The current canopy provides protection from the elements for the occupants of the courtyard only, with the three upper balconies being exposed. The current canopy drains onto the tile-paved surface of the 2nd floor gallery.

The applicant proposes to remove this entire covering system and install a new one at the roof level thereby leaving all balcony levels open within the courtyard. The new canopy system will consist of sailcloth panels suspended by ropes and wires, and it will drain entirely over the roof of the building.

Staff finds several problems that will affect proceeding with this application in its present form:

- Because the existing canopy seems to have been installed without a permit, its status appears to be as a legal non-conforming condition.
- Plans submitted are incomplete in that they do not include a full site plan or any information about the current or proposed open space on the property, and they do not clearly illustrate the roof plan.
- The proposed canopy material is not clearly stated, and a sample of it should also be submitted with the application.

For these reasons, staff recommends deferral of the application until the applicant can supply more detailed information about the project and its effect on the required open space on the property can be better evaluated.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

07/09/13 (DRAFT)

Mr. Fowlkes presented the report that had been drafted by Mrs. Irvin. Mr. Williams again was the applicant for this application. Discussion included whether the existing courtyard cover was permitted by the VCC or has a legal, non-conforming status; the fact that both the existing and proposed covers would be used only under specific circumstances and weather conditions and would not impact open space; and the Committee's preference for a less visible frame system. The Committee then **forwarded** the proposal to the VCC with a recommendation for **conceptual approval**, with the applicant returning to the VCC for additional design review.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

07/16/13

Proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application received 06/25/13 & drawings received 06/28/13 & 07/12/13.

**NOTE:** The Committee forwarded the proposal to replace the existing courtyard cover with a new cover to the VCC with a recommendation for **conceptual approval**. Although staff could find no documentation that the VCC permitted the existing cover, it has been in place for over twenty years. Therefore, the Committee

forwarded the proposal to the VCC and asked the applicant to return to the Committee for further design review. The applicant has submitted revised drawings which will be reviewed at the July 23 Architectural Committee meeting.

**VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION ACTION:** 07/16/13 (DRAFT)

Mr. Williams represented this application; and Mrs. Irvin presented the staff's report and noted that revised drawings had been submitted which would be reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its July 23, 2013 meeting. Because the new courtyard cover system is viewed as a temporary installation, Mr. Musso said, the Committee recommended conceptual approval. Mr. Musso then moved, and Mrs. Denechaud seconded, to **conceptually approve** the proposal, with final approval to be given by the Architectural Committee after further review. The motion passed unanimously.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 07/23/13

Proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & revised drawings received 06/25/13, 06/28/13 & 07/12/13, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 07/23/13

Since the last Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant submitted revised drawings, including additional details for the framing system and a sample of the awing material; and the VCC conceptually approved the proposal, with additional review of the revised drawings to be conducted by the Architectural Committee.

Since the applicant has met the requirements of the Architectural Committee, staff recommends **approval**. Staff notes, however, that permits for the courtyard cover at the Royal Sonesta Hotel include a limited period of installation/operation from mid-December to early April.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 07/23/13 (DRAFT)

Mrs. Irvin presented the background of this item of business, including the fact that the Vieux Carre Commission at the July 16, 2013 meeting conceptually approved the installation of the courtyard cover system on a temporary basis, provided that the Architectural Committee reviews and approves the final details. Mr. Musso noted that the drawings submitted 06/25/13 did not include the required framing details. Mr. Williams said that these would be submitted. The Committee then **deferred** this proposal for review at a later meeting after the submittal of the required drawings.

**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 12/10/13

Revised proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & drawings received 06/25/13 & 11/20/13, respectively.

Background: A similar proposal was reviewed and conceptually approved by both the Commission and the Committee in July of this year. However, it was deferred at the last review on 07/23/13 due to certain framing details for the canopy being left out of the submitted materials.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 12/10/13

The current proposal has been revised from the conceptually approved sailcloth panel and wire canopy cover to a canopy composed of two (2) sets of four (4) aluminum-framed tempered-glass panels, which retract laterally to either side of the building. While the current design has a more permanent nature than what was previously conceptually approved, staff prefers the current design due to the ease with which it can be opened and closed. Staff finds the proposal to be approvable for this relatively contemporary (late 20<sup>th</sup> century) building. Staff recommends the Committee forward the proposal to the VCC with a recommendation for **conceptual approval** as submitted, with the applicant to provide further details for the proposed canopy prior to the VCC review and/or prior to returning to the Committee, if necessary, for further review and for final approval.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 12/10/13

Mr. McLeod made the staff presentation with Mr. Williams & Ms. Wotring in attendance for the application. Discussion centered on the system's retractability and how often it would be utilized. Mr. Williams said that the covering would operational as frequently as needed. Mr. Taylor stated his concerns regarding life safety issues created by the enclosure and whether the State Fire Marshall and Board of Zoning Adjustments would approve the enclosure because a roofed atrium is created, roofing over the courtyard and eliminating the existing open space and creating smoke and fire detection/prevention issues. Mr. Taylor additionally noted that a structure of this size will require substantial construction and major structural connections to the roof and possibly even the ground to withstand wind-loads of 130 mph. The Committee requested further drawings to illustrate the proposed additional structure as it would be viewed from an adjacent property(ies). The Committee ultimately

elected to **conceptually approve** the proposal and forwarded it to the Commission for conceptual review prior to returning to the Committee for continued design development.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

01/10/14

Revised proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & drawings received 06/25/13 & 11/20/13, respectively.

