

STATE OF TEXAS §
COUNTIES OF POTTER §
AND RANDALL §
CITY OF AMARILLO §

On the 1st day of March, 2012, the Downtown Urban Design Review Board met in a scheduled session at 5:30 P.M. in Room 306 on the third floor of City Hall, 509 East 7th Avenue, Amarillo, Texas, with the following members present:

VOTING MEMBERS	PRESENT	NO. MEETINGS HELD	NO. MEETINGS ATTENDED
Chan Davidson	Yes	9	7
Melissa Henderson	No	9	7
David Horsley	Yes	9	9
Charles Lynch, alternate	No	9	6
Kevin Nelson	Yes	9	9
Bob Rathbun	Yes	9	7
Wes Reeves	Yes	9	6
Mason Rogers	No	9	2
Howard Smith	Yes	9	9
Dana Williams-Walton	No	9	8

CITY STAFF:
Kelley Shaw, Planning Director
Cris Valverde, Senior Planner

Chairman Smith opened the meeting, established a quorum, and conducted the consideration of the following items beginning with ITEM 1.

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes from the December 1, 2011 meeting

Chairman Smith asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the minutes? Mr. Horsley motioned to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Rathbun seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Consider an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Victory Duplex Veteran Housing project located at 1200 S. Van Buren Street

Chairman Smith asked that the Board go back to Item 2 for discussion. Mr. Shaw began by explaining that this project was in one of the oldest areas in town as far as being platted for development. This area was once a substantial residential area but has evolved into a mix of land uses ranging from homes to industrial uses. However, this particular area is being developed with a total of seven duplex units for veterans who finish a specified program provided by Another Chance House.

Another Chance House has other homes in the immediate area. Mr. Shaw asked Ms. Sandy Fenberg to give the Board a description of the project. Ms. Fenberg, describe the purpose of Another Chance House and specifically what these units would be for (housing for Veterans who have completed a rehabilitation program supported by the HUD BASH program). She explained that the houses are maintained in very good shape and also that Another Chance house has been provide funds for the first phase of three duplex units by way of private donations.

Mr. Shaw then described the overall site plan for the seven total units being along Van Buren and the one facing 2nd Ave. The units would have typical front yard setbacks but would incorporate sidewalk and street tree improvements. Mr. Shaw stated that although this area is within the non-commercial area of the DAUDS district, given the type and density of this residential development and being located in a residential setting, it was staff's opinion that the DAUDS for residential areas be applied.

Questions regarding the phasing of the units and landscaping were asked and Mr. Shaw stated that the first phase would be the three southern units and the street improvements (trees and sidewalk) would be constructed as the units were built.

Mr. Shaw stated that the improvements (residential units, setbacks, sidewalks, and trees) met all low density "residential" standards and recommended approval with the variance given to apply the low density, "residential" standards for this project. Mr. Shaw then went over the specific requirements that the variances were being requested for (sidewalks, lighting, and building edge). Mr. Shaw stated that it was staff's opinion that the development met the intent of the DAUDS and recommended approval of the project.

Mr. Reeves stated that he thought the project as proposed made sense. Chairman Smith aske dif lights were installed, how many would be required? Mr. Shaw stated approximately four on the Van Buren side and three on the 2nd Ave. side. Mr. Horsley pointed out that the trees shown were Bradford Pear trees and that those were not on the recommended tree list. Ms. Fenberg replied that Mr. Shaw had made here aware of that and that she would install a tree that was on the list. Mr. Reeves thanked Ms. Fenberg for not building a large, higher density, sterile building and stated that the residential units looked good. Mr. Horsley asked staff if they were comfortable with the variances being given and setting a possible precedent. Both Mr. Shaw and Ms. Dailey stated that with the type and density of the development that is would not be a problem and that it was not the intent of the DAUDS to require low density residential units to install lights on an individual basis.

Chairman Smith asked if there were any more questions and hearing none asked for a motion. Mr. Reeves motioned the project be approved with the variances as stated, Mr. Horsley seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

ITEM 3: Presentation of Amarillo College parking lot/streetscape located at Polk Street and SW 14th Avenue

Chairman Smith asked that the Board proceed to Item 3 first. Mr. Shaw introduced Mr. Bruce Cotgrave, Amarillo College Facilities Manager and asked for him to inform the Board on Amarillo College's plan to renovate the existing parking lot south of AC's Polk Street Campus.

Mr. Cotgrave began by giving a brief history of the lot itself and described the old "Fuqua House" that used to exist on the lot. Mr. Cotgrave then described the project and that it was part of the 2007 Bond Project that was approved by the voters. Mr. Cotgrave described the streetscape

standards that were being installed which included street trees and pedestrian lights and that they were working to cooperate with Polk Street Methodist Church on a walkway between the parking lot and the church. Mr. Cotgrave said the project was progressing quickly and with continued good weather, should be finished soon.

Mr. Shaw then described some of the variances to the DAUDS that could be seen on the project, those being two drive openings along 14th Ave. and smaller trees/bushes along 15th Ave. The two drives on 14th were, in staff's opinion, acceptable given that AC eliminated any drives on Polk Street in order to mitigate possible pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Also, the small trees/bushes along 15th were needed because of overhead electrical lines directly above.

Chairman Smith asked about possible plans for new buildings located on the site. Mr. Cotgrave said that the initial plan was to create a more "campus" style development on the block but that the funding was not available for that and the plan was tabled.

ITEM 4: Consider future agenda items

Mr. Nelson stated that he would find it beneficial for the Board to receive updates on previous projects and how they are progressing as well as how the downtown hotel, MPEV and any other associated development plans were coming along. He also had questions regarding a possible ANB sign. Regarding the previous projects and downtown development, Mr. Shaw stated that he could include that into future agendas. Discussion followed that the ANB sign was still being discussed and was not final. Mr. Nelson asked if there were any way timing issues were addressed as far as what was approved with previous projects. Mr. Shaw said that building permits had timing limitations and that the Certificate of Appropriateness itself had a one year limitation.

ITEM 3: Public Forum

Mr. Smith asked if there was any public comment and hearing none, adjourned the meeting.

Kelley Shaw
Planning Director