

Central Business District  
Architectural Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes

Date: August 26, 2014

Location: City Hall, 1300 Perdido Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, New Orleans, LA

Called to order: 9:30 a.m.

Adjourned: 11:30 a.m.

Members Present: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting:

Members absent: Lee Ledbetter, Brooks Graham

---

**I. AGENDA**

1. Approval of the minutes of the August ARC Meeting

Motion: Approve the minutes with corrections.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Seconded: Elliott Perkins

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

Approval of the minutes of the September ARC Meeting

Motion: Approve the minutes with corrections.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Seconded: Elliott Perkins

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

2. 749-51 St. Charles Avenue:

Application: Partial demolition of existing building and construction of seven-story side and rear addition and renovation of remaining three-story building, including addition of balcony and new storefront

Motion:

The ARC agreed the revisions are generally more responsive to the existing context; however, the ARC members continued to express concern regarding the massing of the building. The ARC agreed the one-story rooftop addition to the existing three-story building and the two stories that are setback above the four-story portion of the proposal are not setback far enough to adequately mitigate the vertical presence of the building mass on the street. The ARC recommended moving the one-story rooftop addition further from the street edge to reduce its visibility in relation to the remaining existing building and requested the proposed guardrail be correctly shown in the side elevation. The ARC questioned whether the proposed

access to an occupiable roof top terrace in excess of the maximum allowable height at the six-story portion of the building complies with zoning. The ARC requested the applicant seek a zoning review of the current proposal in addition to verifying with the Director of Safety & Permits whether building six-stories as proposed requires a variance of the IZD. The ARC reiterated that it does not support a massing that exceeds what is allowed by zoning.

The ARC continued to express concern regarding the atypically low clearance height of the gallery, but noted that the gallery does generally align with the awnings of the adjacent buildings on this block face if not the galleries on the opposite block face. The ARC recommended reducing the depth of the balcony to the typical depth of 3'-6" to a maximum of 4'-0".

The ARC agreed the expansive blank walls on the side elevation are inappropriate and need further study; the walls will be highly visible and should have more architectural intent even if fenestration is not allowed.

Robbie Cangelosi made a motion to defer further review of the project pending official verification of what is allowed by zoning.

Seconded: Elliott Perkins

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments: Several speakers spoke regarding their concerns about the proposed design.

3. 1035 Tchopitoulas Street

Application: Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of ten-story, approximately 30,240 sf mixed use building.

Motion:

The ARC reiterated its previous comments regarding the inappropriateness of enclosed space projecting over the front property line and the introduction of a green wall as not contextual of the Warehouse District local historic district, which is characterized by flat, continuous wall planes at the street edge and hard, austere, industrial materials. While projections are not typical of the Warehouse District in general, when they do occur, they are discreet, open, and additive to the mass of the building, not an extension of the mass, such as is created by continuing the building cornice over the property line and enclosing the volume.

The ARC agreed that while it could be argued the portion of the wall that is angled at the 9th and 10th floors may respond to the intent of the required setback, the double-height space is a distinct architectural element located in the required setback. Ultimately, the Department of Zoning must determine whether angling the wall complies with zoning. The ARC agreed it does not support a massing that exceeds what is allowed by zoning.

Robbie Cangelosi made a motion to recommend denial of the proposal as presented.

By: Robby Cangelosi

Seconded: Elliott Perkins

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments: A neighbor spoke regarding his concerns about the development.

4. 924 Canal Street

Application: Construct new gallery and storefront.

Motion: The ARC agreed that the proposal "E2" was most successful in responding to ARC and Commission recommendations and existing site conditions. The design of the metal handrail, although

appropriately decorative, should be simplified. Please contact the Staff for assistance with the design. The relationship between location of the handrail and edges of the gallery should be modified so that they coincide with the outside edge of gallery columns below.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend conceptual approval of the proposal with the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

Seconded: Ashley King

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

5. 333 St. Charles Avenue

Application: Addition of two mosaics at front entry.

Motion: The ARC agreed that the proposed modification to the underside of the existing metal canopy structure were not successful. The LED down lighting would be too harsh. A more discreet solution to providing additional lighting at that area should be presented. The ARC also suggested completely removing this non-historic building element.

Although the ARC is supportive of the concept to illuminate the central portion of the building, the lighting should respond to the architecture in a meaningful way. The ARC was concerned with the current proposal to illuminate the four central pilaster elements of the building consistently. They recommended illuminating the two center pilasters differently than the two outer ones to accentuate the architectural detailing. If new light fixtures are to be integrated into the existing flag poles more information is required as to how this is to be accomplished. If the fixtures are to be wall mounted instead, the exact locations of the fixtures should be provided. Care should be taken so as not to interrupt the existing architectural detailing of this landmark building.

The ARC agreed that the large scale of the elements of the proposed murals competes inappropriately with the fine detailing of the existing, elegantly articulated loggia. If murals are to be added at these locations they should be more sensitively rendered and be more specific to this particular building. The ARC suggested investigating the possibility of slightly recessing the large panels and providing a plaster coating that could be scored or painted to match the adjacent architecture.

Elliot Perkins made a motion to defer the application and requested that the applicant revise their drawings based on the recommendations.

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Robby Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

At this time there was no further business to discuss and the meeting was adjourned.