**Background:** A suspended vinyl canopy is currently in use over the courtyard of this orange-rated building, installed within the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors. The only documentation in the VCC files for this canopy is in the form of violation reports and a violation letter dated May and June of 1991, respectively. The current canopy provides protection from the elements for the occupants of the courtyard only, with most of the three upper level balcony corridors being exposed. The current canopy drains onto the tile-paved surface of the 2nd floor gallery. Whereas, the existing canopy was installed without a permit, its status is as a legal non-conformity since its violation status has now prescribed.

The Vieux Carré Commission at the July 16, 2013 meeting conceptually approved the installation of a new sail cloth panel and wire courtyard cover system on a temporary basis, provided that the Architectural Committee reviewed and approved all final details. Though the previous proposal received conceptual approval, final details were never submitted and permits were never issued for the installation.

At the 12/10/13 Architecture Committee meeting, the Committee expressed concerns regarding life safety issues presented by the current proposal, and questioned whether the proposal could be approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustments & the State Fire Marshall's Office. The Committee ultimately **conceptually approved** the proposal and forwarded it to the Commission for **conceptual review** prior to returning to the Committee for continued design development.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

01/10/14

Since this item was last reviewed by the Architecture Committee on 12/10/13, staff has conferred with the staff of the Board of Zoning Adjustments (BZA), as well as the Zoning Administrator, and the Director of the Dept. of Safety & Permits, and determined that because there is at least a possibility that the cover system could be left closed at all times, a waiver of open space from the BZA is required in order to permit the proposed retractable courtyard cover system.

The applicant has additionally consulted with the Office of the State Fire Marshall (SFM), and has been advised that the proposed system could be approved provided that the courtyard was properly sprinklered for times when the covering is in its closed position. The applicant has indicated that this would be accomplished by placing directional coverage sprinkler heads along the center beam of the proposed canopy, which will remain fixed, traversing the space over the courtyard at all times. A structural engineer, Walter Zehner, has also been retained to address the structural concerns presented by the proposal. He has determined that the load of the new canopy can be transferred to the building's existing columns. The applicant has further stated that all loads and structural needs will be addressed during the design development phase of the project.

Staff recommends **conceptual approval** of the proposal as submitted consistent with the recommendations of the Architecture Committee with the applicant to return to the Architecture Committee for design development review after further developed drawings are prepared addressing life safety issues and incorporating the requirements of the SFM and recommendations made by the structural engineer of record.

**VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION ACTION:**

01/10/14

Mr. McLeod presented the staff report with Mr. Williams & Ms. Wotring in attendance to represent the application. Following the staff presentation, Mr. Musso clarified that this review was for conceptual review only and that the proposal would still require design development and construction document review prior to returning to the Vieux Carre Commission for final approval. With no further discussion, Mr. Lyons moved, Mr. Skinner seconded, to grant **conceptual approval** to the proposal as submitted, consistent with the recommendations of the Architecture Committee with the applicant to return to the Architecture Committee for design development review after further developed drawings are prepared addressing life safety issues and incorporating the requirements of the SFM and recommendations made by the structural engineer of record. The motion carried unanimously.

**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

02/25/14

Design development review of conceptually approved proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & drawings received 06/25/13 & 02/17/14, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

02/25/14

This proposal was conceptually approved by the VCC on 01/10/14. Since last reviewed by the Architecture

Committee, 12/10/13, the applicant has scheduled a meeting with the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) staff to discuss the requisite waiver of open space. The applicant anticipates that the application to the BZA will be docketed for the April 14, 2014 agenda.

The applicant has also provided the following additional information on the proposed canopy:

- Manufactured by Roll-A-Cover International
- Sprinkler heads will be placed along the fixed center beam of the canopy and under the pitched roof and balconies on all levels of the courtyard elevations per the request of the State Fire Marshall
- The canopy is to be composed of aluminum rafters and framing, and 10mm bronze thin-wall polycarbonate glazing on the roof and ¼” clear polycarbonate on the side-walls
- The motorized components and pulley system are placed on either side of the fixed center beam according to the plan drawings (see sheets A101 & A102)
- Sections of the motor and pulley systems have been provided (see sheet A500)
- Details of lateral and vertical connections have been provide (see sheet A500)

While staff notes that additional details, including framing & and connections, will be required, staff finds the proposal sufficiently developed to recommend approval of the design development phase with the proposal to return to the full Commission for review and approval while the application to the BZA is pending.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 02/25/14

