

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

On the 27th day of August, 2015, the Downtown Design Review Board met in a scheduled session at 5:30 p.m. in Room 306 located 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
Vacant	NA	NA	NA
Steve Gosselin (Alternate)	Yes	21	19
David Horsley, Chairman	Yes	35	31
Charles Lynch	No	35	26
Kevin Nelson	No	35	24
Steve Pair	Yes	4	3
Bob Rathbun	Yes	35	27
Wes Reeves	Yes	35	27
Vacant	NA	NA	NA
Dana Williams-Walton	No	35	23

CITY STAFF:

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kelley Shaw, Planning Director

Cris Valverde, Senior Planner

Acting Chairman Horsley opened the meeting, established a quorum, and then conducted the consideration of the following items beginning with Item 1.

ITEM 1: Approval of August 6, 2015 Downtown Urban Design Review Board meeting

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

ITEM 2: Discuss and consider a Certificate of Appropriateness related to the conversion of a warehouse located at 705 SE Grant St. to apartments that was tabled on August 6, 2015

Mr. Horsley asked Mr. Shaw to begin the item. Mr. Shaw began the item by giving some background on the applicant's project and the last meeting where it was discussed that a subcommittee should be established to meet with the applicant to specifically discuss issues relating to the proposed design and the existing design standards.

Mr Shaw stated that a meeting did occur at the site with Mr. Reeves, Mr. Lynch, and Mrs. Walton representing the DDRB and Mr. Hudson, the applicant.

Mr. Shaw stated that members of the subcommittee discussed several possible options that may be considered regarding the design of the wall, which in their opinion was the most pressing concern. Mr. Hudson stated that all alternatives would not work given various constraints related to the site and reiterated to the subcommittee members that safety was of the greatest concern and that the 8 foot wall was needed. Mr. Hudson also presented that he had added additional design elements of the wall to make it look better and that he reduced the length of the wall and felt that he was doing what he could to make the design fit better with the design standards but given the dimensions of the street and the characteristics of the building, meeting the design standards would not be possible, not only for his building but for all the buildings on Grant St. Mr. Shaw disagreed and stated that it was the design of the wall that prevented the project from meeting the design standards.

Mr. Horsley stated that again, he wanted to support the project but that as proposed, the project did not meet the design standards and that although he knew the project had been previously approved by the TIRZ #1 Board for incentives, that he could not support an approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness as it related to meeting the design standards.

Mr. Gosselin reiterated that he felt the project warranted special consideration given previous consideration and approval from the TIRZ Board and that he felt it was not a decision, at this point, that the DDRB should act on by denying the project. Mr. Rathbun stated that he understood the need for the security of the wall.

Mr. Pair stated he felt that the Board was being asked to vote on if the project meet the current standards and, although he understood the history of the project, felt it did not meet current standards and could not support approving the project as it might set a dangerous precedent for future projects.

Mr. Horsley stated that he felt the Board had heard all points of view and needed to act and asked for a motion. Mr. Gosselin motioned for approval of the project as presented. Mr. Rathbun seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 3-2 vote.

However, Mr. Reeves felt that although the Board approved the project, that a resolution be passed that stated the Board felt, that given the previous history of this project, this was a unique circumstance and a unique property that the Board had to deal with and that it needed to be on the record that this was an exception to what would be normally required of a project. Mr. Shaw stated that he would prepare such a resolution and have it available before a final decision was made on the project.

Mr. Reeves made a motion to prepare the resolution. Mr. Pair seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 3: Public Forum

There was none

ITEM 4: Consider Future Agenda Items

The Board stated that they felt the warehouse area needed to be looked at regarding how the existing standards applied and that perhaps specific standards needed to be considered for the warehouse area that better fit the existing conditions of that area.



Kelley Shaw
Planning Director