

New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission
Architectural Review Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: March 14th, 2023

Location: Economic Development Conference Room, 1340 Poydras Street, Suite 1800

Called to order: 12:30 p.m.

Members present: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting:

Members absent:

I. AGENDA

1. Minutes of the February 14th, 2023, meeting

Motion: Approve the minutes.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Beth Jacobs

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

2. 1020 Music St.

Application: Demolition of non-original rear addition and construction of new camelback addition at a Contributing rated, one-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed the proposed camelback was set far enough back on the building that it was considered an appropriate addition to the existing historic structure.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

Comments: Eric Paul Perez spoke against this application.

3. 502 Frenchmen St.

Application: Renovation of an existing Significant rated three-story, mixed use building including demolition of the roof structure and construction of new rear addition.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend denial of the application. The ARC agreed the existing historic building's roof forms and parapets are visible from several areas in the public right of way, particularly along Esplanade Avenue, and that the proposal involves too much destruction of the Significant rated building's roof structure and historic building fabric. The ARC also noted that the proposed addition appears to be handled well architecturally, but the amount of roof demolition is too high and cannot be recommended for approval based on the HDLC Guidelines.

By: John Klingman

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

Comments: Allen Johnson and Nathan Lott spoke against this application.

4. 523-525 Washington Ave.

Application: New construction of a 4,464 SF two-story, two-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval of the massing, materials and openings with the final details and elevations to return for additional ARC review once further developed. The ARC agreed that:

- The proposal has improved since the previous iteration and the introduction of more contemporary elements and streamlined detailing is successful.
- Façade Option (1) is preferred as the other option with arch-top openings appears too Spanish/Mediterranean in appearance for the rest of the proposed new construction.
- To visually unify the distinct building masses and materials, a base course of stucco should be introduced to the full length of the left and right-side elevations, at a minimum to the height of the windowsills.
- The applicant should consider installing shutters on both left and right-side elevations.
- There is some concern the front building and façade may be too flat, simple, and austere with too little surface relief for the existing historic context. The ARC recommended refining the drawings to include necessary façade elements such as stucco score marks, gutters/downspouts, etc. They also recommended considering additional ways to create more depth and layering at the façade, such as by installing a handrail at the porch or by introducing an awning or roof covering over the porch.
- Updated elevations should be included for the next review including additional plaster details.

By: John Klingman

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

5. 527 Washington Ave.

Application: New construction of a 3,249 SF two-story, single-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application for additional review. The ARC agreed that:

- There are too many different window types on the building, and these should be simplified with the Gothic-style and arch-top window types removed.

- An additional window should be added toward the front of the building on the North elevation.
- The gable-on hip roof shown at the front and rear of the camelback should be simplified and the ARC recommended considering either a hipped or gable roof form instead.
- The side entry door is too ornate and prominent and should be refined so that it appears more as a secondary entrance to the main front entry door at the façade.
- The portion of second-floor massing above the side entry door should be pushed back a minimum of 2'-0" (or to become coplanar with the entry wall below) so the overall massing reads more as a camelback constructed to the width of the historic building from the street.

By: Beth Jacobs

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

6. 1041 N Rampart St.

Application: Renovation of a Contributing rated, two-story, mixed-use building including new gallery at front facade.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that:

- The metal materiality of the handrail may not be appropriate.
- Transoms added to front façade entries would help delineate doorways.
- The columns look thin and might be more appropriate at 10"x6".
- The column alignment at the two upper gables seems odd and should be further explored. We recommend that you identify similar building façade treatments for direction as to appropriate placement.

- The bump out addition on the Ursuline Street side of the building should be retained in massing and fenestration.

- The shed roof and historic millwork of the small porch on the Ursuline Street side of the building should be retained.

- Further exploratory interior demolition should be done to find evidence of possible scarring from older architectural elements.

- Sanborn, Fire Insurance, and photo databases should be searched for evidence of prior building conditions.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Beth Jacobs

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

7. 1212 Magazine St.

Application: Renovation of a Contributing rated, two-story, bed and breakfast including restoring the double gallery façade.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that:

- Slip head windows would be most appropriate in lieu of doors and that exploratory interior demolition should be done to confirm if pockets for windows still exist.
- There is no opposition to moving the third-floor smaller window on side elevation if the new location was appropriate.
- There is no opposition to moving the third-floor smaller window on side elevation if the new location was appropriate.
- The coins at the side elevations should be removed.
- The balustrades should be metal for longevity with a preference for Option 3 which depicted more ornate metalwork.
- The window trim at the front elevation should be simplified to the profile, size, and dimension of buildings like 1347 Coliseum.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

8. 820 Eighth St.

