

Highland Park Neighborhood Association

February 2021 Minutes

Meeting Date: February 9, 2021

At 6 pm President Elizabeth Sanfelippo welcomed everyone arriving into the virtually held Highland Park Neighborhood Association February meeting. She introduced herself as President and Secretary Judy Jones. Sanfelippo explained that Redmont Neighborhood was doing a joint meeting with Highland Park tonight, that their residents were on the call tonight. She introduced Redmont President Jay Reed, Vice President Cathy Adams and Secretary Deborah Lewis who, Sanfelippo said, was traveling for work tonight and unable to be present. She expressed appreciation to Stephen Foster, President of the Five Points Neighborhood Association, for setting up Highland Park's meetings via Zoom.

Sanfelippo confirmed attendees as per city instructions, doing a verbal roll call of Highland Park residents on the call (additional names were added later as individuals joined the meeting).

Sanfelippo asked if everyone had received the January Meeting Minutes and whether anyone had any corrections or addition to those minutes. No one had any changes or corrections. Larry Contri moved adoption of the January Meeting Minutes as presented. Mary Helen Crowe seconded Contri's motion. Sanfelippo took a vote; there were 14 yea votes and no nays so the January minutes were approved.

Sanfelippo said she didn't think there was anyone from the Police Department or Public works on the call - but that she hoped everyone knew that if they were having any issues residents could report them to 311, adding they could also relay the complaints and 311 confirmation numbers to the neighborhood via email at highlandparkneighborhoodal@gmail.com. Sanfelippo then turned the meeting over to Redmont President Reed.

Reed thanked Sanfelippo and Highland Park for allowing Redmont to join the meeting, saying it would be good to get this presentation knocked out with just one event. Reed then went through a roll call for Redmont residents who were present for the meeting.

Arlington Development Project Update/Randall Minor & Evan Watts

Sanfelippo said several members from the development team are on call to include Randall Minor who is the attorney for the project. She introduced Evan Watts from D&A. Watts then introduced his business partner Kartik Desai who was also on the

call. Sanfelippo greeted David and David Silverstein and added there were representatives from FiveStone Group also present.

Sanfelippo explained that fall a year ago the neighborhoods received a presentation by developers regarding a redevelopment of the Bayer Property building on Arlington. The proposed project would include 2 towers, one residential and one a hotel, and some retail. She said over the past year the developers have taken feedback/concerns offered by the neighborhoods and have eliminated the hotel from the project scope so that the development now represents a smaller footprint. The revised proposal now includes a residential building plus with a redeveloped Bayer building for office space. Sanfelippo commended the developers saying there had been good communication keeping the neighborhoods in the loop, answering our questions as they came up and in their overall scaling the project back in response to neighborhood concerns. She noted that since this was not a request for re-zoning, HP would not be voting on the measures. She said she wanted to turn the meeting over to the developers now and asked attendees to mute if they were not speaking and to hold their questions until the presentation was over.

Randall Minor told the group that he and Evan Watts would be doing the bulk of the talking, that they intended this 'presentation' to be a dialogue. Minor said they have conducted a few meetings with smaller groups and tried to be responsive to their feedback, adding that everything had been made a little more challenging with Covid. Minor thanked both neighborhoods for convening this meeting, that he understood that Redmont doesn't normally do video meetings and he thanked everyone for participating tonight. Minor said he is a Shareholder with Maynard Cooper and does a lot of real estate development work. Minor said he was here tonight representing his client, D&A. He said David Silverstein and his son David Silverstein were also present tonight along with Michael Riley with the FiveStone Group.

Minor began saying the group was not seeking a rezoning, saying this plan/approach was kind of an alternative to rezoning. He said the group was going to see a lot of pretty pictures but that the meeting was really about '20 parking spaces' and that they would walk through this. He said the goal is to show attendees the comprehensive goal for the development. that they have really spent a lot of time crafting a way to ask for the least they could with respect to zoning.

Minor said he would share some history of the project and that Evan and Kartik would share plans for the property, that they'll take questions then circle back to the question of the '20 parking spaces'.