Mr. McLeod made the staff report with Mr. Williams & Ms. Wotring present to represent the proposal. Mr. Musso inquired how much time it took to close the canopy. Ms. Wotring stated that she had not yet been given this information, but that she would find out. Mr. Musso inquired whether the glazing was laminated or tempered. Mr. Williams stated that the glazing was tempered. Mr. Lyons inquired whether the courtyard was air conditioned or if air conditioning would be part of the proposal. Mr. Musso stated that the issue of smoke exhaust would need to be addressed. Mr. Williams confirmed that this would be addressed with the State Fire Marshall. The Committee elected to **approve** the design development phase of the proposal with the applicant to develop construction documents for review and approval prior to being forwarded to the Commission for final approval.

**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 06/24/14

Continued review of a proposal to remove existing retractable courtyard cover system and install new system, attached at roof and situated above all levels of courtyard balcony, per application & drawings received 06/25/13, 02/20/14, & 06/17/14, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 06/24/14

In order to permit the retractable canopy, the applicant has obtained a waiver of open space from the BZA with the following proviso:

- *The property owner shall record a restriction against the title of the property requiring the glass canopy over the courtyard be maintained so that it is functional and retractable. Any changes to the canopy relative to its status as a temporary covering shall require review and approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustments. The recorded restrictions shall be submitted to the BZA staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.*

The applicant has submitted further details for the proposed canopy system as follows:

- The glazing of the canopy system will consist of 10mm bronze thin-wall polycarbonate glazing on the roof panels, and ¼” clear polycarbonate on the side walls.
- The pitched roof sections over the fourth level of the courtyard balcony will be removed, salvaging the existing roofing slates and gutter system.
- W18x35 structural steel bridging will be added to the roof structure where the pitched roof meets the main building (see details on A300 & S101).
- The pitched roof sections will be reconstructed, using the salvaged slates and gutter systems.
- Per the SFM, additional sprinkler lines will be run along the courtyard balcony ceilings on all elevations on all levels.
- Smoke evacuation is to be tied into the fire alarm system.
- The canopy is also to open immediately if fire is detected.

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposal as submitted and forwarding the proposal to the Commission for final review with a recommendation of approval.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION** 06/24/14 DRAFT

Mr. McLeod gave the staff presentation with Mr. Williams & Ms. Wotring present on behalf of the proposal. In reviewing the revised details, Mr. Musso inquired about the two (2) steel beams traversing the courtyard at the roof level. Ms. Wotring & Mr. Williams confirmed that the beams would be in place over the courtyard at all times. Ms. Lousteau inquired under what conditions the canopy would be left open or closed. Ms. Wotring replied that the roof would be closed only during inclement weather. Mr. Lyons asked if the courtyard was to be air conditioned, to which Mr. Williams replied in the negative. Further discussion

centered on issues of structure and fire safety. The Committee elected to recommend **approval** of the proposal as submitted and forwarded it to the Commission.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

07/02/14

Continued review of proposal to remove existing non-permanent courtyard cover system and install new structural system with retractable glass panels, constructed at roof level, per application & drawings received 06/25/13 & 06/17/14, respectively.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

07/02/14

This proposal was conceptually approved by the VCC on 01/10/14. Since being conceptually approved, the proposal has not changed appreciably during the design development phase of review. In order to permit the retractable canopy, the applicant has obtained a waiver of open space from the Board of Zoning Adjustments (BZA) with the following proviso:

- *The property owner shall record a restriction against the title of the property requiring the glass canopy over the courtyard be maintained so that it is functional and retractable. Any changes to the canopy relative to its status as a temporary covering shall require review and approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustments. The recorded restrictions shall be submitted to the BZA staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.*

The following details have been submitted for the proposed canopy system:

- The pitched roof sections over the fourth level of the courtyard balcony will be removed, salvaging the existing roofing slates and gutter system (sheet D100).
- W18x35 structural steel bridging will be added to the roof structure where the pitched roof meets the main building (see details on A300 & S101).
- The pitched roof sections will be reconstructed, using the salvaged slates and gutter systems.
- Sprinkler heads will be placed along the fixed center beams of the canopy and under the pitched roof and balconies on all levels of the courtyard elevations per the request of the State Fire Marshall (sheet A100)
- The canopy is to be composed of aluminum rafters and framing, and 10mm bronze thin-wall polycarbonate glazing on the roof and ¼” clear polycarbonate on the side-walls (sheet A100)
- The motorized components and pulley system are placed on either side of the fixed center beam according to the plan drawings (see sheet A300)
- Sections of the motor and pulley systems have been provided (see sheet A500)
- Details of lateral and vertical connections have been provide (see sheet A500)
- Smoke evacuation is to be tied into the fire alarm system.
- The canopy is also to open immediately if fire is detected.
- The canopy system is manufactured by Roll-A-Cover International

Staff finds that all necessary details submitted for the proposed canopy remain in keeping with the conceptual approval granted by the Commission in January 2014. Staff recommends **approval** of the proposal as submitted, consistent with recommendations of the Architecture Committee, with the applicant to submit all recorded deed restrictions relative to the functionality and openness of the retractable covering, as required by the Board of Zoning Adjustments, and that final construction documents be submitted to VCC staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a permit.

**VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION ACTION:**

07/02/14

Ms. Ripple presented the staff report on the application with Mr. Williams in attendance to represent the proposal. Mr. Musso clarified that the canopy would remain open the majority of the time and was only to be closed during inclement weather. Mr. Williams confirmed that this was the intent. With no additional discussion, Mr. Lyons moved, Mrs. Denechaud seconded, to approve the proposal as submitted consistent with the recommendations of the staff & the Architectural Committee, as noted in the report. The motion carried unanimously.

ADDRESS:	730 Bienville	APPLICANT:	Avery Foret
OWNER:	730 Rue Bienville, LLC	SQUARE:	65
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	14,512 sq ft
USE:	Commercial (Hotel)		

DENSITY-		OPEN SPACE-	
ALLOWED:	24 units	REQUIRED:	4353 sq ft
EXISTING:	0 units	EXISTING:	3465 sq ft
PROPOSED:	No change	PROPOSED:	No Change

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: **Orange** - Twentieth Century Construction.

Before being occupied by the St. Louis Hotel, the property at 730 Bienville was first the site of two buildings, a one-story frame dwelling and a two-story masonry one, and later several structures which served as the bottling house for the Regal Brewery, which was torn down in 1969 to make way for the existing hotel. Myrlin McCullar, architect of the new hotel which was completed in 1971, based his design on Parisian models and arranged the small-scale hotel around a central courtyard.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

06/07/17

**Permit # 16-38181-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht****Violation Case # 16-03705-VCCNOP****Inspector: Erika Gates**

Proposal to retain signage, lighting and other miscellaneous VCC violations, per application received 11/18/16. [Notice of Violation sent 05/10/16]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

06/07/17

The applicant has indicated that the previously cited lighting, specifically rope lighting, string lighting, and lights within the sign archway, have been or will be removed. The applicant is also continuing to work with the VCC staff and Architecture Committee regarding alternatives to the unpermitted acrylic glass installed on the exterior side of windows and doors for noise abatement.

The applicant is appealing the denial of two signs related to the business "Patrick's." The entrance to the courtyard from Bienville St. was modified with the addition of a metal archway ca. 1987. In late 2015 or early 2016 the archway was modified with the addition of a large metal sign with cut out letters without VCC review or permit. Staff does not find the installation of a sign in this location approvable as it obscures an architectural detail, is overly large, and is a second sign for a business with only one street front. Staff notes that the retention of this sign would also require a waiver from the Board of Zoning Adjustments (BZA) as it is in violation of several of the sign requirements established in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO).

This business has a second sign which projects from the building wall adjacent to the courtyard entrance. Staff notes that this sign appears to reuse the sign cabinet from the previously existing business, although new sign faces were installed without any VCC permits. The sign appears to be an internally illuminated plastic-faced box sign, which is a sign type no longer permitted by the guidelines.

Staff recommends **denial** of the retention of both of these existing signs with the applicant to submit for a sign which conforms to the guidelines and requirements of the CZO.

**VIEUX CARRE COMMISSION ACTION:**

06/07/17

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Ms. Foret present on behalf of the application. Mr. Musso noted that the current situation can't be let go as-is. Mr. Musso continued that this was not only a VCC violation but also a BZA violation.

Ms. Foret noted that they were attempting to clean up the property. Mr. Taylor noted that it was likely that the BZA would seek an opinion from the VCC.

Mr. Blanda moved to defer the application to allow the BZA to rule on the proposal. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion, to allow the applicant to complete the BZA process.

Mr. Block noted that the Commission should speak to the merits of the proposal compared to the design guidelines.

**[Ms. Stokes left the meeting during the discussion.]**

The vote was called and the motion for deferral, including a neutral recommendation to the BZA, passed unanimously.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

04/11/17

**Permit # 16-38181-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht****Violation Case # 16-03705-VCCNOP****Inspector: Erika Gates**

Proposal to retain signage, lighting and other miscellaneous VCC violations, per application received 11/18/16. [Notice of Violation sent 05/10/16]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 04/11/17

*See Staff Analysis & Recommendation of 03/28/17.*

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 04/11/17

Mr. Albrecht gave the staff presentation with Ms. Foret present on behalf of the application. Ms. Foret stated that this property has the same issues with acrylic glass and guest rooms as seen in the previously reviewed properties.

Mr. Block stated that the sign on the arch was particularly egregious. Mr. Block continued that he would like to defer the issue of the acrylic glass to allow the applicant to seek an alternative. Mr. Fifield noted that the installation of the acrylic glass has made the balconies inaccessible. Ms. Foret noted that they are seeking alternatives to the acrylic glass.

