

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

January 18th, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Nick Holmes III, Steve Stone, Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen and Robert Brown.

Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and David Barr.

Staff Members Present: Shayla Beaco, Cartledge W. Blackwell, Florence Kessler, Matthew Anderson, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.

2. The Board reviewed the application on the agenda, 55 N. Ann Street.
3. Mr. Stone moved to amend minutes from November 18th meeting with Ms. Flo Kessler's comments responses to Mr. Bob Allen's comments. The motion received a second and passed with one opposed.
4. Mr. Stone then moved to approve midmonth CoA's granted by staff for the January 18th meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Adrienne Golden on behalf of Fuse Project
 - A. Property Address: 200 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/8/2016
 - C. Project: Install a 2' x 5' double sided diagonal corner hanging blade sign printed on 3mm max metal to be 8' above sidewalk.
2. **Applicant:** Adam Kerian on behalf of St8 (State) Permits
 - A. Property Address: 152 Hannon Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/8/2016
 - C. Project: Repair and replace wood to match existing on rear porch.
3. **Applicant:** Charlana Quiovess
 - A. Property Address: 9 S. Joachim Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/8/2016
 - C. Project: Install aluminum 3' x 3' hanging blade sign.
4. **Applicant:** David Miller
 - A. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/8/2016 (Partial Renewal of previous CoA)
 - C. Project: Restoration/ rehabilitation of rear elevation on main house including construction of dormer windows (previously approved by ARB). Install appropriate siding to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint as necessary. Install eight foot wooden privacy fence in rear lot (house adjacent to multi-family). Said fence will be shadow boxed with boxed lattice top. (Lot is adjacent to multi-family.) Remove later concrete paving

in front of house (driving/ parking pad). Install wooden picket fence enclosing the front yard. The fence will feature a pedestrian gate and possibly inward-opening vehicular gate(s).

- 5. Applicant:** Robin Rockstall on behalf of the Archdiocese of Mobile
 - A. Property Address: 2 S. Claiborne Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/12/2016
 - C. Project: Repair and when necessary replace posts and sections of iron fencing damaged as a consequence of a fallen tree. The repair and/or replacement of ironwork will match the existing in design, location, dimension, and material.
- 6. Applicant:** ALFA Season, LLC
 - A. Property Address: 1402 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/13/2016
 - C. Project: Replace commercial windows to match the existing.
- 7. Applicant:** Jonathan Peeden
 - A. Property Address: 1455 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/13/2016
 - C. Project: Construct 6' dog-eared wooden fence. Install along side perimeter of lot and rear of lot, not to exceed front facade plane. Wooden gate to access driveway.
- 8. Applicant:** Michael Spina
 - A. Property Address: 1252 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/14/2016
 - C. Project: Install single face metal and wood sign to bolt and weld to existing structure. Sign will be 13'W x 2'H and placed 8' above the ground per submitted plans. Construct and install monument sign in front of property per guidelines no more than 25 sq. ft. and 5' tall. Up lighting will be in planters.
- 9. Applicant:** Michael Liljegren
 - A. Property Address: 304 State Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/15/2016
 - C. Project: Erect six foot privacy fence north side of property, dropping down to four feet where it ties in with existing metal fence.
- 10. Applicant:** Construction Expert LLC on behalf of Bill Finch
 - A. Property Address: 1106 Savannah Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/15/2016
 - C. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in weatherwood.
- 11. Applicant:** Preston Thompson
 - A. Property Address: 154 Houston Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/15/2016
 - C. Project: Prime house white.
- 12. Applicant:** Douglas Kearley on behalf of David Rasp
 - A. Property Address: 72 S. Royal street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/16/2016
 - C. Project: Install 20' x 6' aluminum canopy with surface mounted can lights on the underside to be mounted at least 8' above sidewalk.