Minor said they started with two 10-story buildings. He said that concept for the site was abandoned for three sets of reasons, the first being the strong opposition from both neighborhoods; there were a number of supportive voices related to the project but they heard very clearly there was a significant portion of both neighborhoods that were not in favor of the project. Minor said he characterized the opposition in three different categories - 1) height, 2) traffic and 3) scale. The second set of reasons he referred to as 'previously misunderstood site constraints', saying he felt the misunderstanding applied to everyone involved. He said most had likely heard about a 'settlement agreement', adding that some people also call these 'restrictive covenants on height'. He said the second reason in this category was 'topographical challenges' saying these were understood beforehand but as they've had the benefit of time during Covid to really hone their analysis and compile/evaluate feedback from the neighborhood and try to be responsive to those things and as a result they really dug deep on the topographical challenges of the site. He said the third reason in this category was the impact of the highway cut-through, that there was obviously the physical impact of that but there were also regulatory things as well. He said the last reason was related to the impact of Covid on the demand for hospitality.

Minor turned the presentation over to Watts who shared his screen to show a visual on the new concept for the project. He said he and his partner Kartik Desai were the developers and design architects for the '2222 Project'. Desai shared that D&A stands for 'developers' and 'architects' saying that he and Watts had worked together for 12 years. He said their entire team was excited about this project, that the first time he came to Birmingham in early 2019 that he was blown away, he thought that Birmingham was an amazing city. Desai said Watts would now walk the group through the project development plan, to include the design for the office building and the design for the proposed condominium. Watts started by showing the existing site conditions with their proposed project lined in red - starting with the office building (former headquarters for Bayer Properties), the existing 2 story parking deck and a vacant portion of land which will be used as the development site for the condominium. Watts pointed out the property was surrounded by Red Mountain Expressway to the west, 23rd Street to the north and Arlington to the south and that the Crescent Office Building was to the north with its parking garage. He said the 2 and 3 story office building is served by a covered parking garage and an alley in the rear providing rear access to the site. He said the proposed condominium building will gain access off 23rd Street, saying the existing 2 story parking structure was off 23rd Street.

Watts then showed a slide of what was being proposed - the office building, the 2-story parking structure and the 7 story condominium that will include covered parking that is underneath.

Watts said he wanted to first talk about the existing zoning for the site. He said, as the group may recall, the last time they presented this project they were requesting a rezoning of the entire site to B-3 use; that this classification permitted the hotel as well as relocating the condominium to Arlington Avenue. He said as Minor mentioned they were no longer proceeding with a rezoning application. In lieu they now plan to move forward with an all 'as of right' project which means adhering to the existing zoning classifications that run with the land. He said the current slide shows the site with current zoning uses, the former Bayer headquarters (the south portion of the site) being O & I (Office and Industrial District) which permits the office use - which as an office building, it will continue to operate as an office building compliant with the underlying O & I. Watts pointed out the north portion of the site is an R-6 zoning use designation which allows for multi-family and residential use, hence the condominium being 'as of right' per this zoning district.

Watts said the next few slides will walk residents through the proposed heights for the buildings. He said many of the group were aware of a land covenant that runs with the land restricting the building height to 65 feet. Watts pointed out the portion of the site that has the height restriction of 65 feet - the office building, the existing 2 story parking deck and a triangle-shaped piece of property on the western edge of the property at the periphery of the highway. Watts showed the portion of the site not governed by the existing land covenant which allows a building to raise to a level of 80 feet while adhering to the site setbacks according to the underlying R-6 zoning designation. Watts said this was achieved using side, rear and front setbacks prescribed in the R-6 zoning text.

Watts moved to a review of some of the proposed elevations, starting with an elevation view of the office building, the existing Bayer Properties Building re-clad with new elements on the façade, all new windows, expanded and enhanced windows, lobby area enhancements with double/triple height space allowing 2 access points into the lobby from Arlington Ave. Watts said there was also considerable enhancements to the surrounding landscape, curb appeal upgrades, enhanced overall pedestrian friendliness, new sidewalks, new access to the building in many new locations.