Mr. Block moved to defer the acrylic glass and to deny the retention of the signage. Mr. Fifield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 03/28/17

**Permit # 16-38181-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to retain signage, lighting and other miscellaneous VCC violations, per application received 11/18/16. [Notice of Violation sent 05/10/16]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 03/28/17

The entrance to the courtyard from Bienville St. was modified with the addition of a metal archway ca. 1987. In late 2015 or early 2016 the archway was modified with the addition of a large metal sign with cut out letters without VCC review or permit. Additionally, color changing lights have been installed within the cut out letters. Staff does not find the installation of a sign in this location approvable as it obscures an architectural detail, is overly large, and is internally illuminated.

This business has a second sign which projects from the building wall adjacent to the courtyard entrance. Staff notes that this sign appears to reuse the sign cabinet from the previously existing business, although new sign faces were installed without any VCC permits. The sign appears to be an internally illuminated plastic-faced box sign, which is a sign type no longer permitted by the guidelines.

Staff recommends **denial** of the retention of both of these existing signs with the applicant to submit for a sign which conforms to the guidelines.

The hotel operating at this property also has multiple signs, with at least a wall sign and a flag sign displayed. Staff notes that a BZA waiver would be required in order for this business to have multiple signs on the same street face.

This property also features the installation of acrylic glass over several windows on at least the Bienville elevation. Similar to other recently reviewed properties, staff finds this type of installation completely inappropriate. Staff recommends **denial** of the retention of the acrylic glass.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 03/28/17

The application was deferred due to the loss of a quorum.

ADDRESS:	730 Bienville	APPLICANT:	John C Williams
OWNER:	730 Rue Bienville LLC	SQUARE:	65
ZONING:	VCC-2	LOT SIZE:	14,512 sq. ft.
USE:	Commercial (hotel)	OPEN SPACE:	
DENSITY:		REQUIRED:	4353 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	24 units	EXISTING:	3465 sq. ft.
EXISTING:	0	PROPOSED:	0 sq. ft./3465 sq. ft.
PROPOSED:	No change		

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

**Main building:** Orange - Twentieth Century Construction.

Before being occupied by the St. Louis Hotel, the property at 730 Bienville was first the site of two buildings, a one-story frame dwelling and a two-story masonry one, and later several structures which served as the bottling house for the Regal Brewery, which was torn down in 1969 to make way for the existing hotel. Myrlin McCullar, architect of the new hotel which was completed in 1971, based his design on Parisian models and arranged the small-scale hotel around a central courtyard.

### **Architecture Committee Meeting of**

**11/22/2022**

### **DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/22/2022

**Permit #22-32385-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Proposal to install retractable glass canopy over courtyard, per application & materials received 10/26/2022.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/22/2022

The applicant proposes to replace an existing non-conforming “temporary” courtyard covering that has been installed on a permanent basis since at least 1991, when it was cited as a violation. The existing covering and courtyard have not been inspected by staff in some time, but photos from 2012 show it as a transparent, tent-like structure that covers the courtyard at the second-floor level. The drawings submitted by the applicant are from the 2014 VCC subpermit to install a retractable glass canopy at the overall roof level, but permits were never issued by other departments and work did not begin. A BZA waiver was required as the glass structure, while technically retractable, covered the entire courtyard and eliminated all open space on the property. The site already has less open space than required by the CZO. The Board approved a variance (with provisos: see previous staff reports), but final drawings were not submitted, and it was never formally executed by that department; if it had been, it would have expired after one year, so BZA review and waiver will once again be required prior to VCC approval.

Revised drawings complying with the current building code will be required prior to further review, but staff has scheduled a preliminary hearing so the Committee may provide initial feedback. The retractable canopy is proposed to be installed above the existing fifth floor roof line, enclosing the entire courtyard instead of covering just the lower floors. Staff notes that the overall height of this addition is not noted in the drawings, and it is unclear if any waivers will be necessary. Substantial framing is shown added above the existing roof, bearing on existing framing (S101). Roof drainage modifications are shown on sheet A100.

Staff requests confirmation from the applicant that the following items noted in 2014 still apply:

- The pitched roof sections over the fourth level of the courtyard balcony will be removed, salvaging the existing roofing slates and gutter system (sheet D100).
- W18x35 structural steel bridging will be added to the roof structure where the pitched roof meets the main building (see details on A300 & S101).
- The pitched roof sections will be reconstructed, using the salvaged slates and gutter systems.
- Sprinkler heads will be placed along the fixed center beams of the canopy and under the pitched roof and balconies on all levels of the courtyard elevations per the request of the State Fire Marshall (sheet A100)
- The canopy is to be composed of aluminum rafters and framing, and 10mm bronze thin-wall polycarbonate glazing on the roof and ¼” clear polycarbonate on the side-walls (sheet A100)
- The motorized components and pulley system are placed on either side of the fixed center beam according to the plan drawings (see sheet A300)
- Sections of the motor and pulley systems have been provided (see sheet A500)
- Details of lateral and vertical connections have been provide (see sheet A500)
- Smoke evacuation is to be tied into the fire alarm system.
- The canopy is also to open immediately if fire is detected.
- The canopy system is manufactured by Roll-A-Cover International

The Design Guidelines were published since this work was initially proposed, and must be taken into consideration. Chapter 10, Guidelines for Site Elements and Courtyards, states:

### COURTYARD COVERING & ENCLOSURE GUIDE

All permanent, semi-permanent and temporary coverings or enclosures, including a tent, are subject to review for conformance with the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. Contact the City Planning Commission or Department of Safety and Permits for requirements.