- 13. Applicant:** Windell Quimby
- A. Property Address: 553-571 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/15/2016
 - C. Project: Phase I of Larger Restoration/ Rehabilitation:
Remove concrete infilled windows on second floor (of easternmost units). Install six-over-six windows composed of wither wood, aluminum, clad, or extruded aluminum within the aforementioned openings. The window units will be properly cased and recessed. Repair boarding within existing ground floor storefront unit. Replace boarding in locations where deteriorated and repaint building in approved color scheme: white with green within infilled wooden storefronts and trim. Reroof.
- 14. Applicant:** Edward and Nancy Barry
- A. Property Address: 329 McDonald Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/20/2016
 - C. Project: Re-glaze windows and repaint the dwelling.
- 15. Applicant:** Steve Stone on behalf of Frankie Little
- A. Property Address: 211 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/22/2016
 - C. Project: Replace face of two sided hanging blade sign within existing sign cabinet. Sign to be routed composite material, back lit, with no plastic or acrylic.
- 16. Applicant:** Wayne Bowen
- A. Property Address: 205 Church Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/28/2016
 - C. Project: Replace to match existing five one-light configuration aluminum clad windows on hyphen between historic buildings.
- 17. Applicant:** Rameh Khazen
- A. Property Address: 204 Rapier Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 12/30/2016
 - C. Project: Repair and replace exterior wood siding as needed to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repair existing shutters. Install framed wood lattice per MHDC Guidelines. Repaint exterior the following: Main body-Hardwick White; Trim: Soft and Sympathetic White; Porch Deck: Soft Moodiness Grey; Accent: Black Blue
- 18. Applicant:** Chris Murphy on behalf of Retirement Systems of Alabama
- A. Property Address: 107 St. Francis Unit 115
 - B. Date of Approval: 1/3/2017
 - C. Project: Install painted aluminum hanging blade sign.
- 19. Applicant:** Ron Diegan Construction
- A. Property Address: 203 S. Georgia
 - B. Date of Approval: 1/4/2016
 - C. Project: Reroof in architectural shingle in charcoal.
- 20. Applicant:** Ryan Campbell on behalf of Richard Beckish
- A. Property Address: 252 Rapier Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 1/4/2016
 - C. Project: Repair and replace fascia boards and dentil moulding to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-1-CA: 55 N. Ann Street: APPROVED

- A. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Mr. Noel Broughton
- B. Project: Restoration and Addition Related - Make in-kind repairs the main existing main residence; restore original rear galleries; remove later additions; make repairs to a rear addition; and construct a deck.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Legal
- 2. Midmonth Approvals
- 3. Chair and Vice Chair
- 4. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-1-CA: 55 N. Ann Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Mr. Noel Broughton
Received: 12/30/2016
Meeting: 1/18/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Project: Restoration and Addition Related - Make in-kind repairs the main existing main residence; restore original rear galleries; remove later additions; make repairs to a rear addition; and construct a deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

This extended Foursquare dwelling dates circa 1906. Built by Belle Hooks, the house possesses Colonial Revival features such as hipped roof, full width porch, cornice with dentils, and six-over-one windows. Minus significant changes to the rear elevation, both the remainder of the exterior and almost the whole of the original interior of this house remains little altered from its period of construction.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property last appeared before the Old Dauphin Way Architectural Review Board (ODWARB) in December 5, 1990. At that time a fence was permitted to be installed. The application up for review calls for the replacement and repair with in-kind materials, removal of porch infill, removal of later rear additions, making repairs to a rear addition, and construction of a deck.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material.”
2. “Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features substantiated by historic, physical, and pictorial evidence.”
3. When considering demolition of later portions of a building, the following criteria are taken into account “significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development.”
4. With regard to the deck, “wherever possible construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were removed, the essential form and historic integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
5. “Design an addition so overall characteristics of the site are retained.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Conduct in-kind repairs to the main residence (For this C-1, the sequence of work is enumerated first in general and then specific by elevation.).
 - a. Repair and/or replace wooden lattice skirted to match the existing in terms of material, design, and construction.
 - b. Repair and when necessary replace wooden siding to match the original as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - c. Repair and when necessary replicate wooden elements (shutters for instance) and details (rafters) to match the existing as per design, profile, and dimension.
 - d. Repair and when necessary replace wooden windows to match the existing as per material, light configuration, and moldings.
 - e. East Elevation (North Ann Street façade)
 - i. Repair cast iron grates.
 - ii. Repair capital and shafts of bases to match the existing. Install new bases to match the existing in certain or all situations.
 - iii. Repair and replace balustrade, cornice with detail, and tongue & groove decking to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
 - f. North Elevation (a side)
 - i. Remove existing downspout from easternmost portion.
 - ii. Remove piping from westernmost portion of original house.
 - g. South Elevation (a side, one alongside driveway)
 - i. An existing downspout will be removed and a new downspout will be installed at the eastern portion of the original residence.
 - ii. Remove infill from enclosed rear galleries and reinstate a reconstructed railing matching physical remnants of the original. (See B 2 & 3.).
2. Remove later rear additions (later first-story accretions, porch infill, and a sleeping porch).
3. Re-expose the original rear two-tiered gallery.
 - a. The galleries will feature two-square section porch posts per floor.