Watts shifted to the northern portion of the site, the proposed condominium of the development. He shared some basic elements of the 7-story condominium (7 above covered parking) overall design and features - a total of 27 units rising to a height of 80 feet after adhering to the R-6 designation - terraces on the side and rear, balconies, as well as the penthouse set back from the sides of the building. Watts showed slides from different vantage points around the condominium, pointing out the existing 2 story parking structure that he said will service both the office

building and the condominium. Watts then turned the presentation back over to Minor.

Minor proceeded to explain the zoning request for the project saying that they have an R-6 zoning district (north portion of site) considered to be 'residential' and an O & I zoning district (south portion of the site) considered to be 'commercial'. He explained that in R-6 districts you can't have commercial uses unless there's some sort of grandfathering in the commercial uses, so related to the settlement agreement and how it is recorded, their concern is, how can they be sure that they can use the R-6 portion of the site to park the office building. Minor said the whole goal of their parking application is to allow them to essentially legalize the 'existing condition'. Minor said he had seen something at some point, a zoning letter from the city some years ago, that explained that the use of this existing two-story parking garage is a 'grandfathered' use with respect to 2222 Arlington. He said they will be doing a substantial rehab of the office building at 2222 so they don't want to rely on a letter, they'd rather have something official in the way of a parking modification. Minor said if you look at the office building by itself, based on its square footage, it generates a parking requirement that this existing parking garage combined with the parking on the site, doesn't satisfy - as in there's a deficit of approximately 20 spaces. He went on to say they have submitted two parking applications - the first is to modify the requirements that would normally apply in an O & I District to reduce the requirement so that don't have to build 20 spaces somewhere else. Minor said one of the things they've been considering is that the expressway is right adjacent to the site, saying that proximity creates constraints but also possible opportunities - but that one of the opportunities was that the entire area under the ALDOT right of way could be used for parking, that there is approximately 35 spaces under the ALDOT right of way. Minor said obviously they would be entering into the longest agreement possible with ALDOT for use of those spaces, saying that in practicality there would more than enough spaces available to satisfy the O & I parking requirement. But, he said, going back to the investment that is going to be made in this building, they didn't want to hope they could negotiate something with ALDOT and then hope that the city would allow that year to year lease with ALDOT to satisfy the parking requirement - which is why they applied for the parking modification. He went on to say the second application is for a special exception allowing for parking in a residential district that serves a commercial use. As in - if they get the modification requested and don't have to furnish an additional 20 spaces somewhere else, can they use the lowest level parking of the residential condo building for their commercial building at 2222 Arlington. Minor said Watts could explain the related topographical perspective but not only did this make for a more efficient building, it also made logical sense to have the lowest level of the residential building have access across the alley straight into the office building. Minor said they wanted to present the whole plan and answer any questions - but

that technically their application is only for 2222 Arlington and it's only for parking, they are not seeking any waiver of any requirements in the settlement agreement or a change in zoning, that this is a very targeted/focused application essentially to allow the development to proceed consistent with what the residents have been shown.

Sanfelippo asked if Minor could clarify an email that was sent out recently that suggested this was voted on several years ago. Minor said the email mentioned suggested that was a prior parking modification granted and that this current request would just be a renewal of that. The city had accidentally included language from another case which caused the confusion. Minor said this was not accurate, that this request would be a brand-new application and specifically in the context of this development as they've presented tonight. He said they have to present plans to the Zoning Board of Adjustment that are exactly what they have shown residents this evening.

Sanfelippo asked for a pause to update the attendance roll with individuals who had arrived later. After doing that she reminded the group that she had confirmed with the city that Highland Park was not voting on these requests, that only residents of Redmont would be voting after we finished discussion.

Minor emphasized since the beginning of this effort one of the things they've tried to do, even before they filed the prior rezoning application that they presented to both neighborhoods, is to be open and transparent, to provide residents with information, to answer any questions. He said in one of the smaller group meetings they had there was a concern that if they supported the rezoning that it essentially opened up Pandora's Box with respect to what could be there, on the site; as in yes you could do Q-conditions but that it opened up a lot of things and perhaps set a precedent that people didn't feel comfortable with. So after that meeting he and Watts talked at length about getting to a place that addressed people's concerns. He said giving up the rezoning request definitely had negatives for the development team/business plan, for example, winding up with 100% residential instead of some retail on the ground levels - but the goal has always been to present something that checks as many boxes as possible and also delivers on the team's design vision. With this, Minor opened the floor to questions.

