

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Vice Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Janelle Adams (alternate), Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Karrie Maurin (*arrived at 3:09*), Craig Roberts, Gypsyie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

Members Absent: Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Andre Rathle, and Joseph Rodrigues

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Shayla Beaco, Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, Jim DeLapp, Marion McElroy, and John Sledge.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the August 3, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: RGH Development LLC

- a. Property Address: 167 S. Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2022
- c. Project: Repaint house in Benjamin Moore colors as follows: Body: Queen Anne Pink; Trim: White Dove; Porch and other accent areas: Black Forest Green.

2. Applicant: Brian Doyle

- a. Property Address: 1752 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2022
- c. Project: Replace approx. 20 ft. of white 6in gutter in-kind on west side of garage.

3. Applicant: EZ-Roof & EZ-Restoration LLC

- a. Property Address: 10 S. Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/27/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Weatherwood color.

4. Applicant: Joe Huff Enterprises LLC

- a. Property Address: 1104 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Tamko shingles in black.

5. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 715 Monroe Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/29/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with composition shingles in Georgetown Gray color.

6. Applicant: Mobile Land and Realty Co., LLC

- a. Property Address: 300 George Street

- b. Date of Approval: 8/01/2022
 - c. Project: Repaint entire house in the following colors (BLP): Body: Fort Gaines Blue; Trim/accent: DeTonti Square White; Porch: Light Grey.
- 7. Applicant: Bayside Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1109 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/04/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in charcoal color.
- 8. Applicant: B & M Roofing & Construction LLC**
- a. Property Address: 1311 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/04/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with GAF Shingles in Barkwood color.
- 9. Applicant: DBK Incorporated**
- a. Property Address: 950 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/01/2022
 - c. Project: Reissue of COA originally issued on 7/22/2021: Construct rear addition.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-43-CA: 926 Conti Street

- a. Applicant: Taylor Atchison
- b. Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Construct 6-8' wood privacy fence parallel to Conti Street

DENIED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-45-CA: 455 S. Broad Street

- a. Applicant: Architecture & Design, Inc. on behalf of Point Cartwright Properties
- b. Project: Storefront renovation; install awning on façade; repaint brick veneer

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-46-CA: 255 West Street

- a. Applicant: Lydia Blackwell
- b. Project: Demolition of non-historic additions

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2022-47-CA: NW corner of S. Claiborne and Canal streets

- a. Applicant: Michael Cartoski on behalf of FD Stonewater/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- b. Project: Concept Approval: Construct 6-story office building and related site improvements

APPROVED IN CONCEPT - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for September 7, 2022.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (christine.dawson@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, August 16, 2022. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	926 Conti St.	APPLICATION NO.	2022-43-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	After-the-Fact Approval: Construct 6-8' wood privacy fence parallel to Conti Street		
APPLICANT	Taylor Atchison	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	8/3/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

According to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District National Register nomination, the one and one-half story frame Gulf Coast Cottage type house was constructed c. 1900. The 1878 Hopkins map shows two small, rectangular structures on the property, both located much closer to Conti Street than the existing house. The chain of title reveals that the property was owned by Fannie Shepherd when the house is believed to have been constructed. The property subsequently was sold to Harold S. Walker, who lived in the house until at least 1911 and sold furniture at various addresses on Dauphin Street. Walker constructed the western section of the furniture warehouse located north of the house by 1907, and this arrangement is shown on the 1904 Sanborn map. The houses neighboring to the east and west were located as they are today, much closer to Conti Street. By the time of the 1925 Sanborn map, the property looked much as it does today; the property had been expanded to the east north of the house and included a four-story brick storage warehouse stretching the width of the northern property line. The warehouse, which included two elevators, was labeled “Walker’s Storage Warehouse.”

According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has appeared once previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In January 2021, the ARB approved moving the existing house approximately 60’ south on the lot.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application, plans, and communications)

1. Install wooden privacy fence ranging in height from 6’ to 8’ between the west elevation of the existing house and the western property line, approximately 30’ north of the Conti Street right-of-way (ROW).

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.

- Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48", depending on the location of the fence, shall be given...If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36", or in some cases 48".
- For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area to not exceed 48" in height.
- Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
- Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE):

- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered. (10.2)

B. Staff Analysis

The one and one-half-story Gulf Coast cottage at 926 Conti Street is a Contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under consideration is the after-the-fact approval of a wooden privacy fence ranging in height from 6' (72") to 8' (96") and running parallel to Conti Street.

The *Guidelines* state that fencing enclosing a parking area associated with a commercial use should not exceed 48" in height. (A.1) The existing parking area is associated with a residential use (condominiums), so this directive does not precisely apply to this case. The application proposes maintaining a wooden privacy fence with two gates (one pedestrian, one vehicular) that ranges in height from 6' (72") to 8' (96"), obscuring the parking area for residential condominiums.