- b. Said porch posts will replicate extant enclosed and/or deteriorated porch posts.
 - c. Wooden picketed railings will enclose the upper gallery.
 - d. Said railings are based on those found on the building.
 - e. Repair and when necessary install tongue & groove porch decking.
 - f. Existing doors will access the galleries.
4. Repair an existing single story wing beginning located at the northwest corner of the West Elevation of the original residence.
- a. Wood siding and trim will be repaired or replaced to match existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - b. Repair existing windows and shutters to match as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and construction.
 - c. Some materials such as a door and transom, rafter tails, and shingles on the later additions proposed from removal will be salvaged on the subject area.
 - d. Ornamental rafter tails will be employed on the addition and match those under mounted on the existing eaves.
 - e. A hipped roof will surmount the addition.
 - f. Reused mineral fiber shingles will be employed on the aforementioned roof.
 - g. The South (a side – driveway-facing) Elevation will feature a glazed wood frame door and transom with surmounting bracketed wooden awning and a one-over-one window.
 - h. The West Elevation will feature the same fenestration pattern currently employed on the first floor.
 - i. The North (a side) Elevation will feature the same fenestration pattern
5. Construct a wooden deck off the existing rear elevation.
Said deck will be situated at the southwest corner of the dwelling and will feature steps (with attendant railing) off its western side opening onto the rear lawn.
6. Sand, prime, and repaint the residence. *The color scheme is yet to be determined.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application, one for restoration and addition related interventions, involves the following: the repair and/or replacement of deteriorated elements with in-kind materials; removal of porch infill; removal of later rear additions; making of repairs to a rear addition; and construction of a deck. Based on the pertinent sections of the Secretary of the Interior Standards and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, Staff believes that these rehabilitative efforts would positively impact a contributing residential structure. The work is minimally visible from the public view on account of the size of the lot, the situation of the dwelling on the lot, the elevation of the proposed changes, and composition of the house.

With regard to the in-kind repair and/or replacement of existing features, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible, but in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability (See B-1.). This house has suffered for deferred maintenance. As with any wooden buildings in a humid climate, the deterioration runs the gamut – siding, porch decking, columnar supports, railings, etc...When

material elements can be repaired, they will be so. In accord with the Section B, all replacement efforts will match the existing with regard to composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. The same principles will extend to the repairs to the existing rear wing. The fenestrations changes thereon are limited to one elevation of that portion of the dwelling – the South Elevation, an inner lot location. The proposed fenestration changes reflect those found on the dwelling and employ salvaged elements.

The proposed removal of the later porch infill, rear accretions, and later sunporch are all interventions that would impact constructions which are either minimally or not visible from the public view.

As per the removal of infill from the porch, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that the repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features substantiated by historic, physical, and pictorial evidence (See B-2.). In accord with the aforementioned, physical evidence in the form surviving walls, encased columns, ghosts of details, and surviving sections of railing clearly indicate the location, dimension, elements and treatment of the galleries proposed for restoration. Surviving fenestration will be retained in the spaces impacted.

Three later rear additions – a ground level addition, a small first-story space, and a second-story sleeping porch - are proposed for removal. When considering demolition of later portions of a building, the same criteria informing the review of demolitions of principle structures are taken into account. The reviewing criteria are as follows: significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development (See B-3.). The subject areas are two first-story additions off the center of the rear elevations and a second-story sleeping porch. With regard to architectural significance, the three spaces are not of the same architectural caliber and construction quality as the contributing main residence. While these additions illustrate the historical evolution of the building, that do not define its architectural significance. As evidenced by the photographs accompanying the application, site visits, and additional staff photographs, the condition of these constructions/spaces are not in the best states of repair. One of the two lower-story additions rises directly from the earth and serves as conduit for moisture and insects. The second-story sleeping porch exhibits interior and exterior signs of structural failure. With regard to the redevelopment of this portion of the building, the applicant proposes construction of a new roof atop of and making repairs to an existing one-story wing located off the northwest corner of the impacted rear elevation. As mentioned previously, all repair and replacement work on the existing rear wing would match the existing as profile, dimension, and material (See B-1.). The hipped roof form echoes that surmounting the body of the main block of principle dwelling.

