

Mitchell J. Landrieu
MAYOR

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

C. Elliott Perkins
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Minutes

Guidelines Working Session for Commissioners

January 10, 2018, 9:30 a.m. 1300 Perdido Street, One Stop Shop Conference Room A, 7th floor, City Hall

I. Roll Call

Members present:

Kevin Kelly, Greg Pierce, James Amdal, Greg Hackenberg, Jennifer Greene, Anne Redd, Heather Szapary, Jesse LeBlanc

Members arriving after the roll call:

Jean Nathan

II. Introduction

Jesse LeBlanc called the meeting to order and stated that the HDLC had procured the services of a consultant, Domanique Hawkins of Preservation Design Partnership to update the HDLC Design Guidelines due to the addition of four, new, local historic districts. As a result, Commissioners and staff were reviewing proposed updates and policy changes needed to update the Guidelines.

III. Guidelines Sub Committee

The members present discussed the idea of creating a Guidelines Sub Committee to guide the update process. It was agreed that there did not seem to be a need for such a sub-committee at the moment and the idea was tabled.

IV. Proposed new sections

A. Jesse Le Blanc

Mr. Le Blanc outlined the additional chapters created for the new Design Guidelines for the VCC and the group discussed the pros and cons of incorporating the additional chapter into the HDLC Guidelines. Executive Director Elliott Perkins stated that the detailed VCC Lighting and Security Camera Guidelines may not be applicable to the broader and more diverse New Orleans historic districts. It was also mentioned that the staff may not have the bandwidth to regulate additional lighting standards. It was agreed that the additional lighting and security chapter should not be incorporated into the HDLC design Guidelines.

V. Section 1 – Introduction

A. HV Nagendra comments – see attachment A

1. It was agreed that language would be added to Section 1, page 4 that the guidelines are not prescriptive. The language will be taken from the lawsuit the HDLC won regarding the Tracage development.



2. It was agreed that a disclaimer would be added to the Acknowledgements on page 01-16 stating that those listed were present when the Guidelines were originally created. It was also agreed that a line would be added to the bottom of the page with a link of where to find a current list of HDLC commissioners.

B. Jesse Le Blanc – partial control ratings system

The Commissioners discussed the reasoning behind a proposal to increase the number of ratings classifications in the partial control districts. Executive Director Elliott Perkins argued that Commissioners should rely on the information regarding the historic and architectural significance of a structure presented in the staff report when determining whether or not to allow a building to be demolished. The Commissioners agreed that no additional ratings classifications should be added and the matter was tabled.

Tracie Ashe, a member of the public, suggested that the HDLC require the applicant to answer how a building meets the demolition criteria set forth in the Guidelines. This document could be required as part of the application process as is done by the Board of Zoning Adjustments and the requirement stipulated in the Commission's *Rules, Policies and Procedures*. The Commissioners agreed that this was a good idea and should be implemented.

C. Staff comments – see attachment B

1. The staff changes were reviewed and it was agreed that the table showing the numbers of buildings in each historic districts would include a disclaimer that stated that the numbers were approximate as of a certain date and are subject to change.

VI. Section 2 – Historic District Descriptions

- A. Addition of descriptions for four new partial control districts (Mid – City, Parkview, Uptown and Carrollton) and expansion of St. Charles Avenue Historic District
- B. Replace all maps with new maps and include additional map showing all of the districts
- C. Include explanation of difference between full control and partial control districts along with chart – see attachment C

The above items were presented and agreed upon by the Commissioners.

VII. Section 3- Building Types and Architectural Styles

A. HV Nagendra comments – see attachment A

1. It was explained that all structures located within a local historic district are under the jurisdiction and protection of the HDLC. The style descriptions do not reflect post war styles due to a lack of room in the chapter. The staff will discuss the matter with the consultant.

B. Staff comments – see attachment B

1. The Commission members reviewed the proposed changes suggested by the staff and had no objection.

VIII. Section 4 – Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance

A. HV Nagendra Comments – see attachment A

1. After some discussion regarding the difficulties of notifying new and prospective property owners that their property is located in a local historic district, it was agreed that the NOHDLC would create a New Owner Notification Sub Committee at their February meeting to pursue solutions to the problem. This sub-Committee would also investigate the HDLC's ability to penalize contractors.
2. It was agreed that the Exterior Maintenance section as well as parts of other sections address the thermal issues related to historic structures.
3. It was agreed that it is difficult to provide web links in the guidelines since weblinks can change more rapidly than HDLC is able to update the Guidelines. The HDLC does provide a list of resources in the Introduction chapter on page 14.

IX. Section 5 – Guidelines for Roofing

A. Add detailed drawing of a dormer

It was agreed that this would be a helpful addition to the guidelines.