The existing fencing over 6' in height exceeds the maximum 72" height allowed by the *Guidelines* when fencing is located behind the front building plane. The *Guidelines* further instruct that fencing located between two uses that may be at odds, such as a single-family residence and a commercial enterprise, may have an approved height up to 8' (96"). (A.1) However, the fencing in question separates a parking area for a residential condominium building from the Conti Street view, running east-west within the same tax parcel (zoned LB-2, Limited Neighborhood Business, which permits retail establishments and single- and multi-family residential uses). An approximate 6' fence exists between (running north-south along the property line) the house at 930 Conti Street, forward of the house's front plane, and the subject property. File photos from 1983 show that fencing of similar height was in place at that time, existing between two residential properties (the house at 928 Conti Street was extant at the time of the photo). The fence, therefore, was in existence prior to the listing of Old Dauphin Way in the National Register in 1984 and was not subject to design review.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The installed fencing exceeds the prescribed 48" height for fencing enclosing parking areas and is not in accordance with the *Guidelines*.
- The installed fencing exists within a single parcel and does not separate disparate uses, such as commercial and residential; therefore, fencing up to 8' is not permissible under the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTION

The existing fence does not separate two disparate uses, such as a commercial enterprise and a single-family residence or a single-family residence and a multi-family residence. Instead, it separates a parking

area from a small grassy area. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, Staff suggests that the fence be extended north, parallel to the west elevation of the existing single-family residence, then east behind the residence, thus separating the residence from the parking area intended for use by the multi-family residences behind (north of) the residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the wooden privacy fencing exceeding 6' in height installed at 926 Conti Street, as currently situated, impairs the historic integrity of the subject property and the surrounding district and suggests extending the existing fence such that it separates the single-family residence from the condominiums/parking area, bringing the fencing into compliance with the *Guidelines*. Pending the incorporation of this suggested modification, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Atchison was present to discuss the application. He distributed photos to the Board of similar fences in the district. He stated he wasn't aware that fencing was not part of the plans that had been approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He added that the main reasons for the height of the fence are security and to screen the parking area, and in his belief the scale works with the warehouse and the Creole cottage. He noted fences of similar or higher heights nearby on Conti Street.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts questioned whether Mr. Atchison was aware that he needed to apply for approval of the fence. Mr. Atchison replied that the entire redevelopment of the property was a complicated process and reiterated his belief that the fence was approved with a land disturbance permit.

Ms. Davis asked Staff to clarify their suggestions. Ms. Dawson explained her suggestions.

Mr. Atchison stated that he was not amenable to the suggestions because the house is meant to be part of the condo community. He further stated that he interprets the *Guidelines* as requiring fencing to be similar other fencing in the neighborhood.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Atchison to explain his logic of having a 6'0" fence at the driveway and an 8'0" fence at the grassy area with pedestrian gate. Mr. Atchison explained it was an issue of weight and wind loads.

Mr. Allen questioned whether 8'0" was necessary for security, and whether a 6'0" fence would provide sufficient security.

Mr. Atchison stated that he would amend his application to lower his fence by 6" to make it more compatible with fences in the neighborhood.

FINDING FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report as amended by the applicant to lower the fence by 6".

The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed reduction of the existing 8' fence height by 6" would impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should not be granted.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was passed on a 7-2 basis, with Ms. Davis and Mr. Blackwell opposed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	455 S. Broad Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-45-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Installation of new storefront fenestration and canopy; repaint brick exterior.		
APPLICANT	Timothy Spafford	OWNER, IF OTHER	Point Cartwright Properties LLC

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	08/17/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Non-contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The subject property is a one-story brick commercial building. The property does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn map but is depicted on the 1924 publication of said map. It is shown as a brick store with a frame garage attached to the east, or rear, elevation. A 1965 Parcel Appraisal Report includes a sketch of the building appearing in footprint much as it did in 1924. A photo of the same time illustrates a storefront window system of large display windows with transoms above. Centered on the façade (west elevation) are a set of glass and wood double doors flanked by side lights and transom above. There is a large multi-pane window on the western ends of both the north and south elevations. Photos from 2007 show that after 1965 the storefront was altered with window openings on the west, north and south elevations infilled with brick and glass block. The double doors were replaced with a single door flanked by a small glass block window on either side. In 2019 this later infill fabric was removed, allowing for original masonry opening to be restored. These openings are currently covered with plywood.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In 2019 the Board approved an application to remove the later brick and glass infill and install a new aluminum storefront window system in the original masonry openings. However, this project was never completed.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Install new storefront fenestration on west façade and eastern ends of both north and south elevations.
 - a. The new storefront windows and doors would be of anodized aluminum framing and tinted, insulated glass.
 - b. The new fenestration would fit existing masonry openings.
2. Install a metal roofing panel canopy which would stretch across the storefront above the window transoms.