A deck is proposed for construction off the rear elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the addition is so located that overall site conditions as experienced from the public view would remain the same (See B-5.). Said addition is a reversible intervention that, if removed, would not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic building (See B-4.). The boxed and recessed lattice skirting would serve to tie the deck to the body of the house, while its lower elevation would serve to differentiate the proposed work from the original fabric thereby

making the deck “read” as a thoughtful consideration of the old fabric and longstanding regional practices of outdoor living suited to modern day life.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application would impair not the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Noel Broughton (property owner) and Douglas Burtu Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect were present to represent the application. Mr. Blackwell introduced the application. Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public discussion and welcomed Mr. Broughton and Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, owner’s representative, to the meeting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask. Mr. Kearley answered that Mr. Blackwell had outlined the application in full, but went on to provide a brief history of the house and its evolution. He noted that the dwelling was built circa 1902 and at one time served as a boarding house. He estimated that the later additions were built in the 1930’s or 1940’s. Mr. Kearley also brought to the Board’s attention that the rafters of the original building still in situ at the additions.

Ms. Harden asked for further clarification as to fenestration. Mr. Kearley confirmed for Mrs. Harden that original windows were located behind plywood on the elevation impacted by the work.

Mr. Oswalt asked if any other Board members had any questions to ask relating to the application. Other than the applicant and his representative no one from the public was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as written, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second, and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: January 20, 2017

OTHER BUSINESS

LEGAL

A discussion took place discussing the emergency meeting of November 18th, 2016. At the December 21st, 2016 Architectural Review Board meeting, a list concerns was presented by Mr. Allen regarding the November meeting. Ms. Florence Kessler, Chief Assistant City Attorney for the City of Mobile, was present to address the concerns of Mr. Allen and the Board.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed Ms. Kessler to the floor. He explained that Mr. Allen brought forth concerns at the previous Board meeting and that Ms. Kessler's responses would ideally be amended into the previous minutes.

Ms. Kessler explained she was not present at the November 18th meeting. She stated that the meeting did not follow the usual procedure for reason of the emergency nature of the situation as substantiated by professional reports and physical conditions. Ms. Kessler noted that there was need for immediate action. She described how the Legal Department reviewed state law in which one could be given less than 24 hour notice of a meeting concerning a property whose condition could bring danger to persons or other property. She cited the State of Alabama Open Meetings Law Code §36-25A-1.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Allen responded that the Open Meetings Law is a state law which discusses notice as it is to be given to public. Mr. Allen noted he could not find its definition of public or if a board would be included as the public.

Ms. Kessler reiterated that under state law less than 24 hour notice was legitimate for calling a meeting for reasons of emergency situations persons and/or property. Mr. Allen questioned that if under the state law there could be no notice.

Ms. Kessler stated that once a quorum was present, action could be taken. Mr. Allen responded that the MHDC's ordinance states that for a special meeting the board is to be given a 24 hour notice. He questioned if the state law supersedes the ordinance.

Ms. Kessler stated that the ARB received individual notification in the form of an email to the whole of the Board. She pointed out that was illogical to have 24 hour notification where a life safety issue is involved.

Mr. Allen stated that if the Board was operating under the Open Meetings Law then that no notice could be given. He expressed that the Open Meetings Law did not apply to the Board.

Mr. Allen reiterated that the MHDC ordinance states that a special meeting may be called by the chair of the board at a 24 hour period of notice. He elaborated by stating that the Open Meetings Law says you may do away with the 24 hour notice to the public, not to the board.

Mr. Oswalt stated that in situation under discussion, there was an emergency, a life safety issue. He pointed out that everyone received notice and that there was a quorum at the meeting.

Mr. Allen expressed that according to his interpretation that the Open Meeting Law was not an excuse for the Board to go without a 24 hour notice. Mr. Oswalt replied that it was an emergency situation and the Board had to act.

Mr. Allen stated the meeting disregarded the MHDC ordinance. He questioned if the ordinance needed to be changed to include an emergency meeting clause. Mr. Allen went on to allow that doing so would not solve the problem at hand - notification of the November 18th meeting.