The VCC does not regulate structures or furnishings that can be moved by a single person, such as a table umbrella or tent installed for a special event that is promptly removed after the event.

#### **THE VCC REQUIRES:**

- Maintaining openness to the sky in a courtyard

#### **THE VCC RECOMMENDS:**

- Installing a movable, temporary covering, such as an umbrella, rather than mounting a more permanent roof structure to a building

#### **THE VCC DOES NOT ALLOW:**

- Installing a permanent courtyard covering or enclosure

### BALCONY & GALLERY SCREENING GUIDE

#### **THE VCC REQUIRES:**

- Limiting the enclosure of a balcony or gallery with louvered blinds to only those locations with a demonstrated need for additional privacy

#### **THE VCC RECOMMENDS:**

- Installing a drop awning at a balcony or gallery where shading is desired and louvered blinds are inappropriate (Refer to *Awnings, Guidelines for Signage & Awnings*, page 12-8 and photograph caption, *Guidelines for Balconies, Galleries & Porches*, page 08-9)

#### **THE VCC DOES NOT ALLOW:**

- Enclosing a balcony, gallery, porch or loggia with a wall, window or door

*Vieux Carré Commission – Guidelines for Site Elements & Courtyards 10-3*

While the building is Orange rated and historic fabric need not be taken into consideration, the addition is a substantial permanent roof structure and staff is concerned that the retractable enclosure would remain permanently closed. This would greatly impact the courtyard experience and traditional use of exterior circulation space that was maintained as an important aspect of French Quarter revival architecture.

Staff recommends **denial** of the proposal in keeping with the Design Guidelines for Site Elements & Courtyards adopted in 2015. If the Committee wishes to consider the application further, revised drawings updated for code compliance must be submitted for further review and a BZA variance for open space must be granted prior to Commission approval.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/22/2022



**327 Bourbon**

ADDRESS:	327 Bourbon	APPLICANT:	Erika Gates
OWNER:	327 Bourbon Street, LLC	SQUARE:	69
ZONING:	VCE	LOT SIZE:	5,472 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	1,641 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	9 Units	EXISTING:	1,679 sq. ft. approx.
EXISTING:	None	PROPOSED:	No Change
PROPOSED:	No Change		

### **ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: Blue - of Major Architectural or Historical Importance.

This c. 1835 Greek Revival townhouse is noted for its historical associations as the home of Judah P. Benjamin, as well as for its elegantly detailed features such as the carriageway entrance, main entrance, and "bow and arrow" wrought ironwork. The components of the original complex (house, kitchen, stable) remain intact. The mansard roof is a late 19th century addition.

### **Architecture Committee Meeting of**

**11/22/2022**

### **DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/22/2022

**Permit # 22-34992-VCGEN**

**Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht**

Proposal to renovate building including the reconstruction of previously existing rear enclosed gallery and the installation of new mechanical equipment, per application & materials received 10/13/2022.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/22/2022

Staff has met with the applicant on multiple occasions to discuss the future of this property and the renovation plans. Staff has identified a few elements of concern and feels some feedback from the Committee is appropriate at this time. As a reminder the rear enclosed gallery portion of this property was demolished without permits back around December 2021.

### **Reconstruction**

The first aspect of the proposal is the reconstruction of this previously demolished element. The proposed reconstruction appears to be very similar in massing to the demolished portion. The applicant shows a new wood clad three story addition with a pitched and flat roof. The flat roof portion is shown as a possible option for new mechanical equipment. Staff does not believe there are any issues with open space with the proposed construction. Still, staff questions if this is a good opportunity to construct something better than the enclosed gallery condition that was demolished. Staff encouraged the applicant to include at least some open-air gallery space, even if that gallery was used for the installation of mechanical equipment.

The proposed reconstruction is shown as housing an elevator to access the first, second, and third floors as well as restrooms at the first, second, and third floors. These are the only restrooms at the second and third floor levels although notably there are additional restrooms in the main portion of the building at the fourth-floor level.

The proposed reconstruction features windows at the first, second, and third-floor level, which does not match the previously existing condition but may be approvable. The stairs connecting the reconstruction to the service ell have been extended to meet modern codes which creates some conflicts with existing openings of the service ell.

Staff finds the proposed concept of this reconstruction potentially approvable but would still encourage exploration of options that creates some open-air gallery space, remove the mechanical equipment off the roof, or both.

