



Architectural Review Board Certified Record

August 20, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:00pm.

1. Roll Call

Members present: Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members absent: Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, , and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

2. Approval of Minutes from August 20, 2025

Cart Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the August 20, 2025 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Stephen McNair and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Stephen Howle moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 1413 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 08/13/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
2. **Applicant:** Blackard Roofing Inc.
Property Address: 1756 New Hamilton St
Date of Approval: 08/14/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
3. **Applicant:** Bonita Davies
Property Address: 207 Rapier Ave
Date of Approval: 08/14/2025
Project: Remove existing wood fence and gates around backyard
Build 4' tall gothic picket fence across front driveway, with a 42' gate and 10' drive gate to replace existing
Build a 6' tall classic-style fence with a cap around the backyard to follow existing fence lines
Build 6' gate at NW corner of backyard to replace existing 3' gate

All materials are pressure-treated lumber

4. **Applicant:** Protestant Episcopal Church
Property Address: 115 S Conception St
Date of Approval: 08/14/2025
Project: Repair and repaint windows and doors
5. **Applicant:** Rellim Contracting LLC
Property Address: 1752 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 08/15/2025
Project: Repairs to front porch to include:
Level front porch; replace all rotted wood in-kind; prime all new wood
6. **Applicant:** Marlon Wade
Property Address: 204 S Royal Street
Date of Approval: 08/18/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Glacier
7. **Applicant:** Marlon Wade
Property Address: 200 S Royal Street
Date of Approval: 08/18/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oxford Grey
8. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 1559 Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 08/18/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Castlewood Gray
9. **Applicant:** Marlon Wade
Property Address: 202 S Royal Street
Date of Approval: 08/18/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oxford Grey
10. **Applicant:** Marlon Wade
Property Address: 206 S Royal Street
Date of Approval: 08/18/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oxford Grey
11. **Applicant:** Kendrel Harris
Property Address: 262 McDonald
Date of Approval: 08/20/2025
Project: In-kind repairs and repainting at property per submitted SOW to include the following:
 1. Repaint exterior trim and wood paneling in following colors:
Trim - Graphic Charcoal
Paneling- Almond butter
 2. Level and repair existing concrete driveway where needed.
 3. Repair and repaint existing concrete steps.
 4. Repair and replace in-kind damaged fascia and soffit boards. Repaint to match.

12. **Applicant:** Aidan Hale
Property Address: 317 N Joachim
Date of Approval: 08/20/2025
Project:
1. Install a tankless water heater west elevation.
2. Install a "Ring" doorbell by front entry door.
3. Install exterior solar security camera to rear porch.
13. **Applicant:** Maira Mejia
Property Address: 1350 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 08/20/2025
Project: Install an inground gunite swimming pool and spa
- Pool will be located approx. 10'-0" to the north (rear of the structure) and measure 28' wide x 14' deep. The pool/spa will sit 11'-11" south of the north property line, 13'-6" off the east property line, and 24'-2" off the west property line
- Spa will measure approximately 10' x 10' and will sit at the east end of the pool
- 655 sf of paver decking will surround the pool on all sides
- Rear yard area surrounding the pool will be sodded

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-38-CA

Address: NW corner of Congress & N. Claiborne Streets
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent GAI Consultants, Inc. on behalf of Figures Construction & Development
Project: Construct 4-story mixed-use building and related site improvements

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Application 2024-38-CA

DETAILS

Location:

NW Corner of N. Claiborne and Congress Streets

Summary of Request:

Construct a four-story mixed-use building and related site improvements

Applicant (as applicable):

GAI Consultants, Inc.

Property Owner:

City of Mobile/Figures Construction & Development

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Vacant lot

- The massing and scale of the proposed structure is not compatible with surrounding historic structures.
- The application has undergone review by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC).

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	5
Attachments	7

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed design is intended for the southernmost lot on parcel R022906400003036.
- The proposed materials are appropriate for the district and approvable for new construction under the *Guidelines*.
- The submitted plans incorporate the traditional design elements seen in the surrounding district.

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

According to Historic Development survey records and the City's Geographical Information System, the projected parcel proposed for the subject project, on the northwest corner of Congress and N. Claiborne Street streets, straddles what was once 350 and 352 Congress Street. Both lots were occupied by c. 1897 one-and-a-half-stories raised cottages fitted out in the Queen Anne Style. Both facades consisted of a bay window projecting from the eastern end, and a front porch extending westward across the remainder of the elevation.