Cathy Adams shared she was paranoid about 'blasting' and asked if they put some of the parking under the condominiums, did that mean they would have to go deeper underground. Watts said no, they would take advantage of the already-sloping site and this would only require excavation of a small area adjacent to the existing parking structure - and that it would only go down to the existing level of the alley.

Don Cospo asked if there were two levels of parking below the condominiums. Watts replied yes, there was one level of parking that will join up with the existing lower level of the deck that is already there, there will be another level of parking on the lowest portion of the alley - so effectively it's 3 levels, but it zig zags if that makes sense. Cospo asked if they were interconnected levels. Watts replied that they connect via the alley, that there is a ramp on 23rd Street to the parking under the condo, it egresses onto the alley, and then you go down the alley and get to the additional office parking. Cospo asked - re the parking deck, you go in and out one level or the other but they do not interconnect. Watts replied that was correct. Cospo added that was typical to what we had seen of other condos in the area because basically the people who are going to park there know where their parking places are. Watts replied yes, spaces would be allocated for each residential unit.

Minor asked Watts to confirm that the plan was for the condominium building to park itself. Watts replied, yes, that they will build new parking just for the condominium but that there was a little bit of a swap occurring in that they were taking advantage of some of the existing parking on the lower level of the deck and then they were adding more parking.

Mary Helen Crowe asked to confirm - that they were going to have two levels of parking for the condos and this extra partial level that will service the offices. Watts replied that is correct. She asked to confirm they did not plan to count on the parking that is 'under' the highway. Watts replied, that is correct, they were not counting that. Crowe said she wanted to raise the possibility that parking under the highway was against the law anyway, that she thought after 9/11 a law had been passed forbidding parking under interstates because they were concerned about bombings, going on to say that apparently they had never enforced that in Birmingham until they started working on the highway downtown. She said she didn't know if this included US highways like 280. Minor said she was making a good point, that this was a good reason to submit the application because they didn't have an agreement with ALDOT now, it's unknown what may happen in the future, at some point there's likely to be some bridge work and that could change the availability of the spaces now available - so regardless, using the parking under the highway is certainly not a long term solution. Minor explained this is why the plan is to use that space as an additional amenity as long as they can - but not to depend on the spaces to meet any zoning related parking requirements.

Larry Contri said looking the rendering, is he correct that they have five floors of condominiums, a total of 27 with a penthouse on top? Watts replied it was 7 stories with a total of 27 units with a penthouse on top. Contri asked if the condos were 2 bedrooms, 2 baths, whether that decision had been made yet. Watts said they were still working through the unit mix, that it was still a little preliminary until they're

allowed to set the core and shell of the building. Watts said they imagine mostly 2 and 3 bedrooms with a sprinkling of one bedrooms. He said they were also exploring a potential to have the lower floor units be maisonettes which are essentially town houses, two stories with a walk-out terrace on all of them.

A resident asked to confirm if they would be relying on the parking under the highway to meet their business parking requirements. Minor replied they can't say when the condo building will come online but they should be able to quickly get the office building online because it is an existing building. He went on to say the first application is to reduce the technical requirement in an O & I district by 20 spaces which allows them to use the existing 2 story parking garage to satisfy zoning requirements. Minor said that once the residential building is brought online (he thinks Watts was projecting 2022 for this) then the lowest floor of that residential building (and there's actually some spaces on the side that aren't covered) - those spaces would be available for the commercial building. He said if they get the modification, then great, they can use the existing parking garage exclusively for the 2222 Office Building. Minor said once the residential building comes online then that gives us the optionality to use that lowest level in the way that makes the most sense; that it makes more sense for someone to park to access 2222 Arlington from the lowest level of the condo building because it's a shorter walk. Watts emphasized to the group the parking applications are being submitted because they are dropping the B-3 rezoning requests, which would have been for the whole site and would have allowed them to move parking underneath the building to suit all the programs and they wouldn't be forced to segregate where the parking goes; that under a B-3 classification it would already be compliant for the use it is serving. Watts said now that they are proceeding with the existing zoning they need these modifications to park the office and residential buildings on site and not use out-of-site, remote parking.

