

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

On the 5th day of April, 2012, the Downtown Urban Design Review Board met in a scheduled session at 12:00 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 | 10 | 8 |
| Melissa Henderson | Yes | 10 | 8 |
| David Horsley | No | 10 | 9 |
| Charles Lynch, alternate | Yes | 10 | 7 |
| Kevin Nelson | Yes | 10 | 10 |
| Bob Rathbun | Yes | 10 | 8 |
| Wes Reeves | Yes | 10 | 7 |
| Mason Rogers | No | 10 | 2 |
| Howard Smith | Yes | 10 | 10 |
| Dana Williams-Walton | No | 10 | 9 |

CITY STAFF:
Kelley Shaw, Planning Director

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 March 1, 2012 meeting

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

ITEM 2: Presentation and discussion of a proposed Toot-n-Totum development project within the Downtown Amarillo Urban Design Overlay District

Chairman Smith asked Mr. Shaw to begin the discussion. Mr. Shaw began by thanking all the Board members and Toot-n-Totum (TnT) representatives for accommodating the specially called meeting. He then stated that it was important for everyone to know that today's agenda item was for discussion only and that no action was required.

Mr. Shaw then briefly explained how the downtown overlay design standards were a type of form-based regulations and that some land uses, by their very nature, do not fit neatly into form based discussions. Mr. Shaw pointed out that in the DAUDS it specifically mentioned that auto service oriented businesses presented unique design challenges when placed in a pedestrian oriented environment like a downtown. Mr. Shaw then asked TnT representatives to present to the Board their development project.

Mr. Mitchell, TnT Executive, gave a summary of why they were interested in developing a store in downtown stating many people have for years asked when TnT was going to open a business downtown. He believes that with the revitalization efforts going on, now is a great time. He stated that he is excited about the possibility and will do everything he can to adhere to the design standards but wanted the Board to know that at the same time, the store has to be successful.

Mr. Sims, project architect, presented the proposed site plan and explained that there were challenges with this use and meeting the setback requirements. He said they have looked at several different alternatives but for various reasons, have come up with the one being presented as it is the one that addressed needs for the development as well as trying to meet the intent of the DAUDS setback requirements. He also stated that TnT has redesigned the drive-through, eliminated typical signage, and other modifications from their typical store but the setback, given circulation issues related to delivery trucks and customers, was clearly the biggest challenge and with the proposed half wall, street trees and lights, TnT felt that they were meeting the intent of the building edge/setback requirements. Mr. Sims then discussed the northern part of the block stating it would be part of a future phase of development. He then presented several possible building elevations with brick facades and other architectural elements to create a more urban style of building.

Mr. Nelson asked about the timing of the future phase of development and how that area would be addressed until developed. Mr. Mitchell stated that he had already been contacted by others about possible development but at this time nothing was certain.

Mr. Reeves asked if there were any ideas discussed to bring the building closer to the property line and internalize the traffic more? Mr. Sims state that there were several alternatives looked at but because of various circulation issues with this type of use, as well as existing utilities running through the middle of block, the site plan had to be like it was. The Board asked about relocating the utilities to which Mr. Jenkins replied that it was extremely cost prohibitive to do so.

Mr. Reeves then described what he thought might be some alternative designs. Mr. Mitchell stated that there were real reasons why certain distances had to be maintained between canopy and the store as well as visibility from adjacent streets. Mr. Jenkins stated that access and parking for the property to the north also had to be considered.

Mr. Lynch stated that he appreciated TnT's efforts in wanting to be downtown and the work they have done to try and make this work and he understood their comments on why they are proposing the current site plan design and building. However, he believed that those comments were based on a suburban model and that maybe this was a different environment where they may want to look at focusing more on accommodating pedestrian traffic. Mr. Lynch also stated that TIRZ incentives may be available to help with relocating utilities. Mr. Mitchell stated that he had talked to TIRZ Board representatives and that even if he was approved for incentives, utility relocation was still cost prohibitive.

Discussion continued regarding possible alternatives for building placement and site design. Mr. Reeves stated that whatever is done, the Board needs to think long-term and what the impacts may be of any decisions made.

Mr. Nelson stated he too appreciated the efforts of TnT in what they have done but that he felt the drive-through had not been adequately discussed. He asked why it was necessary. Mr. Mitchell stated that it was a service that is highly utilized by customers. So much so that it is now a significant portion of total sales (30%-40%) in stores that have one.

Mr. Nelson asked if the amount of adjacent office space and possible foot traffic from office buildings had been considered and perhaps it could replace or account for any drive-through business lost if the drive-through was eliminated. Mr. Mitchell reiterated the necessity of the drive-through.

Discussion ended by several Board members stating that they were excited that TnT was considering opening a store downtown but suggested that they explore all alternatives in order to try and get the building closer to the property line. Mr. Mitchell thanked the Board members and said he too was excited about the possibility of opening a downtown store and that he would get with his team and see if there was anything they could do that they had not already thought of.

Staff then discussed the necessity of calling a meeting quickly given TnT's contract deadlines and stated they would check on schedules and set a meeting up possibly early the following week.

ITEM 3: Public Forum

No one spoke

ITEM 4: Consider Future Agenda Items

Mr. Smith asked if there were comments and hearing none, adjourned the meeting.

Kelley Shaw
Planning Director