Application: Construction of a 660 SF rear addition at a Contributing rated, two-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed the height of the ridge line at the rear addition should be slightly lower than that at the existing historic front portion and that the overall addition appears subordinate to the existing building and will likely only be minimally visible from the street.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

9. 901 Elmira Ave.

Application: New construction of 1,900 SF two-story, single-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that the building should be pulled forward on the site to align with the face of the building on the left and a window should be added to the rear first-story wall to the right of the door.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

10. 1332-1334 N Derbigny St.

Application: New construction of a 2, two-story, multi-family and commercial buildings on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application for additional review. The ARC agreed that:

- Real balconies would be more appropriate in lieu of faux balconettes.
- Rails at front building parapet should be removed.
- The window openings seem large despite complying with regulations.
- The second-floor windows on the front building could be squarer in nature.
- The overall massing should speak to usage, i.e., Commercial reads as commercial and residential reads as residential.
- Placement of future commercial signage should be considered for massing and entrance sequence.
- The use of a wraparound canopy could help add texture and depth.
- The overall massing seemed to lack “layers”. A cue from the buildings across the street would help to understand layering of surfaces.
- The commercial entrance could be double doors, or single door with a sidelight with a possible transom.
- The building at 1998 Esplanade is a good example of historic commercial/residential design.
- The front building’s massing at the corner should be lowered.
- A mix of materiality should be explored to gain more depth and definition.
- The rear building massing is appropriate.
- Materiality changes should be explored at the rear building. Possible stucco at balconies.
- The rear elevation could have more push and pull for depth.
- A meeting with the HDLC Staff should occur prior to the next ARC meeting.

By: Tracie Ashe

Second: Beth Jacob

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

11. 1822 Joseph Guillaume Pl.

Application: New construction of a 2,860 SF two-story, single-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed the building proportions were too wide and the overall massing appeared to overwhelm the existing adjacent historic structure. The ARC recommended the one-bay portion on the right side be set further back a minimum of 3’-0” to make the overall massing appear more appropriate from the street. The ARC also recommended utilizing as much permeable site paving as possible.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

12. 623 Frenchmen St.

Application: Renovation of a Contributing rated, two-story, commercial building including demolition of non-original rear addition and construction of new side and rear additions.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application for additional review. The ARC agreed the proposed side addition is not appropriate as presented because it is unsympathetic to the existing historic building typology, may damage historic building fabric, and obscures and negatively impacts the perception of the original building massing from the street. The ARC recommended the applicant instead consider replacing the rear building with a larger footprint structure and maintaining the current width of the service wing, so the site plan was more of a "U" configuration. The ARC also agreed the uncovered decks at the right side should be eliminated and the proposed exterior stair should be incorporated at the building interior or further concealed from view from the street. The ARC also requested additional massing studies including views taken from street level be provided for review at the next meeting.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

13. 938 Gallier St.

Application: Renovation and construction of 200 SF rear addition and porch at a Contributing rated, one-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that a corner board should be added to designate the end of the existing building and beginning of the addition.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

14. 2724 St Claude Ave.

Application: Review (after-the-fact) of demolition of non-original rear lean-to and construction of new 655 SF rear addition at a Contributing rated, one-story, two-family residential building without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. This application still requires Commission approval for the addition and retention approval for the removal of the masonry chimney and installation of new standing seam metal roofing without a CofA.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

15. 2234 Chartres St.

Application: Review (after-the-fact) of installation of new covered porch at rear of a Contributing rated, one-story, two-family residential building without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval of correction Option (4) showing the entire porch roof lowered approximately 10-12" from the main building roof with the proviso that the last bay of roofing be removed or replaced with a transparent roofing material and with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that correction Option (2) did not appear to sufficiently break the porch roof visually from the main building roof and is not recommended. The ARC also noted that correction Option (3) would be appropriate, however, is likely not preferred by the applicant.

By: John Klingman

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

16. 3024 St Claude Ave.

Application: Renovation and construction of camelback addition at a Contributing rated, one-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that the corner board at the camelback should extend down at the first story to delineate the existing building and the addition. The ARC also agreed that the camelback windows should have a one over one configuration.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

Comments: Elizabeth Macey and Eve Abrams spoke against this application.

17. 3030 St Claude Ave.

Application: Renovation and construction of camelback addition at a Contributing rated, one-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed that the corner board at the camelback should be extended down at the first story to delineate the addition. The ARC also agreed that the camelback should have one over one windows.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Tracie Ashe, Cynthia Dubberley

Opposed:

Comments: Elizabeth Macey and Eve Abrams spoke against this application.

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