Detailed plans to fully rehabilitate the historic house at 352 Congress under the supervision of the Mobile Housing Board and the Architectural Review Board were drawn up in the early 1980s. Records show that 352 Congress was demolished in 1997. It is likely that 350 Congress was destroyed around the same time, along with all remaining historic structures along the west side of the block of N. Claiborne Street north of Congress Street.

This subject parcel has appeared before the Architectural Review Board twice. In February 2025, an application to construct a new dwelling came before the ARB and was withdrawn. In May 2025, an application for three new residential construction projects were granted conceptual approval and were shortly afterwards issued COAs.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a four-story mixed-use building.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented to the east with a 2'-2" setback from the ROW. The south (secondary façade) elevation would be setback approximately 6'-0".
 - b. The proposed four-story structure would measure 79'-11 5/8" wide by 140'-0" deep.
 - c. The foundation would be slab on grade with a horizontal element running across the east and south elevations at 2'-0" from grade to create the appearance of a raised slab. First floor finished floor to second floor finished floor (ff) would measure 16'-0". Finished floor to finished floor measurements for second through fourth floor would be 12'-0" high.
 - d. The building height from grade to roof peak would measure 77'-2".
 - e. The structure would sit under a cross-gabled roof with the main gable running parallel to N. Claiborne Street and the cross gable running parallel to Congress Street. The main gable would measure approximately 20'-0" high and the second gable would measure approximately 9'-0" high. The roof would be clad in galvalume standing-seam metal.
 - f. The exterior walls of the structure would be clad in STO products. The veneers would be applied as follows:
 - East façade and south elevation: A sand finished stucco would rise above the second story finished floor level, and a brick veneer would cover the upper-floor levels.

- The sand finished stucco would cover the north and west elevations.
- g. All windows would consist of the following across the elevations:
 - Aluminum-clad wood double casement window with side lights and arched transom measuring approximately 10'-0" wide by 9'-8" high.
 - Vinyl-clad wood fixed four-over-four sash window measuring 2'-7 ½" wide by 7'-0" high.
 - Vinyl-clad wood one-over-one window measuring 1'-6" wide by 3' 7 ¼" high.
- h. Doors will be a mix of aluminum-clad and vinyl-clad wood and would consist of the following arrangements along the first floor across the elevations:
 - Multi-light glass doors with stucco bulkhead, fixed sidelights and transoms measuring approximately 10'-0" wide by 12'-1" high.
 - Double multi-light glass doors with sidelights and transoms measuring approximately 8'-0" wide by 12'-1" high.
 - Single multi-light glass doors and transom measuring 3'-2 ¾" wide by 12'-0" high.
 - Double multi-light doors measuring 6'-4" wide by 8'-0" high.
 - Single multi-light door measuring 3'-2" wide by 8'-0" high.
- i. Steel decorative balconies will project from all double windows along the east and south elevations on floors 2-4. Matching steel handrail will be installed on single open recesses located on the south elevation at floors 2-4.
- j. The east façade and south elevation will consist of multiple entry door arrangements along the first floor that access commercial spaces. The second through fourth floors will consist of double and single windows arranged in a symmetrical pattern. The double windows would be accentuated by decorative steel balconies.
- k. The west half of the north elevation would consist of a blank stucco wall (with a louvered vent located in the main gable). The east half of the elevation would include three recessed galleries on floors 2-4. The galleries would be enclosed by balustrades set between posts.
- l. The west elevation would consist of a blank stucco wall.
- m. A parking lot would be located to the north of the parcel at the rear of the proposed building. The lot would sit 70'-0" west of the ROW on N. Claiborne Street. The lot would be enclosed by a 6'-0" high wood privacy fence and door, painted white. Parking islands consisting of lights would be located along the east and west sides of the parking lot at regular intervals.
- n. Landscaping would include jasmine ground cover along N. Claiborne and Congress Streets and red maple trees planted at the rear of the parcel to screen parking area.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. **7.30** Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.
 - Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.

- Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.
 - Face primary building entries toward the public street.
 - Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.
2. **7.33** Place and orient new commercial construction at interior neighborhood locations to be compatible with that of nearby historic residential structures.
 - Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.
 - Locate any ancillary buildings to the rear of the primary commercial building.
 - If off-street parking is required, provide it behind the building where possible.
 - Provide landscaping around a driveway to off-street parking to mimic a driveway for a historic residential building.
 - Orient façades to be parallel with the street.
 3. **7.34** Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.
 - Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.
 - Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.
 - Limit the height or the perceived height of buildings to be similar to heights of nearby historic structures.
 - Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of a larger building mass.
 - Incorporate changes in color, texture and materials.
 - Use architectural details to create visual interest.
 - Use materials that help to convey scale in their proportion, detail and form.
 4. **7.35** Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.
 - Incorporate floor-to-floor heights that appear similar to those of traditional commercial buildings in Mobile.
 - Design a new structure to incorporate a traditional base, middle and cap.
 5. **7.36** Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.
 - Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.
 - Where a structure must exceed a traditional building width, use changes in building configuration, articulation or design features such as materials, window design, façade height or decorative details to break the façade into modules that suggest traditional building widths.
 6. **7.39** Design the massing and scale of a new commercial building to be compatible with the district. »
 - Use massing that is similar to that of nearby historic residential structures. »
 - Where larger building volumes are desired, break down the massing near the street to present components with similar massing to that of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.
 - Limit the height of a building to be equal or less to that of historic residential structures in the district.
 7. **7.40** Maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floor on multi-story structures.

- Incorporate a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the primary façade.
 - Design upper floors to appear more opaque than the street level.
 - Express the distinction in floor heights between street levels and upper levels through detailing, materials and fenestration. The presence of a belt course is an important feature in this relationship.
 - Do not use highly reflective or darkly tinted glass.
8. **7.41** Maintain the traditional spacing pattern created by upper story windows.
- Use traditional proportions of windows, individually or in groups.
 - Maintain the traditional placement of window headers and sills relative to cornices and belt courses.
9. **7.48** Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding historic residential context.
- Use a material that is compatible with the surrounding historic residential structures. Use wood siding for a commercial structure where the majority of the surrounding historic residential structures use wood siding.
10. **10.6** Install a new sidewalk to be compatible with historic ones in the area.
- Maintain the existing width of neighboring sidewalks.
 - Use a traditional sidewalk material as seen in the district if permitted by the City Code. Consult Staff if necessary.
11. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
12. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is part of a vacant parcel located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application proposes the construction of a four-story mixed-use building which would be located on the northwest corner of N. Claiborne and Congress streets. The location of the proposed construction is associated with the Interior Neighborhood Context which is described in the *Guidelines* as follows (the applicable guidelines used to review the project are associated with this context):

This context is more rare in Mobile's historic districts than the two contexts discussed above. This refers to new commercial construction that develops in the interior of a predominantly residential historic district. This context refers specifically to new, small scale commercial construction for corner stores or other neighborhood-serving retail uses that are completely surrounded by residential structures. In most cases, commercial infill in this context is likely to develop on corner lots; however, interior commercial infill is also possible, and particularly in DeTonti Square the northern edge of Church Street East. For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider massing, scale, and orientation to ensure compatibility with nearby historic residential buildings. This context is potentially relevant to DeTonti Square, Oakleigh Garden, Leinkauf, and portions of Old Dauphin Way and Church Street East.

The *Guidelines* direct that the placement of a new structure should be similar to adjacent historic structures. Currently, there are no extant structures along the west side of N. Claiborne Street to the north. Across N. Claiborne Street, front setbacks of historic structures range from approximately 3'-6" to 7'-3". The only nearby historic structures across from Congress Street include 308 and 357 Congress Street, which sit back from the ROW approximately 10'-0" and 15'-0" respectively. Submitted plans demonstrate setbacks of approximately 6'-0" along Congress Street and 2'-0" along N. Claiborne Street, which do not veer far from the established range. These nearby historic structures are single-family cottage dwellings, which could be considered less-than-ideal references for more commercial type building placement and orientation. A look further afield within the district reveals that the placement and orientation of the proposed structure would be respectful of traditional placement patterns within the DeTonti Square Historic District, which historically lends itself to a more urban style of development. The off-street parking provided for the structure is orientated to the rear of the structure and sits 70'-0" back from the ROW along N. Claiborne Street. This placement does not conflict with the guidelines for commercial construction within the Interior Neighborhood Context. (7.30, 7.34, 10.7)

The *Guidelines* state that massing and scale of new commercial construction should be compatible with nearby historic structures. The volume of the proposed structure surpasses that of the closest historic dwellings, and of most structures in the district. In this case, the *Guidelines* instruct that massing be broken down into smaller components to create a more compatible appearance. Regarding scale, the *Guidelines* state that larger buildings should be designed such that the height or perceived height is like nearby historic structures. The design of the proposed structure attempts to break up the massing and scale (both height and width) with elements such as the arched open breezeway, the projecting balconies on the south and east elevations, the multi-floor galleries on the north elevation, and variations in the design of first-floor entry doors and windows on the upper floors. The change in roof form creates the appearance of two distinct sections of the building. Along the north elevation, the recessed galleries create depth and serve to further break up the volume of the structure. The design also calls for the use of stucco at the base (rising partially past the second-story floor height) of the building to differentiate it from the three upper floors, which are clad in a cast brick veneer. The blank walls along the north and west elevations, however, communicate a massive appearance which is not compatible with the district.

