

Downtown Development District

Proposed Amendments

Planning Commission - August 18, 2022 Public Hearing

Comments Received

Nathaniel Bryars

405 Gulfwood Drive Mobile AL 36608

natedoggbryars@gmail.com

2022-08-01 16:52:25

Comments. I believe there shouldn't be more than a 3-story building permitted along the sub district along Claiborne street. Historically the area was entirely residential with no buildings at four stories or taller. Across the street are one- and two-story houses that would be out of place next to a five-story building. A three-story maximum would ensure that it helps transition the civic center area into the Church Street historic district. Additionally, there are many unique styles of buildings that were lost in the original civic center construction. These lost houses and buildings could be replicated in the design of apartment buildings with retail at the bottom. A historical example would be Bloodgood's row. The developer should also work with the historical commission to make sure this development strives to match the surrounding historic district and doesn't throw up a 5 over 1 ahistorical building as seen in many other cities.

Jeffery Morrow

256 S. Lawrence Street Mobile Alabama 36602

bamajamer256@gmail.com

2022-08-11 15:56:18

Comments.

- My residence is located at 256 S. Lawrence Street which is directly across the street from the Civic Center parking lot.
- I am opposed to zoning in CC-5 which permits buildings to be five stories high. This would be out of character for the neighborhood. Current zoning in T-3 allows for two stories. The proposed height limit for CC-6 is three stories and I would argue that buildings in CC-5 be three stories or less to maintain aesthetics and privacy across the street.
- Proposed zoning in CC-5 would allow multi-family dwellings. Multi-family dwellings are not permitted in T-3. There is no definition given for multi-family dwellings in the amendments so clarification would be helpful. I would find three story townhomes acceptable whereas five story apartments or condominiums would be inappropriate.

Downtown Development District

Proposed Amendments

Planning Commission - August 18, 2022 Public Hearing

- I would expect that minimum required parking spaces per residential unit would limit the size of multi-family dwellings. If not, why not and how is parking planned for in multi-family dwellings?
- The proposed zoning amendments require one interior heritage tree for every 15 parking spaces in parking lots over 50 spaces. There is no definition of what constitutes a heritage tree in the zoning amendments. What are examples of heritage trees? Why are tree requirements allowed to be altered by the consolidated review committee without input from an arborist?
- Thank you for your time in considering these concerns and questions. In general, I am looking forward to the redevelopment of this important city property.

Marie Dyson

203 S. Dearborn St. Mobile AL 36602

mnosyd@comcast.net

2022-08-12 13:26:28

Comments. Compilation of comments from residents in Church Street East:

1. allow more time for public review/info gathering discussion and comments;
2. CC.5 landscape should mirror T-3 (across Lawrence St.) landscape with permitting only consistent building heights of 2 stories
3. not allowing multiple-family dwellings
4. increasing allowed parking spaces
5. not permitting neon/electronic signage metal photo-voltaic panels etc. that are inconsistent with residential/historic T-3 zoning requirements.
6. CC.5 faces T-3 and the zoning provisions and landscape should be the same. Why create new zoning sections when there are existing zones that can be used?
7. Like other zoning districts SD-CC should be required to submit a master plan.
8. Overall, please allow more time for the public to become better informed and to provide input. What happens in that space affects the downtown and surrounding residential areas.

James (Jim) Backes

509 ESLAVA ST

jmcmbackes@gmail.com

2022-08-17 12:46:21

Comments.

1. CC.5 and T-3 across the street from each other on Lawrence Street should have similar zoning restrictions. However, the zero side setbacks for CC.5 would be acceptable in order to allow for townhouse development. Multi-family dwellings (apartments) are not appropriate for this area.
2. Building height for CC.5 is proposed as 5 story -- this is not appropriate. 3 should be maximum (to allow for townhouse garages on ground floor accessible from alleyway). CC.6 is proposed as 3 stories, and this should be consistent with CC.5.
3. On-site parking requirements are insufficient in CC.5 -- should be 2 spaces per residence -- all existing residences in the area have at least 2 on the property. We are very concerned about new residents using street parking on adjacent streets if no on-property requirement is set as would be allowed in the ordinance as written.
4. Use of pedestrian forecourts is inconsistent with the architectural approach within Mobile's downtown especially in Church Street East. This should be rewritten.
5. Materials of construction should be the same as T-3 -- brick wood etc. -- no neon signs glass storefronts etc.
6. The Commission should consider splitting CC.5 into two sections considering the suggested development plans submitted and the traffic studies underway. One section would be north of Eslava Street (and its potential extension into the CC.6.; The other South. This would simplify changes in case these parcels are developed separately.
7. I support Marie Dyson in her comments that will be made on behalf of Church Street East at the meeting.

Downtown Development District

Proposed Amendments

Planning Commission - August 18, 2022 Public Hearing

Barbara Caddell

1321 Dauphin St. Mobile AL 36604

barbara.caddell@gmail.com

2022-08-17 20:45:19

Comments. Please allow time for more information to be given to the public about the need for these amendments and what they mean. I found the information published in the "Legal Notices" section of the Lagniappe to be confusing and incomplete. I understand that neighborhood meetings were supposed to be held when changes to the UDC were considered; apparently a "stakeholder" meeting was held after the City Council's Administrative Services meeting. I could not find any notice of this meeting nor was information about this meeting or the amendments disseminated after the fact. These amendments affect public spaces and I think that the public deserves to have adequate and timely information about them.