Reed interjected that it was a good time for Redmont residents to hear the proposal they would actually be voting on, pointing out they had already received the proposals in writing email two times from him. He then read the proposal the residents would be asked to vote to support or oppose - "A special exception to allow remote parking for 56 off street parking spaces within 1000 feet - Title 1, Chapter 5, Article 1, Section 83, Page 249"; And "A modification to allow 104 off-street parking spaces instead of the required 124 off-street parking spaces pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 9, Article 6, Section 6A". Reed said once they wrap up questions Redmont residents will vote to support or oppose, just a simple voice vote. He said hearing some opposition they will move into a roll call vote because they will have to turn in specifically how many residents said yay and how many said nay.

Mary Wade asked what the exterior façade would look like. Watts replied that they anticipate the condominium building to be primarily masonry which is brick. She asked the color, whether it would blend nicely with the surrounds. Watts said they've not designed the façade yet so he can't speak specifically to the color but that he expected it to be suited to the environment.

A resident asked a question about access to the garage and whether they would be using Arlington Alley. Watts replied there would be a ramp that will come down from 23rd Street down along the length of the condominium, it will bring you to the covered part of the condominium and then you would egress onto the alleyway. He went on to say that the same exists today with the existing covered parking for the office, you use the alleyway as part of your aisle to get to the next aisle of parking so that condition will be maintained.

A resident stated he wanted to be extra clear that the request being made for parking adjustments has nothing to do with approving or not approving or even smiling at the plans for the other building. Watts replied that is correct. The resident went on to ask 'so there is a complete disjunction between the proposed condo building and the parking request for the office building'. Minor replied that is correct, that it would be weird for us to just talk about the office building without showing you what you really care about so it was intentional on our part to show you comprehensively what we're doing; that by showing you the residential building it explains why we're doing the special exception because without the context of the new building there we would just be doing the modification application for the two story existing garage.

Sanfelippo asked if a condominium resident wanted to have a party, would they be allowed to have guests park in the office parking. Watts replied yes, that the intention was to use the existing upper level of the parking lot to serve the condominium after hours for guests. He added that the deck was in an R-6 district so this was already a permitted use.

Mary Helen Crowe asked if they had an anticipated start day to begin building the condominium. Watts said they believe they will start construction for the condominium building in early next year (2022). Crowe said she understood from an earlier question that they would not be 'blasting'. Watts replied 'no blasting'.

Reed asked Sanfelippo if they could ask for any more questions from the Redmont neighborhood residents. Sanfelippo said yes and passed meeting control to Reed who asked whether there were any more questions regarding the proposals from Redmont residents. He said there were 26 Redmont residents in attendance on the roll. He reminded the group that if there was any opposition expressed in the voice

vote, they would do a roll call vote. He said at this time, based on the request read, all of those supporting say 'aye'. The ayes were expressed. Reed asked for those opposing to say 'nay'. Reed stated he had 2 in opposition and asked if there were 3. Reed said that concluded Redmont's vote and thanked Sanfelippo.

Sanfelippo replied that we did have a request from Don Cospers to do a hand raise vote. Cospers replied he asked that before the vote was concluded. Councilor Valerie Abbott asked if that vote was properly 'motioned'. Reed replied that they had cleared that up about four meetings ago, that when the 'request' is on the table it doesn't require a motion, the voter is supporting or opposing the request.

Cospers asked if this concluded Redmont's business. Sanfelippo said she believed it did, that Highland Park would continue its business and announcements, that anyone was welcome to stay on the meeting. She thanked everyone for attending and for the good questions asked and being patient with the format, that she is excited it went smoothly.

