

New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission
Architectural Review Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: April 18th, 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, Cynthia Dubberley

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting: Tracie Ashe

Members absent:

I. AGENDA

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

Motion: Approve the minutes.

By: Beth Jacobs

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

2. 2836-2842 Lasalle St.

Application: Changes to previously approved renovation of a Landmark commercial building.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

By: John Klingman

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

3. 1716-1722 S Rampart St.

Application: After-the-fact review of modifications to Landmark, multi-family residential building including new screened in rear porch.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval of the previously approved items including the installation of the entablature, double-height columns, rear balcony, and gable windows. The ARC recommended denial of the construction of the screened in porch and exposed deck at the rear, as they are acontextual to the style of the building and do not meet the HDLC Guidelines. Suggestions were made

about potentially redesigning it so that it was detached from the building, similar to the footprint of the outbuilding shown in the Sanborn Map.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Cynthia Dubberly

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

4. 1137 St Charles Ave.

Application: Change in massing of previously approved rear addition at a Landmark religious building.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Beth Jacob

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

5. 919 Webster St.

Application: New accessory building at rear of property of Landmark, two-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

The ARC stated that the overall design of the accessory should be simplified, including removing the triangle shaped windows, simplify the cornice detailing, simplify the trellis, and remove the bump out and second line at the parapet. The ARC stated that the openings should all have arched tops to better reflect the main building.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

Comments: Terry Schellhaas spoke in favor of this application.

6. 522 Montegut St.

Application: Construction of a 2,000 SF roof top addition at a Contributing rated, four-story, mixed-use building.

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

- The HDLC guidelines for roof top additions should be reviewed and applied to the proposed addition. This setback could be accomplished through a combination of reducing the height and/or moving the addition.
- Provide horizontal window and door protection through awnings at openings.
- Expand upon the concept of transparency regarding the openings. This concept could include eliminating siding between openings.
- Exploring other cladding options could assist in reducing the overall residential character of the addition.

By: Cynthia Dubberley
Second: Beth Jacob
Result: Passed
In favor: John Klingman, Amanda Rivera, Beth Jacob, Cynthia Dubberley
Opposed:
Comments: Tracie Ashe recused herself.

7. 523-525 Washington Ave.

Application: Detail review of the new construction of a 4,464 SF two-story, two-family residential building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

The ARC agreed that:

- An opening should be added at the left elevation in the breezeway.
- Soffit details should be refined.

By: Tracie Ashe

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

8. 527 Washington Ave.

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

Motion: The ARC recommended conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

The ARC agreed:

- Option 3 massing was the most successful, but that the secondary massing should be pushed further back from the front.
- Header heights of the windows should be consistent.
- The half-round windows are not appropriate and should be replaced with oval, hexagonal or diamond shaped windows.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

9. 928 Kerlerrec St.

Application: Renovation and camelback addition to existing Significant rated 1-1/2 story, two-family residential building.

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

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

10. 922 Kerlerec St.

Application: Renovation and camelback addition to existing Contributing (but altered) one-story, two-family residential building including restoration of front elevation.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval of the proposed camelback addition with the final details of the updated façade to return for additional ARC review. The ARC agreed that:

- Because the historic building has been so altered by the removal of the original front room and façade, the proposed brackets, shake gable siding, and 6/2 windows may be too historic in detailing. The applicant should reconsider the front elevation, and the ARC noted this may be an opportunity for a more contemporary vocabulary and material palette to better reflect the quirky history and other changes at the site.

- o For example, the existing wood gable screen could be reimagined in a new material or configuration, such as a board and batten.

- o Windows could utilize plate glass, so they are more contemporary in appearance.

- The current building does not appear to relate to the existing context due to its setback and the applicant should consider additional façade options and iterations, such as a half-porch, so the building can engage more with the street. The ARC noted this could also be achieved by interventions which maintain the existing front yard parking, such as a small balcony or Juliette-balcony or by extending out the sidewalls or gable roof of the existing building.

- An additional 1-2 window openings should be added to the camelback level on the left side.

By: John Klingman

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

11. 623 Frenchmen St.