- a. The metal canopy would be supported by four (4) hot dipped galvanized steel tube canopy brackets centered on each of the four pilasters on the façade.
3. Modify existing and install new fenestration on the east (rear elevation).
 - a. An existing door located on the center of the rear elevation would be replaced with a hollow metal door to fit existing opening.
 - b. A door and window currently located on the northern end of the rear elevation would be replaced with one anodized aluminum storefront window with tinted, insulated glass. This new window would fit a modified opening currently occupied by the existing window and door; it would be equal in size to the storefront windows located on the north and south elevations.
4. Repair and repaint exterior brick.
 - a. The paint will be Sherwin Williams in the following colors:
 Exterior brick: Alabaster (SW 7008)
 Trim: Manor House (SW 7505)

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)*:

1. **7.29** Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.
 - Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.
 - Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.
 - Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the installation of a new storefront, the addition of a new canopy across the façade, minor fenestration modifications on the east (rear) elevation, and repainting the existing brick exterior. The proposed work would maintain the original orientation of the building. Further, the proposed removal of later fabric on the façade and north and south elevations would allow for original openings to be maintained and fitted with fenestration similar to the more traditional storefront window system seen in the c. 1965 photo of the subject building. Although there is no evidence of the building ever having a canopy, the proposed metal canopy is consistent with historic examples within the district. (A.1)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed work follows the *Design Review Guidelines* for changes to non-historic commercial buildings

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the installation of a new storefront and canopy and other proposed work at 455 S. Broad Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Timothy Spafford was present to discuss the application. He stated he had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACT

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed installation of new storefront fenestration and canopy and repainting of the brick exterior would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	255 West Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-46-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolition of rear additions		
APPLICANT	Lydia Blackwell	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Leinkauf	MEETING DATE	08/17/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

The dwelling at 255 West Street is a frame two-story mission/craftsman foursquare built c. 1910. It is located in the Flo-Clair neighborhood, a planned park-like development laid out in the early twentieth century as part of the suburban expansion west of Mobile.

The 1925 Sanborn Map depicts the form of the main dwelling much as it appears today. On this map, there are two accessory structures located along the east (rear) property line, each designated as a garage. The smaller of these two, which is located to the north, is no longer extant as its form and orientation does not align with any accessory structures currently located on the property. The larger of the two may be the hipped roof one-story garage structure located on the property today, as a structure of similar form can be depicted in an aerial photograph from 1952, although it is difficult to decisively confirm. Other more modern one-story ancillary structures sit on the property today. One abuts the rear (east elevation) of the dwelling and runs eastward along the north property line, and a second, smaller adjacent structure runs south along the east (rear) portion of the property, abutting the garage structure on its north elevation. A cinder block wall also adjoins the garage structure on its south elevation. According to aerial photos, it appears these two more modern structures were possibly constructed between 1955 and 1967.

According to the MHDC file, this property has never previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Demolish accessory buildings located east (to the rear) of the main dwelling, to include the flat-roof structure which extends eastward off the rear of the historic dwelling; the garage structure with adjacent small storage areas which extend southward at the eastern end of the property; and the cinder block wall which is located south east of the garage.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*:

1. Demolition Guidelines (12.0)

- a) Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic
- b) Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition

Impact on the street

- c) Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
- d) Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
- e) Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.

Nature of Proposed Development

- f) Consider the future utilization of the site.
- g) If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the demolition of a series of one-story vinyl-clad adjoining accessory structures located to the rear of the historic dwelling on the property. They include a flat roof one-story structure which abuts the rear of the dwelling and runs eastward along the north property line, a second smaller structure which runs south along the east (rear) portion of the property, a hipped roof garage and an adjacent cinder block wall. With the possible exception of the hipped roof garage structure which could conceivably contain part of the fabric of an ancillary building which was extant in 1925 – yet has been significantly altered with vinyl siding, a modern vinyl garage door, and additions on either side – these structures are not historic, nor do they contribute to the historic character of the property or the surrounding historic district.

The buildings proposed for demolition hold no significance and are in poor condition. Because they are located at the rear of the property, only part of the hipped roof garage structure and the cinder block wall are visible from the street. The buildings can be seen from the alleyway which runs behind the property to the east. Further, the proposed development of the site post-demolition will return the rear of the property to a grassy yard. Demolishing these structures would serve to restore historic character to the views from the street and rear alleyway, the surrounding structures, neighboring properties and the historic district.