### **Mechanical Equipment**

The applicant proposes three different options for mechanical equipment on the property. The first option shows six units on the roof of the reconstruction as previously noted. Additionally, two units would be installed on a new roof rack on the roof of the blue-rated service ell building. The work to the rear building would also include a new access hatch.

The second option proposes to utilize a large cooling tower piece of equipment in the same location on the service ell roof. Given the size of this equipment the applicant stated that a new steel structure would need to be constructed inside the building to support the equipment. This option does eliminate any equipment from the main building and reconstruction as this cooling tower would be the only HVAC equipment on the property. Staff finds this option has too much of a negative impact on the highly rated rear building.

The third option features the six units on the roof of the reconstruction as seen in option 1 but moves the service ell units to a new location on a rack in the courtyard space. Staff finds this location promising for the equipment for the rear building but still has concerns regarding the location of units on the roof of the reconstruction. Ideally additional equipment could be located in the courtyard and/or better incorporated into the new construction.

### **Service Ell Openings & Guardrail**

The final aspect of the proposal that warrants additional commentary occurs at the service ell. At the first floor, three existing windows are proposed to be converted to new French doors to match adjacent openings. If completed the first floor would have seven sets of French doors and two windows. The Guidelines discourage this kind of window to door conversion and staff finds the number of doors atypical. Additionally, staff noted that the first window in the series proposed for conversion to a door would be right in front on an interior stair, making a door in that location unusable. The applicant stated that interior brick scarring seems to indicate that these openings were previously full height, although staff has not had a chance to investigate or view photographs showing this. Even if there is evidence of these openings previously being taller, staff is hesitant to recommend this change, noting that 1945 photographs appear to show the arrangement in its current form.

All these French doors are shown as true French doors in plan but joined together in elevation. Staff seeks clarification from the applicant if the proposal includes joining the doors together.

Finally, a new guardrail is shown being installed behind and above the existing wood railing. No notes or details are provided in this set. This approach may be approvable, but staff recommends spacing the vertical supports to better correspond with the existing posts, or possibly eliminating the verticals completely and attaching directly to the backs of the existing posts.

### **Summary**

Staff felt it important to get the proposal in its current form before the Committee to get feedback before continuing too far down this path. Staff requests commentary from the Committee regarding the items noted above.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/22/2022



# Appeals and Violations



**327 Bourbon**

ADDRESS:	327 Bourbon	APPLICANT:	Bob Ellis
OWNER:	327 Bourbon Street, LLC	SQUARE:	69
ZONING:	VCE	LOT SIZE:	5,472 sq. ft.
USE:	Vacant	OPEN SPACE-	
DENSITY-		REQUIRED:	1,641 sq. ft.
ALLOWED:	9 Units	EXISTING:	1,679 sq. ft. approx.
EXISTING:	None	PROPOSED:	No Change
PROPOSED:	No Change		

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Rating: Blue - of Major Architectural or Historical Importance.

This c. 1835 Greek Revival townhouse is noted for its historical associations as the home of Judah P. Benjamin, as well as for its elegantly detailed features such as the carriageway entrance, main entrance, and "bow and arrow" wrought ironwork. The components of the original complex (house, kitchen, stable) remain intact. The mansard roof is a late 19th century addition.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of****11/22/2022****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/22/2022

**Permit # 22-30938-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Nick Albrecht****Inspector: Marguerite Roberts**

Proposal to retain wood fence at end of the carriageway constructed without benefit of VCC review or approval, per application & materials received 10/12/2022.

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/22/2022

On 10/11/2022 staff observed that a new wood fence had been constructed at the end of the alleyway of 327 Bourbon St. to separate the alley from the 327 Bourbon courtyard. It appears this was done to allow the neighboring business at 333 Bourbon to allow patrons to use that alley space. The applicant has described the fence as a construction fence, but staff has some concerns regarding the more permanent appearance of the fence. The fence is constructed using 4x4 posts apparently set into the concrete of the courtyard, 2x4 framing, and dog-eared wood fence boards. Typically for construction fences the VCC allows the use of chain-link fencing or simple wood and plywood fencing or walls.

Staff is concerned that the renovation timeline for 327 Bourbon may be rather lengthy, and this fence may become more of a permanent fixture. A fence or gate in this location at the end of the alleyway is not particularly appropriate and the design is incompatible with the much more refined style of the buildings on the property.