B. HV Nagendra comments – see attachment A

1. Mr. Perkins stated that blue roofs are typically not visible from the public right-of-way and, as such, not much of an issue for the HDLC.

C. Staff comments – see attachment B

1. The staff reviewed their discussion regarding 5-v crimp roofing and decision to keep the guidelines as they are.
2. The staff reviewed the proposed changes to the replacement of metal and asbestos roofing on Significant and Contributing rated structures and the Commissioners agreed with the proposed changes.
3. The staff reviewed the proposed new guideline to allow cap flashing on new construction but not on historic structures. The Commissioners had no objection to this proposal.
4. It was agreed that a more robust explanation regarding mechanical equipment such as mini splits would be addressed in the Site Elements section. The Commissioners had no objection to this.

X. Section 6- Exterior Woodwork

A. HV Nagendra comments – see attachment A

1. The staff noted that appropriate paints and coatings for historic structures are addressed in the Masonry and Stucco section as well as the Exterior Woodwork section.
2. The staff stated that the DEQ and Safety and Permits have protocols for dealing with lead paint. The staff noted that information was included on page 6-16. It was agreed that it could be helpful to provide a link to those resources when discussing lead paint in this section.

B. Staff comments - see attachment B

1. The staff explained the reasoning behind requiring exterior wood surfaces to be painted on historic structures and noted that the Consultant would be adding a definition for paint that indicates that paint should be opaque rather than clear.
2. The description regarding cementitious weatherboards and trim needs to be clarified.

3. The issues regarding mechanical equipment will be addressed in the Site Elements section.

XI. Section 7 – Masonry and Stucco

- A. Staff comments – see attachment B
 1. The staff reviewed their proposed changes and there was no objection on the part of the Commissioners.

XII. Section 8- Windows and Doors

- A. HV Nagendra comments – see attachment A
 1. Mr. Perkins stated that the guidelines currently detail the aesthetic requirements of all proposed new windows and felt as though the guidelines are clear regarding the HDLC criteria for window selection. The Commissioners had no objection to leaving the guidelines as currently written.
- B. Staff comments – see attachment B
 1. The staff reviewed their proposed changes and there was no objection on the part of the Commissioners.

XIII. Section 9 – Porches, Galleries and Balconies

- A. HV Nagendra comments – See attachment A
 1. Mr. Perkins agreed to follow up with Commissioner Nagendra to clarify his comments.
- B. The Staff reviewed the proposed changes and it was agreed that the handrail solution in the VCC guidelines should not be included in the HDLC guidelines. The Commissioners had no objection to the other proposed changes.

XIV. Section 10 – Site elements

- A. As noted earlier, the Consultant will be adding additional content regarding the installation of mechanical equipment.
- B. The staff stated that the Consultant was in the process of developing language for up lighting. It was noted that the HDLC could not control the color of up lighting.
- C. There was a lengthy discussion about regulating fence toppers and it was unanimously agreed that the HDLC should require only that finials be proportional to the overall fencing.

XV. Section 11 – Commercial

- A. Staff comments – see attachment B
 1. The staff reviewed the proposed updates and the Commissioners had no objection to them.
- B. Add guidelines for the installation of Murals – See attachment D
The Commissioners stated no objection to the proposed mural Guidelines. It was reiterated that the definitions of signs and murals would be incorporated into the Guidelines. It was noted that the Zoning Administrator interprets what constitutes a mural vs. a sign.

XVI. Section 12 – New Construction, Additions and Demolition

- A. Add guidelines for raising buildings
The Commission agreed that this would assist the public greatly.

B. Add guidelines for green walls

The staff stated that the consultant would be developing guidelines that allow green walls and language regarding their maintenance on new construction but prohibit them on historic structures.

C. Staff comments – See attachment B

Mr. Perkins will work with Mr. Hackenberg and Mr. Kelly to develop the language regarding contemporary infill.

The staff reviewed the proposed change to the required setbacks for rooftop additions. The staff is proposing to increase the proposed setback from 1:1 to 1: 1.5. For example, a 12'-0" high rooftop penthouse would be required to be set back 18'-0" feet. The 12'-0" height limit would remain in place.

The staff reviewed the draft of the proposed demolition definition. There was some discussion regarding the thresholds that exist in the NCDAC and how they compare to the proposed draft definition. Mr. Perkins agreed to meet with Commissioner Hackenberg and Commissioner Kelly to further refine the definition. The Commissioners added that it would be helpful to include diagrams that illustrate the definitions for presentation to the public, council and commissioners.

At this time, there being no further business to attend to, the Meeting was adjourned.