City Council Update/Councilor Abbott

Councilor Abbott started by saying these days there's not a lot of updates from City Hall, that they are down to the bare bones of their agendas, that they can only do Covid-related votes and votes on essential city business, that today was the first day in a while they had liquor licenses on the agenda, that she guessed that was essential. She said one thing the city is doing, that shouldn't affect residents unless the city was hacked, was changing over computer systems to better defend against someone hijacking their system and forcing the city to pay a bribe to get their data returned, that this has happened to some other cities. She said they were just swimming against the current on this vaccine thing, that people are trying to get their vaccine and can't. She said the process is just slow and people are frustrated but that the city has no control over the vaccination process, adding that her office can't help people get a vaccine faster, that the city was following orders by the governor and doing the best they can.

Mary Helen Crowe asked that in light of this most recent hack of a water system in Florida, that she didn't know who was in charge of the 'Birmingham Water Works' but are they making an effort to make their computer systems more hack-proof? Abbott replied that the Birmingham Water Works Board controls Birmingham Water Works, that the board is appointed by our mayor, our council and other area mayors in other cities/counties served by the Birmingham Water Works. Abbott said she would imagine they were giving it some serious thought given that there were probably very few people who expected a hack on a water system, that it seemed to her that the purpose of the Florida hack was not just a ransom but that this person seemed intent on hurting/killing people. Abbott said she didn't know

specifically what the Water Board was doing but since it's a sudden thing she suspected they were giving it some thought. But she suspected it had been on their radar and they've taken some precautions because since 9/11 since after that event people expected other attacks on the country's electrical grid, water systems, etc. Abbott said they would check with their Board appointees to be certain the issue was being considered. Crowe referenced the recent hacking of Druid City Hospital - and Abbott replied she felt that was a contributing reason the city was upgrading its systems now saying they actually approved additional money today to do more migrating of their systems off mainframes onto more modern vehicles. She said the city partners with ATT and no one knows more about preventing hacking than AT&T so at least they have good advice. Jones said that she would locate contact information for the Water Works Board so that if concerned people wanted to contact them directly they would have the information to do that. Sanfelippo said that would be great, that she knows their website is www.BWWB.org but did not have a phone number.

(Update: Birmingham Water Works Board Office - 205-244-4411; Link to email the Board of Directors: <https://form.jotform.com/23151687964160>)

Sanfelippo asked Abbott to share about the District 3 Town Hall. Abbott said the date for the sixty-minute meeting would be March 16. She added the mayor has asked them to submit topics they would like to see addressed at the meeting. Abbott said she intended to write to all District 3 neighborhood officers and ask for their specific ideas about what they would like to hear addressed. Larry Contri asked for the meeting time, Darryl Lee said the time had not been established yet, that they expected to be sending out more details as soon as it was confirmed. Contri asked if it would be a zoom meeting, Dr Lee replied yes. He went on to say the Mayor, Councilor Abbott, Police Chief, Fire Chief, representatives from Public Works would be present.

Sanfelippo asked for any more questions of Abbott and Lee. A resident asked about recycling, if we knew if and when they would resume weekly pickups. Abbott said they had asked the mayor but that it seems that everyone's primary interest and focus is on issues related to the pandemic. Abbott said they still have not received a report on the recycling pilot program results in the areas where they provide new recycling receptacles for pickup. She said the city's current financial issues also pose an obstacle to proceeding with a new program like that right now. Abbott said the main piece of negative feedback she had heard about the pilot were from people who lived in residences with steep driveways, regarding the challenge of getting a large receptacle down to the street. Sanfelippo shared that the neighborhood leadership is attempting to increase the number of resident email addresses names in our database so that more people get the announcements and reminders about things like recycling, trash pick-up, etc. She went on to tell residents that if they had

neighbors who were putting things out, recycle or trash, at the wrong times, to send her an email with the neighbor's name (if they know it) and address (and ideally email address) - and she would in turn send them a nice email or note inviting them to sign up for the neighborhood communications. Abbott added that if recycles are put out on Wednesdays other than the first one in the month, it all goes with the trash to the garbage dump.