Although the above-mentioned elements contribute to visually lessening the mass and scale of the structure, they do not fully satisfy the Guideline's directive. The application of additional elements such as a vertical component between each of the "columns" of window types along the south elevation; or the incorporation of projections and recesses along the same demarcations may serve to further define distinct 'modules' and increase the compatibility of the proposed structure with the surrounding district. There is a lack of definition along the top of exterior walls on the east and south elevations. The *Guidelines* clarify that taller buildings should have a distinctive base, middle, and cap. The proposed design lacks a defined cap. Elements such as cornices, eaves, parapets, and coping are commonly seen on historic homes throughout the district. The integration of such features, interpreted in a manner that integrates with the more contemporary design, would create a more compatible appearance. The proposed structure maintains the distinction between the street level and upper floors and incorporates a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the main south and east elevations, as directed by the *Guidelines*. (7.34-7.36, 7.40)

The height of the building does not fall into the established range of historic structure heights within the DeTonti Square district. There is no historic precedent for a four-story structure. In addition, the visual massing of the gable roof (parallel to N. Claiborne Street) in proportion to the structure is not compatible with historic structures in the district. (7.39)

The design generally incorporates traditional window placement and spacing patterns that reflect those seen in the district. However, as mentioned above, details such as the space between window head and top of exterior walls denote a departure from traditional proportions and design. (7.41)

All proposed materials are approvable for new commercial construction in Mobile's historic district and are compatible with the surrounding historic district. (7.48)

As discussed, a parking lot would be located to the rear of the structure, stretching north to south. A 6'-0" high privacy fence is proposed to enclose the parking lot. Landscaping will further shield and soften the parking area.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Christine Dawson of GAI Consultants, Inc., was present to discuss the application. Rashawn Figures of Figures Construction & Development and project architect Robert Maurin were also in attendance. Ms. Dawson had prepared a separate PowerPoint presentation from that typically provided by staff. The applicant also provided physical copies of a letter of support from the De Tonti Square Neighborhood Association, which staff distributed to the Board members in attendance.

Ms. Dawson stated that the proposed apartment complex would be located on a corner lot at the western edge of the district. Ms. Dawson specifically noted that there were no historic structures surviving on the subject block. The proposed apartment complex would be mixed-use with commercial space on the first floor and 36 one- and two-bedroom apartment units on the upper three floors. While there are not extant historic 4-story structures in the district, Ms. Dawson noted that Sanborn maps establish historic precedent for structures in excess of three stories within the district. Ms. Dawson noted that a specific three-and-a-half-story structure shown on the Sanborn map is no longer extant.

However, the Federal Courthouse at the district's eastern edge is taller than four stories. Ms. Dawson cited this as a precedent for large landmark structures on corner lots, especially at the district's edges.

Residents of the De Tonti Historic District were also present to comment on the application. Paul Murden of 304 N. Claiborne Street stated that he was in favor of the development as long as it met historic district design guidelines. Mr. Murden also stated that it was his understanding that the letter from the De Tonti Square Neighborhood Association had been written in support of the development concept for the purposes of receiving funding. In his view, the letter should not be interpreted as a support of the specific design before the Board for consideration. Taylor Imel, also of 304 N. Claiborne Street, also spoke in support of the development concept. Mr. Imel stated that the developer had been communicative with the neighborhood. Mr. Imel stated that he believed the development would be a benefit to the community, as long as it complied with historic district design guidelines. Mr. Imel stated he would appreciate the Board's input on how to improve the design.

Linda Tressler spoke as a member of the public but did not provide an address for the record. Ms. Tressler stated that she was not expressly against the project but that she did have concerns. Most of Ms. Tressler's comments were in relation to traffic and the number of parking spaces, which are not under the purview of the Architectural Review Board. Ms. Tressler did state that many people in the neighborhood were considered with the overall scale and the location of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Stephen McNair asked Robert Maurin, project architect, to speak about the design process. Mr. Maurin responded that he had tried to address both street frontages in his design and that he pulled the material palette (stucco and veneer brick) from the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. McNair asked if the balconies were functional. Mr. Maurin responded that they were. Mr. McNair asked what the roof material would be. Mr. Maurin responded that it would be standing-seam metal with a galvalume finish.