Application: Renovation of existing 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 recommend conceptual approval of Option (2) with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level and for the application to return for additional ARC review if proposed mechanical equipment becomes visible from the public right of way. The ARC agreed that:

- All three options are an improvement over the previous iteration, but Option (2) is preferred because it provides more breathing space and visual distinction between the existing historic building and new addition and more closely reflects the previous building footprints on the site based on Sanborn maps.

- The simpler rear dependency doors shown in Option (3) are preferred.

By: John Klingman

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

12. 606 Frenchmen St.

Application: Review of updated first-floor storefront design since previous approval of renovation of existing Contributing rated two-story commercial building including installation of new gallery at previously existing location.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level. The ARC agreed the updated first-floor storefront design appropriately reflects the evidence obtained following exploratory demolition work at the façade and is an improvement from the previous iteration.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

13. 5640 Burgundy St.

Application: Review (after-the-fact) of installation of new 600 SF right side canopy awning addition and new 500 SF rear covered porch addition at an existing Contributing rated two-story, commercial building in deviation of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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

- The rear covered porch addition is less problematic because it also serves the function of ADA access and is better integrated with the overall building and site. However, the right-side canopy is too large for the existing historic building and too prominent from the front elevation. The ARC recommended the canopy be set back further from the front façade by a minimum of one column bay (or) be reduced in width such that it is more of a covered walkway.

- o A new smaller canopy could also be proposed at the front of the right-side where the existing canopy is to be pushed back to allow for additional pedestrian rain protection and to better indicate the area as an entry point for the site.

- o The right-side canopy could also be shifted back on the site such that it connects to the rear covered porch, forming a continuous “L” shaped covering.

- The proposed metal posts for the right-side canopy are acceptable as they relate to the existing sidewalk canopy posts.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

14. 1205 Coliseum St.

Application: Construction of a 148 SF side addition at a Significant rated, 2 ½ story, two-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 single pitch shed roof was more appropriate.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

15. 1326 Josephine St.

Application: Renovation of and a 1,182 SF addition of a Significant rated, three-story, multiuse building.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application.

The ARC agreed that:

-The front wall of the addition should be set back further than the front of the historic building.

-Glass may be an appropriate solution for the materiality of the hyphen.

-The hyphen would work better set back 3 to 4 feet from the front wall.

-The windows appear too square. Taller/narrower windows would be more appropriate.

-The windows don't necessarily need to be centered.

-Transoms over windows are generally not considered to be appropriate.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

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

Opposed: Beth Jacob recused herself.

Comments: Grant McNamara spoke against this application.

16. 903 Spain St.

Application: Request to install new dormer on the roof of an existing Contributing rated, two-story, two-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 that:

- The pitch of the dormer roof appears too flat and should be increased to around 3:12 with the location of the ridge remaining and the difference made up by reducing the windowsill height.

- The mullion between the two windows should be reduced in width.

- The dormer cheek walls should be clad in wood or smooth finish Hardie weatherboards rather than asphalt shingles or an alternative material such as metal.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

Comments: Tracie Ashe recused herself.

17. 1315 First St.

Application: Construction of new 650 SF accessory carport structure at rear of existing Significant rated two-story, single-family residential building.

Motion: The ARC appreciated the design and detailing of the proposed accessory structure and noted that its location at the rear corner of the property would make it minimally visible from the street.

The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval with the final details to be worked out at the Staff level.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: John Klingman

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

18. 1388 Camp St.

Application: Addition of a metal security gate at front entry on the primary façade of a Contributing rated, two-story, two-story, single-family 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 ornate infill that matches the balconies is not appropriate.

-Simple vertical pickets should be used.

-There should be a gap at the top of the gate to not use the whole opening.

By: Cynthia Dubberley

Second: Beth Jacob

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

19. 1449-1451 N Robertson St.

Application: New Construction of a 2640 SF two-story, two-family building on a vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC voted to defer the application.

The ARC agreed that:

-The columns should not be continuous and should read more like the example project.

-The second floor seemed squatty due to the roof detailing.

-A block face drawing is needed to understand the massing in context.

-The clear porch depth is preferred at 6ft.

-The columns should be more rectangular in shape.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Amanda Rivera

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

20. 2600 Saint Claude Ave.