Barry Norris spoke up sharing that he probably should call 311 but that he has had a pile of nicely bagged leaves in his alley since December. Abbott said definitely call 311 and give them your address and tell them it's on the alley. She added that a lot of times they will send someone back for missed pick-ups, especially if it's been missed since December. Sanfelippo added that Norris can always email 311@BirminghamAL.gov and recommended that he copy us at highlandparkneighborhoodal@gmail.com - just to keep us in the loop. Sanfelippo said a number of people had emailed about missed pickups after this last run and that she was in talks with the Public Works head about better communicating with the neighborhood if they get behind or are having issues - so that when she starts getting emails about missed pickups she knows better how to respond.

A resident asked where the monthly recycling pickup goes. Abbott answered that it goes to the recycling company on 41st St just past the railroad tracks - Birmingham Recycling and Recovery. Abbott said she had gone in and had a tour of it which was very enlightening. She said people can go by there and drop off their recycles. A resident added that there are other places to drop off certain types of recycles that this company doesn't take - such as Publix taking plastic bags and styrofoam. Abbott said she thought at one time Target was taking glass. Sanfelippo shared there was a new business called Kinetic Recycling that will pick up your glass for a small fee. Philip Foster said they had signed up for the Kinetic service and thought they were great. (<https://kineticrecycling.com>)

Jones said it would be good for everyone to review the recycling criteria - because if we don't want to put it out at the wrong time and send it to the trash dump we sure don't want to put something in our recycling bin on the 'right' day and have it be trash and thrown away as well. She added there was no reason to waste their time and the city's money by putting trash to be sorted from the recycles. Sanfelippo shared that one very big problem was people including plastic bags - that one of these could cause machine breakage. She went through the recyclable materials for city pickups: #1 and #2 plastic (rinsed with no food debris in them), clean cardboard, newspaper, paper, aluminum, steel and tin cans. She added this information was on Highland Park's website Highland-Park.org under one of the links at the top labeled 'Helpful Information' (<https://www.highland-park.org/helpful-information>) Janet Wallace added that Homewood takes #5

plastic but that she doesn't know anyone who takes #6 and #7. Abbott added that Homewoods #5 recycle date this month is Tuesday February 16 and it's behind the Rec Center.

Mary Helen Crowe asked when the sidewalk repairs would be starting. Sanfelippo said she had gotten a call on this from Pat Byington who lives in our neighborhood and does stories for BhamNow. She said she thought it was either the last meeting or the meeting before that the neighborhood approved just over \$13,000 for sidewalk repairs that will start at Freddy's and go to Niazuma. She said that is what we are calling Phase 1. Phase 2 will be the next park on Highland, Phase 3 will be over to IPC and Phase 4 will be working on side streets. Sanfelippo said she knew some of the side streets were pretty bad but that the neighborhood had to put a plan together that would put priority on the higher traffic areas which are along Highland. Sanfelippo said the project needed to await weather that was slightly warmer and more stable. She said Michael Eddington from the city is going to help the neighborhood coordinate the work with the contractor and get it all started. Councilor Abbott added that the Council approved the money last Tuesday. A resident asked when the neighborhood might see Phase 4 - Sanfelippo replied that was unknown at the present, especially with Covid, city finances - and our need to verify that we have the right contractor before we proceed with additional phases. The resident said he walks, pushes a stroller and walks a dog simultaneously and while he concedes the side streets clearly aren't as high trafficked but if you were to take a sample of the degree to which the various streets' sidewalks are impaired that he would bet the sidewalks on the side streets are in much more disrepair than those on Highland Avenue. He said he was simply thinking of 'safety', that he actually had a stroller accident today, that he was in Redmont but he just thought it timely that he mentioned this. Mary Helen Crowe asked if Redmont was doing anything like we were with the sidewalks. Sanfelippo said she didn't know/had not heard of anything. Councilor Abbott said she didn't think so either, that Highland Park was the first neighborhood she had heard of in years that has put money toward sidewalk repairs - in fact she doesn't remember the last neighborhood that actually did do this. Sanfelippo shared that the reason Highland Park has been able to do this is that Councilor Abbott doesn't travel on her discretionary funds, she gives it to the neighborhoods. Sanfelippo said over a couple of years we've built up some dollars and adding that a couple of years ago we did a survey of resident issues and sidewalks were a huge priority, sidewalks and trees. She said she wished we could move faster but between the city process and working with contractors, that it was just a slow involved process. Jones asked to confirm that the only thing the neighborhood has funded so far is Phase 1, Sanfelippo said yes. Jones went on and said, so the additional phases kind of depend on the neighborhood having the funds, unless there's more participation by the city. Sanfelippo said yes. And added that it is yet unknown what the cost of the next phases might be.