(1. a – g)

C. Summary of Analysis

The structures proposed for demolition at 255 West Street do not contribute to the historic integrity of this property or that of the surrounding district. The proposed demolition and return of the rear of the property to a yard will serve to appreciate the historic character of the immediate neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the demolition of accessory structures at 255 West Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Lydia Blackwell was present to discuss the application. She stated she had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACT

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed demolition of rear additions would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS/PARCEL	R022906400013012	APPLICATION NO.	2022-47-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Concept Approval: Construct 6-story office building at northwest corner of Claiborne and Canal streets; site improvements		
APPLICANT	Michael Cartoski/FD Stonewater on behalf of USACE	OWNER, IF OTHER	City of Mobile (land)
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	8/17/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The larger parcel of which the subject parcel was part, is occupied by the 1964 Civic Center, a complex composed of an arena, a theater, and an exposition hall. As shown on the 1876 Hopkins ward map of Mobile showing the area bounded by Church, Lawrence, Canal, and Claiborne streets - the land on which the Civic Center and associated parking now exist - was densely developed with residences. The 1885 Sanborn map illustrates only the far northwest corner of the current Civic Center property, showing an area densely populated with one-story frame dwellings, “tenements”, and “shanties.” A two-story brick stable with attached one-story brick barber shop is shown on Lawrence Street just north of the current location of Civic Center Drive. Two grocery stores, one at the northeast corner of Monroe and Lawrence and one at the southwest corner of Monroe and Hamilton, were recorded, and a saloon was placed at the southeast corner of Monroe and Lawrence.

The entire Civic Center area is illustrated on the 1891 Sanborn map, which continues to show a densely developed residential area. Interspersed with the mostly one-story frame houses of varying size were grocery stores, barber shops, an ice cream shop, retail stores, a fire station, a church, a saloon, and a restaurant. By the time the 1904 Sanborn map was prepared, more residences including more two-story dwellings were present, and the variety of businesses appears to have narrowed. A two-story frame residence with apparent bay window on its façade was shown at the northeast corner of Monroe and Franklin streets, and a two-story brick furniture store was at the opposite end of the block at the northwest corner of Monroe and Franklin streets. The neighborhood included a Chinese laundry, a barber, Bethel A.M.E. Church, and a furniture warehouse.

The 1924 Sanborn map, updated in 1955, shows a similar pattern with a few exceptions. A cinder block dwelling had been constructed at the southwest corner of Hamilton and Eslava streets at some point between 1924 and 1955, and a cinder block addition had been made to a frame house on Claiborne Street south of Monroe in the same period. The grocery stores and barbers seem to have disappeared, and the block bounded by Madison, Claiborne, Canal, and Franklin streets had been cleared for use as a “Public

Play Ground” complete with public restrooms. The two and one-half story brick Robert E. Lee Public School occupied the block bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets.

Available aerial photographs of the Civic Center area taken in 1938, 1952, 1955, and 1960 show essentially the same development as reflected in the 1924/1955 Sanborn map. By the time of the next available aerial photograph, 1967, more than seven blocks had been leveled to make way for the Civic Center. The only structure remaining was the public school bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. The school disappeared by the time of the next available aerial photograph, taken in 1980.

Per the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, the larger parcel, of which the subject parcel was part until recently, has appeared three (3) times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In November 1983, the ARB approved placement of a commemorative plaque on a brick base at the corner of Claiborne Street and Auditorium Drive (now Civic Center Drive). The installation of a 100’ telecommunications tower and construction of a one-story 10’x16’ accessory structure on a small parcel to the immediate north of the subject parcel were approved by the ARB in July 1998. The ARB approved the construction of two steel and glass bus shelters located along the Lawrence Street side of the parcel was approved in October 2009.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans)

1. Construct 6-story office building at the southeast corner of the property.
 - a. The building footprint would measure 284’ along the Canal Street (south) elevation and 120’ along the Claiborne Street (east) elevation. The primary entrance would be located on the west side of the building in a cutout of the northwest corner creating an entry porch. The central bay on the east and west elevations would be recessed from the outermost plane of the elevation by approximately 10’.
 - b. The building would be approximately 86’ high with a central HVAC penthouse adding an additional 14’ in height. The first floor would be 16’ in height; the floor-to-floor height for the second to sixth floors would be 14’.
 - c. The lowest two stories (base) of the building would be clad in a medium-dark brown brick laid in stretcher bond. The upper four stories would be constructed of 10’ precast architectural concrete, which would be painted a light color to contrast with the brick base.
 - d. The window and door materials are not specified at this time.
 - e. The roof would be flat.
 - f. The windows would be placed to line up vertically and appear to span two stories (first and second, third and fourth, fifth and sixth) with opaque spandrel glass separating the two floors. Spandrels would measure approximately 5’ high by 4’ wide.
 - 1) Windows on the first floor north, east, and south elevations and southern bay of the west elevation would be one-by-one fixed lights measuring 10’ wide by approximately 9’ high.
 - 2) Windows on the second floor north, east, and south elevations and southern bay of the west elevation would be one-by-one fixed lights measuring 5’ wide by approximately 5’-10” wide over single fixed lights measuring 5’ wide by 2’-6” high.
 - 3) Windows on the first and second floors at the western inset bay and entry cutout at the northwest corner would be full-height fixed light window walls, with individual lights measuring 5’ wide by approximately 9’ high over a single fixed light measuring 5’ wide by approximately 2’-6” high.
 - 4) Windows on the upper four stories on all elevations would consist of a larger upper light measuring 5’ wide by approximately 6’-7” high over single fixed lights measuring 5’ tall by 2’-6” high.