Staff does not object to the concept of a construction fence in this location provided that it is truly temporary but requests commentary from the Committee regarding retention of the current fence or installation of fence of a different design.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/22/2022



**717-19 Royal,  
700-08 Orleans**

ADDRESS:	717-19 Royal Street, 700-08 Orleans Street		
OWNER:	Sahuque Realty Co.	APPLICANT:	Archetype LLC
ZONING:	VCC-2	SQUARE:	60
USE:	Mixed	LOT SIZE:	1467 sq. ft.
DENSITY:		OPEN SPACE:	
ALLOWED:	x	REQUIRED:	293 sq. ft. (20%, corner lot)
EXISTING:	x	EXISTING:	Unknown
PROPOSED:	x	PROPOSED:	No change

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:**

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

One in the 1831 row of four Transitional style "Vignie Houses," designed by Gurlie and Guillot, this one retains much of its original detailing including arched ground floor openings (one of which leads into a side passageway), casement openings topped by delicate transoms on the upper floors, decorative cast iron lintels above the square-headed openings, a continuous wrought iron balcony at the second level, basket balconies at the third level and Gurlie and Guillot's characteristic garlanded wood cornice.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of** **11/22/2022**

**DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:** 11/22/2022  
**Permit #22-20369-VCGEN** **Lead Staff: Erin Vogt**

Appeal to retain metal expanded mesh installed on alcove gate, per application & materials received 07/07/2022 & 11/04/2022. [**Notices of Violation sent 08/12/2019 and 02/18/2022**]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:** 11/22/2022

On 08/12/2019, staff inspected the property and observed an expanded metal mesh backing had been applied to the Orleans-side alcove gate without benefit of VCC review and approval. The mesh had not been present when last photographed in 2017. The applicant is appealing to retain the mesh for security reasons, as the interior lock and knob had been accessible from the outside by reaching through the pickets.

The VCC Design Guidelines do not allow for any backing material to be installed on alcove gates of this type, and expanded metal mesh is particularly inappropriate. Staff notes that hardware solutions have been found for similar applications in the past, or the addition of intermediary pickets may also be considered. Staff recommends **denial** of the appeal to retain the mesh, with the applicant to work with staff on approvable alternatives to provide adequate security.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:** 11/22/2022



**529 Bienville**

ADDRESS: 523-29 Bienville  
 OWNER: Chateau Bienville, LLC  
 ZONING: VCC-2  
 USE: Commercial/Residential

APPLICANT: Kirk Fabacher  
 SQUARE: 29  
 LOT SIZE: 9327 sq. ft.

**DENSITY-**

ALLOWED: 15 Units  
 EXISTING: None  
 PROPOSED: No change

**OPEN SPACE-**

REQUIRED: 2798 sq. ft.  
 EXISTING: Unknown  
 PROPOSED: Unknown

**ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION:**

Main Building: **Yellow**- contributes to the character of the district

This three-story brick commercial style building dates from circa 1920-25; and, along with the other early 20<sup>th</sup> century warehouses and commercial buildings in this block, was constructed in 1908, after a massive fire destroyed the earlier structures on the block. In 1998-1999, the building underwent modifications for conversion from a radio station into a residence. Although the VCC denied the proposed balcony installation at that time, the City Council overruled the VCC denial, and the existing balcony was installed.

**Architecture Committee Meeting of****11/22/2022****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION:**

11/22/2022

**Permit #22-33217-VCGEN****Lead Staff: Erin Vogt****Violation Case #21-01561-VCCNOP****Inspector: Anthony Whitfield**

Appeal to retain pergola constructed in deviation from VCC permit, per application & materials received 11/02/2022. [**Notice of Violation sent 02/23/2021**]

**STAFF ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION:**

11/22/2022

Following approval by the Committee, staff issued a VCC subpermit on 09/18/18 for construction of a wood pergola at the rear elevation. The permit and stamped materials included the proviso that the pergola could not be left exposed wood and must be painted French Quarter green, or stained. The pergola was constructed without issuance of the required accessory structure permit from the Department of Safety and Permits, and a red flag was placed on the property. S&P is requiring retroactive review and approval of the structure prior to permit issuance. However, staff noted that the pergola was constructed in deviation from the VCC approved materials; the wood was left exposed, a glass cover was installed, and the column base connections are detailed differently.

The applicant submitted revised drawings that describe the glass as “9/16” impact glass, typ. Meets requirements of ASTM E1886 and ASTM E1996” with “aluminum pressure bars fastened to top of existing rafters @ 12” o.c.” Staff notes that the rafters are shown spaced 2’-6”, so it is unclear if this is a drafting error

The bases of the columns were previously drawn and permitted as 8x8 treated columns with 4x4x1/4 galvanized angles and 5/8” lag bolts, with concrete footers and 2” concrete encasing the steel. As built, the columns appear to die into the ground and are wicking up moisture. The pavers have been modified around the columns to provide a small area for vines to grow up the pergola.

Other violations include rampant vegetation growth along all of the property line fences, which has spread to many of the surrounding properties and has contributed to masonry damage and water intrusion for much of the square for years. The historic masonry walls are in need of maintenance, and string lights, ceiling fans, and speakers have been installed on the pergola and building without permit. The current application does not address these items. Staff urges the applicant to revise their scope of work to include staff approvable resolution of these issues so they can be resolved. Appeals may require further Committee review.

Staff seeks the guidance of the Committee regarding the deviations in the pergola construction from what was approved, and emphasizes the extreme importance that the vegetation violations be abated before any flags are lifted on the property.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION:**

11/22/2022