Mary Helen Crowe asked about the lights in the park. Councilor Abbott replied that the cost of repairs/replacement was extremely prohibitive. She said they had been working with Alabama Power Company, who has responsibility for lights in some parks, to do repairs, but that she wasn't certain what had happened, whether money had run out or what. She said the ironic thing was that dogs urinating on the base of the poles had corroded everything to the point they can't be repaired and must be replaced. Jones added that she felt the same way about that irony but that Highland Park had an issue once with the pieces of metal at the base of the poles disappearing, that someone had replaced a lot of it with unsightly pieces of metal that we had received complaints about. She said there were plenty of light poles through the neighborhood, several she could think of specifically over by Rushton Park, that the space was completely open at the base of the pole. She said yes it's an issue if a dog walks by and pees into an open hole at the base of a light pole - but what are they all doing open in the first place? Councilor Abbott said she knew exactly what Jones was talking about, that she lives in Glen Iris and had seen many poles with those covers missing. Sanfelippo suggested reporting the poles with missing base covers to 311, that you would need to furnish a location - or a pole number if one could be found. Abbott shared that Alabama Power was responsible for replacing lamps in all street lights and some of the parks, they just aren't in charge of all the parks yet because there was a shortage of money.

Sanfelippo thanked Councilor Abbott for being on the call - and all that she does day to day for our community.

Old Business

Sanfelippo said we would find out the target date for neighborhood elections at the next Community Advisory Board meeting, which is this coming Monday. She said she would keep everyone posted on when/where to vote when we get that information.

Sanfelippo said our Community Resource Representative Jasmine Fells was not on the call this evening. Sanfelippo said she often emails Fells on any number of issues day to day and that she was always very responsive.

Janet Wallace said she would like to put some bluebird houses in Rushton Park and asked how she would go about doing that. Sanfelippo said that was awesome - and that if Wallace would email her at highlandparkneighborhoodal@gmail.com - then she will put her in touch with someone in Parks & Rec to get approval for that project.

Sanfelippo said the trees are being ordered for the next planting.

Sanfelippo said she had picked up the refill bags for the dog waste stations in the parks, as well as the one replacement station needed. She said due to weather she had not been out to replace the damaged station but planned to do that this weekend.

Announcements

Sanfelippo said the next Trash & Brush pickups would be Thursday February 25th and Thursday March 18th.

Sanfelippo said our next Zoom Neighborhood Meeting would be Tuesday March 9 at 6 pm. She told residents they will be able to use the same information to access the next meeting (and future meetings) that they used tonight.

Candidate Introductions & Remarks/ Joseph Casper Baker, III

Sanfelippo introduced Joseph Casper Baker, III who is running for City Council District 3. Baker said this meeting he was just coming by to say hello, that he knows a number of people present, having met them through the years. He said he was running for City Council because he feels it's time for a change in Birmingham especially given the point we are and how we move on to rebuild Birmingham in a post-Covid and potentially politically toxic environment. Baker said a lot of his focus would be on creating balance, especially between the offices and branches of our local government and particularly taking a focus on the relationship of our city government to the state government and how they control aspects of how we can develop and make decisions that have local consequence and that we don't have much control over. Baker said he would be fleshing out more of his positions as time goes on, that he just wanted to come in, say hello and listen to what was going on in this local community.

Sanfelippo asked for a motion to adjourn. Larry Contri so moved. Diann Weatherly seconded. There was no opposition and the February meeting of Highland Park Neighborhood Association was adjourned at 7:37 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Judy Jones
Secretary, Highland Park Neighborhood Association