- 5) Windows on the upper four stories would be shaded with vertical sunshades protruding approximately 18" from the face of the building.
- g. The elevations would appear as follows.
 - 1) West (façade)
 - a) Base (bottom two floors): pier supporting overhang; paired entry doors; window wall; pier supporting overhang; recessed wall of windows at central third of elevation; one-by-one window; one-by-one window
 - b) Upper four floors: one-by-one window; one-by-one window; recessed wall of windows at central third of elevation; one-by-one window; one-by-one window
 - c) The main entry would be accessed via a set of steps with ramp from an entry drive off Canal Street. The steps/ramp would measure approximately 35' wide and be protected by security bollards of as-yet unspecified design.
 - d) The front entry also would be accessed by a secondary ramp, running perpendicular from the parking garage walkway proposed for the north side of the building.
 - 2) South elevation (all floors would have identical fenestration pattern): 18 evenly spaced units of one-by windows
 - 3) East elevation
 - a) First floor: one-by-one window; one-by-one window; paired doors accessing loading area; one-by-one window; one-by-one window
 - b) Second through sixth floors: one-by-one window; one-by-one window; recessed wall of windows at central third of elevation; one-by-one window; one-by-one window
 - 4) North elevation
 - a) First floor: 6 evenly spaced units of one-by windows; pair of doors accessing mechanical equipment yard; 9 evenly spaced units of one-by-one windows; pier supporting overhang
 - b) Second floor: 16 evenly spaced units of one-by windows; pier supporting overhang
 - c) Third through sixth floors: 18 evenly spaced units of one-by windows
 - d) The south wall of the porch created by the overhang of the third floor would be clad in an, as yet, unknown material resembling wood panels.

2. Site Improvements

- a. Demolish existing brick wall at the northwest corner of Claiborne and Canal streets, and remove any existing trees on the site.
- b. Remove existing pylon sign.
- c. Raise grade 4' for flood protection.
- d. Install 8' high metal picket fencing (material unspecified at this time) around site perimeter. The building would be set back from the Canal Street and Claiborne Street rights-of-way (ROWs) by 50'.
- e. Construct 4' high retaining walls to enclose two low planters (one on either side of the entry steps on the west side of the building). The planting beds would measure approximately 60'x35' and 60'x70'. The materials have not been specified.
- f. Plant a tree allée along the northern side of the building, bordering a walkway from a parking garage that is not part of this project.
- g. Construct a mechanical equipment yard enclosure measuring approximately 60' wide and 40' deep, approximately centered on the north elevation. The height and materials

of the enclosure are not specified.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. 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.
 - 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. (7.30)
2. 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.
 - 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. (7.34)
3. 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. (7.35)
4. 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. (7.36)
5. Although imitation is discouraged, traditional façade and material patterns used in historic structures should inform the design of new commercial structures in locally-designated historic districts. Traditional multi-story commercial façade composition in Mobile features a clear differentiation between the street level and upper floors. The street level generally appears taller than other floors and has a high percentage of fixed plate glass with a small percentage of opaque framing materials, a bulkhead, and a recessed entry. An upper floor... is the reverse – opaque materials dominate, and windows appear as smaller openings punctuating a more solid wall. (7.0)
6. 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. (7.40)76. 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. (7.41)
7. In order to assure that historic resources are appreciated as authentic contributing buildings, it is important that new buildings be distinguishable from them. Therefore, new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area...Building materials and finishes for new structures...should contribute to the visual continuity of the district and appear similar to those seen traditionally. (7.0)
8. Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
- Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48” in height if located in the front yard.
 - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish, and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
 - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district. (10.2)
9. Acceptable Fence Materials: Materials that have a similar character, durability, and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
- wood picket
 - wood slat
 - wood lattice
 - iron or steel
 - historically appropriate wire fences
 - aluminum that appears similar to iron

Unacceptable Fence Materials: Materials that do not have a similar character, durability, and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:

- chain link
 - stockade
 - post and rail
 - Masonite
 - PVC
 - plywood or asbestos paneling
 - razor wire
 - barbed wire (10.3)
10. Visually connect the street and building.
- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry. (10.5)

B. Staff Analysis

The application under consideration is for concept approval of the construction of a 6-story office building and site improvements at the southeast corner of what is known as the Civic Center site. The existing Civic Center buildings were considered Non-Contributing elements to the Church Street East district at the time of the last survey in 2005. The proposed site does not fall into any of the commercial contexts (Main Street, Commercial Corridor, Interior Neighborhood) outlined in the *Guidelines*.