Cart Blackwell asked why the transition between the stucco base and brick-clad middle portion happened halfway through the second-floor level instead of between the first- and second-floor levels. Mr. Blackwell stated the latter was more typical of historic buildings. Mr. Maurin stated that he felt the proportions of stucco base to brick middle appeared more appropriate for both the shorter and longer elevations if the break happened as shown on the elevations.

Jennifer Roselius asked for clarification on the rooftop area. Mr. Maurin explained that it was a useable covered rooftop deck.

Ms. Roselius expressed concerns about the blank north and west elevations. Mr. Maurin responded that these were left blank because it is expected that future development on neighboring lots would obscure any ornamentation on these elevations. Mr. McNair suggested adding faux windows to these elevations. Ms. Dawson interjected that since new development would eventually obscure these elevations, decoration was not needed. Ms. Dawson also cited historic precedent for large masonry buildings with blank secondary elevations.

Ms. Roselius agreed that the blank wall was less concerning on the north elevation. However, Ms. Roselius stated that the west elevation would present a 4-story blank wall at a gateway into the historic district. Ms. Roselius asked if the owner would consider adding some details to alleviate the monotony of a massive masonry wall. Mr. Figures stated that the development would be affordable rather than market rate housing. He indicated that adding details would make the development less economically feasible.

Catarina Echols, Board Chair, stated that the Board must review the project in the context of the Design Guidelines and not in the context of personal taste. Ms. Echols stated that historically it would be more customary to transition from stucco to brick between the first- and second-floor levels, in contrast to transitioning halfway through the second-floor level, as shown on the submitted elevations. Ms. Echols asked why this design choice was made. Ms. Echols also stated that the light fixtures appeared to be undersized for the scale of development. Ms. Echols also requested clarification on the color of the bricks and the design for the balcony railings.

Stephen Howle asked if the project had gone through CRC review. Ms. Dawson responded that it had. Mr. Howle asked if they needed to seek any other variances or approvals. Ms. Dawson stated that a height variance was required, given the two-story height limit in the Downtown Development District. Mr. Howle said that reviewing the design before receiving a height variance felt like putting the cart before the horse. If the zoning board denied the height variance, the project would have to reapply to the Architectural Review Board for design review.

Ms. Dawson and Mr. Figures responded to earlier comments on the number of parking spaces, which is outside the Board's purview.

Mr. McNair asked if the applicant would consider 6-inch-deep indentions to give the appearance of blocked up windows on the blank west elevation. Alternatively, Mr. McNair suggested using alternating cladding materials to create visual interest. Mr. McNair stated that neither change should add significant costs. Mr. McNair confirmed with Mr. Maurin that the proposed wall indentions would not take away from usable interior floorspace. Mr. Figures responded that the design focused on elevations than faced the neighborhood and that he had to cut costs somewhere. Mr. McNair commended the applicant for the work he had done so far.

Mr. Roselius echoed Mr. Howle's concern that it was pointless to review the design before the applicant received a height variance. Ms. Echols agreed, adding that other elements of the design were not currently before the Board, including the proposed brick and stucco colors. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the Architectural Review Board, interjected that the applicant had the right to ask for approval in whatever order they saw fit.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the applicant were amenable to transitioning from stucco to brick between the first and second-floor levels, instead of partway through the second-floor level. Both Mr. Figures and Mr. Maurin stated that they were. Mr. Blackwell asked if the Board could review a sample brick. Mr. Maurin responded that he was expecting to receive a sample brick the following week. Mr. Blackwell asked if Mr. Maurin was open to preparing a new west elevation showing some variety on the west elevation, such as blind window openings as recommended by Mr. McNair. Mr. McNair asked Mr. Maurin to confirm that the proposed faux window indentions would not take away from the useable interior floor space. Mr. Maurin stated that they would not.

Mr. McGowin suggested that the Board could table the application until the following Board meeting so that the applicant could provide additional drawings of the west elevation and a sample of the proposed brick and stucco. Mr. Figures agreed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that the Board carry the application over to the next Board meeting on September 17. Mr. Howle seconded the motion, which the Board approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.