

Central Business District  
Architectural Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes

Date: June 15, 2021

Location: Zoom Teleconference

Called to order: 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Miriam Salas, Robert Boyd, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting: Lee Ledbetter

Members absent:

---

**I. AGENDA**

1. Minutes of the May 18, 2021 meeting.

Motion: Approve the meeting minutes.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Second: Ashley King

Result: Passed

In favor: Miriam Salas, Robert Boyd, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

2. 1000 Canal St

Application: New construction of a ten-story hotel with ground floor commercial space.

Motion: Defer this application for additional review. The ARC noted that the proposed setback of the tower at the Canal St. elevation did help to modulate the building mass somewhat, however, the setback needs to be increased as the building still overwhelms the existing low-rise construction. They did not agree that setting back the mass of the building to better relate to the Canal St. scale should necessarily allow the height of the tower element to be increased. The ARC also made the following recommendations:

- The floor-to-floor heights should be increased to better relate to the adjacent existing buildings. The height of the Canal St. portion of the building could be increased to accommodate the increased ceiling heights.
- The treatment of the window openings at the lower volume should be studied; plain punched openings may not be the most appropriate option, given the level of articulation and depth seen in the windows in the neighboring buildings. The windows do not have to be treated the same on both parts of the building.
- The treatment of the second floor fenestration is out of place and should be similar to the treatment of the third and fourth floors.
- Both the shorter and taller volumes should have a capping element, but it does not need to have traditional detailing.
- The proposed mechanical equipment and pool deck furnishings should be included in the drawings, especially the elevations.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Second: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In Favor: Miriam Salas, Robert Boyd, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

3. 429 Julia St

Application: Reconstruction of demolished brick wall and application of stucco to new and existing walls.  
Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that because the new brick would not match the existing brick regardless of size, a common brick size with standard mortar joints would be acceptable. It would be preferable to make the new bricks clearly different from the original brick, although it should be in the same color family. The brick should not be painted. They also suggested that the control joint be located where the demising line would have fallen between the two original buildings.

By: Lee Ledbetter

Second: Robby Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In Favor: Miriam Salas, Robert Boyd, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

4. 710 Baronne St

Application: Review of proposed tinted glass for previously approved four-story addition and six-story new construction.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer this application for additional review. The ARC noted that tinted glass is generally not an appropriate material in the historic districts but agreed that some amount of tinting may be acceptable as low-e glass is approved and has a degree of tint due to the coating process. The ARC requested that the applicant construct a free-standing mock-up of the exterior façade condition, showing a window installation with the proposed grey tinted glass, so they can better evaluate the overall effect in the final construction.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Second: Ashley King

Result: Passed

In Favor: Miriam Salas, Robert Boyd, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.