The *Guidelines* offer instruction on designing commercial structures that are compatible with Mobile's historic districts. One important element of compatibility is the orientation of a new structure. Because the proposed site for the new office building is not in close proximity to other buildings in the district, the proposed 50' setback from South Claiborne Street and Canal Street would not be contrary to the *Guidelines*' direction to, "Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings." The *Guidelines* continue to instruct that, if there are no directly adjacent historic buildings, the setbacks of nearby historic structures should be used as guidance. (A.1) Unfortunately, the closest historic structure is the residence at 501 Eslava Street, which is approximately 460' to the northwest. The building type and distance from the proposed new building make 501 Eslava Street a poor reference for a commercial type building setback.

The primary entry for the proposed new building would face west, toward a new entry drive to the Civic Center site. This placement is contrary to the *Guidelines*, which state that primary entries should face the public street. (A.1)

The design and scale of a commercial building also are key elements for compatibility with a surrounding historic district. The *Guidelines* again refer to "nearby historic structures," which in this specific case do not exist. The *Guidelines* do, however, instruct, "Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility." This can be accomplished with the use of vertical and horizontal articulation and changes in color, texture, and materials. (A.2) The *Guidelines* further instruct that, "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." (A.4) The design of the proposed office building incorporates inset notches on the east and west (short) elevations to break up their mass. The design also calls for the use of brick veneer at the base (lowest two floors) of the building to differentiate it from the upper four floors. The long north and south elevations, however, would not be broken into smaller components to alleviate their massive appearance, which is not compatible with the district.

As noted above, the proposed design would incorporate a building "base" (the brick veneered lower two floors), as prescribed by the *Guidelines*. (A.3) The *Guidelines* also direct that taller buildings should have a distinctive "middle" and "cap"; however, the proposed six-story height of the building is not conducive to such a design. The proposed design accomplishes the *Guidelines*' instruction to maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floors on multi-story structures and incorporate a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the primary facade. (A.6)

The proportions and placement (grouped and vertically aligned) of the proposed windows are similar to those seen in tall historic buildings in Mobile such as the Van Antwerp Building (1907), the Waterman Building (1947), and the First National Bank/Trustmark Building (1964). Therefore, while there are no similarly sized historic commercial buildings within the district, the windows do reflect the traditional proportions of historic tall buildings in Mobile's nearby Lower Dauphin Street Commercial district. (A.6)

While new buildings in historic districts should be compatible with the surrounding district, it is critical that they not attempt to recreate historic structures, but be distinguishable from them. As the *Guidelines* state, “new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area.” (A.7) In that vein, building materials and finishes for new structures should be visually similar to those seen traditionally, but they need not match. (A.7) The exterior wall materials of the proposed office building would be brick veneer and precast architectural concrete. The brick veneer would recall the long tradition of brick construction in Mobile, and the precast architectural concrete would be visually similar to panels seen on the First National Bank/Trustmark Building and the Waterman Building.

The proposed site improvements include creation of two planting beds at the west entry to the building, installation of 8’ metal fencing at the perimeter of the leased parcel, and installation of security bollards at the west entrance to the building. The *Guidelines* provide that fencing along street frontages be no higher than 48”, well below the proposed 96”. (A.9) The ARB in the past year has recognized unique situations in which higher fencing might be justified. In this specific case, the fencing essentially would replace an existing brick wall at the corner of South Claiborne and Canal streets. The proposed fence would provide excellent visibility to the new building, whereas the existing wall provides no visibility into the Civic Center site. These facts, combined with the USACE’s security requirements, may be basis to consider permitting an 8’ fence at this site.

The *Guidelines* direct that there should be a visual connection between the street and a building in a historic district, recommending a walkway between the sidewalk and the main entrance. (A.10) The proposed office building’s main entrance would face an internal driveway, rather than Canal Street or South Claiborne Street, thus making compliance with this guideline difficult if not impossible.

C. Summary of Analysis

- Because the proposed site of the new office building is more than 450’ away from the nearest historic building in the district, there are no “nearby historic buildings” in the district to use as reference.
- The primary entrance for the new building would not face the public street, contrary to the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed building materials, as presented, are compatible with other historic buildings of similar scale, but differentiate the building as non-historic.
- The window and door materials have not been specified.
- The long north and south elevations of the proposed building are not compatible with the traditional massing of the district.
- The proposed 8’ fencing would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district.

STAFF SUGGESTIONS

Staff suggests the following design modifications to bring the proposed office building into full compliance with the *Guidelines*.