Application: Renovation of existing Non-Contributing rated two and three-story commercial buildings including window replacement and installation of new side-yard balcony and exterior access stair.

Motion: The ARC voted to recommend conceptual approval for the proposed exterior work with the details of the courtyard entry to return for additional ARC review once the details are further developed.

The ARC agreed that:

- The outdoor balcony along St. Claude Avenue is appropriate, however, the overall area currently appears like a service entry from the street and could be enhanced and made to be a more prominent and functional feature of this area and better indicate the primary entry.
- The proposed parking configuration requiring guest to back out onto St. Claude Avenue may be impractical and the applicant should consider an alternative configuration.
- The applicant should consider a simple covering above the outdoor balcony, such as a roof or awning, to make this area more functional and to better protect the proposed new 2nd floor entry doors and windows.
- The applicant should consider a simple covering for the walkway and parking area that could extend from the new balcony to better serve this area and to create more of a prominent entry condition along the St. Claude Avenue side for visitors.
 - o The ARC recommended several options, such as a canopy or covering attached to the building wall, installed at the top of the wall with integrated lighting for the mural, or as a new freestanding element.
 - o Signage could be incorporated into this element to help prioritize this as the main entry.
 - o If site permeability is a concern, the applicant could consider removing a portion of the building's existing rear one-story roof to increase the amount of impervious area at the new front entry court.
- The proposed perforated metal material is interesting for this building and its use could be expanded and brought out closer to the street.

By: Tracie Ashe

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

Comments: Allen Johnson spoke on this application.

21. 1028 Saint Anthony St.

Application: New construction of a 2,500 SF 1-1/2 story, single family residential building including new construction of 1,500 SF two-story rear residential accessory building on a vacant lot.

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

- The overall site plan is appropriate, and the rear accessory appears to be only minimally visible from the street.
- Stucco is an appropriate building cladding material for the front building, but the applicant could also consider weatherboards or another more contemporary material.
- The parapet walls extending out to the street from the face of the building should be eliminated.
- The proposed dormers and their detailing appear awkward, and the applicant should consider eliminating them from the front roof or using a more contemporary language and materials.
 - o The ARC also recommended the applicant consider additional dormer and/or roof form options for presentation at the next review.
- The front entry door alcove should be enhanced so it is wider and more prominent.
- The proposed windows should be operable and additional information on window types, detailing, and installation (such as depth in wall) should be provided for the next review.
 - o For example, the first-floor elevation windows could be operable above a fixed panel for a contemporary "Juliette" style balcony in a more contemporary language.
- The side elevation windows at the front building should be studied further and refined.

- A context drawing should be provided for the next review that accurately depicts the existing adjacent buildings on the block face, so the ARC can better evaluate the proposed massing, foundation height, fenestration, etc.

By: Amanda Rivera

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

Comments: James Sauer, Cheryl Gerber, and Mark McGrain spoke against this application.

22. 702 Desire St.

Application: Installation of awning and two sets of doors at rear wing of a Contributing rated, two-story, single-family residential building.

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

- Providing perspective drawings indicating the location of the doors and awning would be helpful for review.
- Awnings at this location would be more appropriate if the tiebacks were eliminated and brackets were introduced at the underneath side.
- Treating the exterior wall of the infilled portion of the gallery with stucco could differentiate that area and potentially allow for the metal doors to be installed.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Tracie Ashe

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

23. 633 Esplanade Ave.

Application: Installation of new minimally visible elevator and dormer roof extension at rear of a Significant rated, three-story, multi-family residential building including change of existing rear balcony access in preparation for sub-division of lots into single new lot of record.

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

- The proposed elevator addition and roof changes are substantial for the existing building given its significant rating and despite the limited visibility of this area from the street.
- The applicant should consider alternative strategies, such as the rearrangement of the interior layout so the new elevator would not need to extend to the 4th floor and to reduce its overall impact on the existing historic building fabric.
- The proposed rear stair changes are appropriate, but the solution for the brick wall at the rear of the site could be more inventive.
- The applicant should continue to study and refine the proposed design and consult with SHPO for additional feedback prior to the next ARC review.

By: Beth Jacob

Second: Cynthia Dubberley

Result: Passed

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

Opposed:

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