Mr. Oswalt reiterated that the Board received notice. Mr. Allen stated it was not a proper notice. Mr. Oswalt replied there was not time for proper notice in an emergency situation.

Mr. Stone pointed out there that there existed no difference in the ordinance between a special meeting and an emergency meeting. He asked the Open Meetings Law allowed for clarification.

Ms. Kessler responded the general concept of notice is some form of communication. She further explained that in this case the Board received "actual notice", and therefore she did not see an issue.

Mr. Stone stated he did not see any intent to deceive on the part of staff and that there were enough Board members present at the November 18th meeting to make a quorum.

Mr. Allen again asked if the MHDC ordinance's special meeting requirement of a 24 hour notice applied. Ms. Kessler responded that given that the property was deemed a life-safety concern the state Open Meetings Law applied. Mr. Allen maintained that the Open Meeting s Law did not apply to the Board. Ms. Kessler stated the Open Meetings Law was relevant because it spoke to the legitimacy of the meeting in the urgent circumstances. She continued by noting that the notice to the ARB was "actual notice" not "special", but "emergency".

Mr. Stone asked if the ordinance needed an emergency provision or could the action be accomplished by amending the bylaws. Ms. Harden stated that the bi-laws could address a property which could bring grave danger to public, but there would need to be a definition of emergency.

Mr. Oswalt then suggested adopting Ms. Kessler's response to the November 18th minutes.

Mr. Stone moved to amend the November 18th, 2016 minutes including Ms. Kessler's response to Mr. Allen's comments. The motion was seconded and approved with one opposed.

Ms. Harden noted that the Board could review emergency related criteria as articulated in other municipal codes. Mr. Blackwell said he would email the bylaws to the Board.

MIDMONTHS

A discussion on midmonth or administrative approvals ensued.

Mr. Allen brought to the attention of the Board that at their August 3, 2016 Meeting Mr. Roberts had cited several administrative approvals which he thought should have been placed on an agenda for review by the Board.

Mr. Holmes suggested that the most resent resolution be redistributed and reviewed. Ms. Harden agreed, and suggested that the resolution be amended further if needed.

Mr. Blackwell stated he would redistribute the latest resolution, and asked the Board to note any particular concerns by the next ARB meeting.

Mrs. Echols asked for clarification on two midmonths numbers 8 and 18. Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Lague addressed Ms. Echols concerns.

Mr. Stone asked that applicants provide existing elevations. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Blackwell stated that he would send an email with the bylaws and midmonth resolution attached therein to the Board following the meeting.

Mr. Oswalt then asked the Board if they had any additional questions, comments, or concerns.

Mr. Allen stated the MHDC ordinance requires annual election of a chair and vice-chair. He further explained he had been informed that it was the responsibility of the Board, not staff, to instigate the election. He nominated Mr. Oswalt for chair. Mr. Oswalt was elected as chair.

Names for a Vice-Chair were mentioned. Names mentioned included Mr. Brown, Mr. Wagoner, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Holmes. Given his previous experience, Mr. Wagoner was nominated as vice-chair.

Mr. Allen then apologized for offending anyone at the December 21st meeting. He expressed that he was concerned by the way which the Board operates. He continued by expressing that if the Board acts in a capricious manner there could be repercussions in the court system. He also stated that he believed that the way in which the Board acted on November 18th corroded the public support of the ARB. Mr. Allen reiterated that he did not think the Board was following its own rules and guidelines. He closed by saying he is passionate about the city and preservation.

Mr. Brown thanked Mr. Allen. He stated that he wished that other city boards showed passion and dedication. Mr. Brown noted that he believed a board not expressing its beliefs did not

represent service, but disservice. Mr. Brown expressed stated that boards are not obligated to the officials who appoint them, but to constituents.

Mr. Oswald agreed that Board members needed to express their concerns when germane to an application and thanked Mr. Allen for his apology.

Ms. Shayla Beaco, Executive Director Build Mobile, addressed the Board. She noted that the City could provide the Board with development and training opportunities. Ms. Beaco thanked the Board for their time, dedication, and service. She explained that staff is here to provide a service to the ARB, but they are to be communicated with in a professional manner. Ms. Beaco stated that she looked forward to attending more meeting and thanked the staff.

Mr. Oswald then asked his fellow Board members if they saw the need for further discussion. After hearing no response, Mr. Oswald moved to adjourn the meeting.