- Create an entry (or the appearance of an entry) on the south side of the building. Such a doorway might offer access to the broad grassy area along Canal Street for building users. Installation of a walkway from Canal Street to the entry on the south elevation, even if not in use, would visually connect the building to a public street.
- Incorporate recesses or projecting bays into the north and south elevations to alleviate their

massive, monotonous appearance.

- Provide proposed materials for windows, doors, exterior stairs/ramps, fencing, retaining walls, bollards, and mechanical equipment enclosures on the roof and ground. Provide details on exterior lighting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes the proposed 6-story office building and related site improvements at the northwest corner of South Claiborne and Canal streets, in concept, would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application in concept, with full approval contingent on design changes and provision of materials information as outlined above.

Ms. Kathleen Huffman recused herself from consideration of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Richard Mann, from FD Stonewater and Mr. Richard Van Zeyl, from Wight & Company, were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Mann stated that the existing building used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is now obsolete and held that security needs are part of what is driving the proposed project. (He referenced the recent incident at the FBI field office in Cincinnati, OH). Mr. Mann added that high security buildings call for a balance between guideline compliance and security requirements.

Mr. Van Zeyl stated that his firm, Wight & Company, specializes in secure facilities. He presented an overview of the proposed plan to the Board in which he described the building project and clarified the following matters.

- The application at hand seeks concept approval because the full “Civic Center Site” is a comprehensive redevelopment project which is not yet entirely planned at this point.
- He described the I-10 bridge work along South Claiborne Street and its effects on the subject property.
- The proposed parking garage would be for the USACE employees and also for use by the public after office hours.
- The building would be raised 4’ above grade for flood resiliency. Retaining walls placed on the site would also serve this purpose.
- The 50’ setback clear zone, 8’ security fence, and bollards are all requirements for federally secure buildings.
- The entrance would be placed as shown on the submitted plans to allow for closer access from parking garage.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked if the building could be mirrored or “flipped” to allow for the rear loading dock area to be located on the interior of the parcel, improving the view of the building from I-10, and bringing the building into compliance with the *Guidelines* with an entry facing the street (Claiborne Street). Mr. Van Zeyl replied that Claiborne Street as currently known won’t exist, as it will become an off-ramp from I-10.

Mr. Jim DeLapp, Executive Director of Public Works, clarified that the Alabama Department of Transportation shows a ramp coming out of the Wallace tunnel onto Claiborne Street, which will essentially dead end. Therefore, the loading dock area proposed in the application will become “back of house.”

Mr. Roberts asked how many people will work in the USACE, as a 1,000-space parking garage is being planned. Mr. Van Zeyl replied there are around 900 employees. Mr. Mann stated that the garage will be for the public, not just USACE employees.

Mr. Allen observed that, when exiting the tunnel, people will see the loading dock and rear access to the building. This will be their first impression of Mobile. Mr. Van Zeyl suggested that landscaping could be added to area.

Mr. Allen stated that he is afraid that if the Board approves this application in concept as it is, that the design won't be the best it could be because there are so many unknowns and moving parts regarding the development of the Civic Center site and the surrounding area.

Mr. Blackwell stated that breaking up this mega-block in one of the oldest historic districts in Alabama would benefit the proposed design and that implementing variety in the form of advances and recesses to the very visible south elevation would improve the building's compatibility with the surrounding historic district, as would upgrading the design of the fence; the view of a gym upon entering this building does not lend the dignified air which a federal building should project. Mr. Blackwell added that he would strongly advise following up on Staff suggestions contained in the Staff report.

Mr. Roberts suggested that the federal courthouse recently completed has all the security requirements and fits into the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Van Zeyl explained that the thin-set brick veneer on the bottom two floors, followed by architectural concrete panels above, was designed to meet progressive collapse requirements and help to break up the six (6) stories into three (3) sets of two (2), alleviating the perception of a “tall building.” The open entryway “announces” the entry with a two-story carveout instead of a canopy, and the perforated metal sunshade panels will lend a traditional shutter aesthetic while breaking up the monotonous concrete structure. He noted that, given the orientation of the building, horizontal sunshades might make more sense, and that detail is not finalized. He also stated that the orientation of the building could be shifted to better align with the parking garage.

Mr. Roberts stated the problem is in the massing, not the detailing.

Ms. Van Antwerp requested that Mr. Blackwell repeat his statement regarding suggestions and alterations. Mr. Blackwell cited the previously mentioned solutions to massing in the form of advances and recesses, etc., restated his comments in regards to the dignity of the entrance to this proposed federal building, and added that the modified “shutters” are a great tie-in to other elements which could be added that are signature “Mobile” and could serve to link the building to the historic district's architectural character.

(Ms. Van Antwerp departed at 4:16 pm)

Mr. Mann explained that this proposed building is a federally leased facility, as opposed to a federally built facility. Therefore, this building has a lower budget and less opportunity for flexibility.

Ms. Maurin stated that she thinks the building is a good modernist design. She questioned if the designers had taken into account the effect of the coal dust in Mobile would have on light-colored architectural concrete panels, as the coal dust does not patina as well on modern buildings.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Carol Hunter, from Downtown Mobile Alliance, to comment on how this proposed building relates to the rest of the site and surrounding area. Ms. Hunter stated that this application is out of sequence, as the Downtown Development District Code requires the property to be master planned before rezoning occurs. Ms. Hunter continued that she is not sure how the site can be planned without knowing for sure what will happen with Claiborne and/or Joachim Street (which is also potentially slated to be dead-ended).

Ms. Maurin stated her opinion that designing buildings before the site is master planned is foolish.

Mr. DeLapp stated that the new “Map for Mobile” shows some ideas for this site and that the City has been working on master planning the site for years. He outlined the proposed master plan for the site, which was shown yesterday to the City Council and will be shown to the Planning Commission tomorrow. Mr. DeLapp added that the City is trying to master plan the site with the best information it has to date from the Alabama Department of Transportation, noting that there are three (3) parallel processes at work: the Civic Center building redevelopment, planning for the USACE building and garage, and the development of the rest of the parcel.

Ms. Maurin commented that she thinks we can do better than dead-ending streets and questioned if that is what we are designing for.

Ms. Marie Dyson, president of the Church Street East Historic Neighborhood Association, asked if the drive to the proposed building will be accessed by an extension of Eslava off Lawrence Street.

Mr. DeLapp replied that the concept shows Eslava Street connecting through to Water Street, but there will be no additional access off of Lawrence Street. The access to drive to the proposed office building will be from Canal Street. Mr. DeLapp further mentioned that the access road to the proposed building is more of a drive than a thoroughfare. Mr. Van Zeyl agreed with Mr. DeLapp and added that the intentional jog in the driveway design is to prevent people from cutting through.

Ms. Maurin asked if the area under the I-10 interstate interchange is undevelopable. Mr. DeLapp stated that it will be turned back over the City after the reconfiguration by ALDOT, and will at that time be developable land.

Councilman William Carroll stated his opinion that, if Claiborne and Joachim get dead-ended, Lawrence Street would become a major thoroughfare and access to the auditorium. He continued that the lack of a master plan hurts us and that he would hate to see buildings which don't go together. Mr. Carroll stated that, before moving forward, there needs to be a master plan with some major questions answered.

Mr. DeLapp stated that the entrance to the parking garage would be off Claiborne, as would the entrance to the loading dock of the proposed office building, so it would always have some traffic flow. Mr. DeLapp further stated that he did not want to derail the purpose for the Architectural Review Board (ARB), which is to review the design of the building.

Mr. Carroll stated that a master plan would strengthen the position of the ARB – not weaken it – giving them a clear concept to then determine if the proposed plan fits within the character of the historic district.

Mr. DeLapp stated that he wishes to keep the process moving forward.

Mr. Wagoner stated that purpose of the ARB is to approve the conceptual design and noted that comments have been given from the public and the Board.

Mr. Van Zeyl asked that the scope of “concept” approval be explained.

Ms. Dawson stated that the ARB has the authority to approve basic height, placement on site, etc. and can ask for additional details and final design.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the designers must give thought to adding advances and recesses to the southern elevation of the building, but that he is agreeable to the proposed height and required institutional setbacks.

Mr. DeLapp stated that the parcel has been subdivided off; therefore, the building cannot be moved and its size will remain the same. Interior plans and nuances to the elevations won’t change the footprint.

(Ms. Adams departed at 4:49 pm)

Mr. Allen stated his concern that the building would turn its back on Claiborne Street, with the unknowns regarding the reconfiguration of surrounding streets by ALDOT.

Mr. DeLapp stated that the City would seek some surety from ALDOT regarding those plans.

Mr. Wagoner moved to poll the ARB in regard to the general height and location of the proposed building on the site.

Mr. Van Zeyl asked how to achieve full approval if there are so many unknowns.

Mr. DeLapp stated that the master plans and ALDOT plans can be acquired, though the materials and character of the building would not change.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the ARB was not approving the materials or character of the building today.

Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Davis felt that the long facades must be broken up. Ms. Davis stated her appreciation for the metal sunshade ‘fins’, that they had a great deal of potential if implemented correctly.

RESOLUTION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that the proposed office building, in regard to the proposed square footage/footprint, height of the building (six stories), height of the fence, and proposed setbacks, and with special attention paid to staff suggestions, *in concept* would not impair the historic or architectural character of the surrounding district.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ms. Dawson reminded Board members to respond to the emailed Outlook appointment regarding a meeting to discuss alternative materials.
2. Ms. Dawson asked that an ARB member volunteer to represent the ARB regarding an appeal of one of their decisions when it is heard by City Council next week.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.