

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

On the 6<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017, the Downtown Design Review Board met in a scheduled session at 5:30 p.m. in Room 203 located on the second floor of the Simms Building, 808 S. Buchanan, Amarillo, Texas, with the following members present:

VOTING MEMBERS	PRESENT	NO. MEETINGS HELD	NO. MEETINGS ATTENDED
Steve Gosselin	N	28	25
Steve Pair, Chairman	N	11	7
Cole Camp	Y	6	6
Cindi Bulla	Y	6	5
Gary Jennings	Y	6	6
Verlinda Watson	N	6	1
Becky Heinen	Y	6	5
Alan Cox (alternate)	Y	3	3

Staff in Attendance:

AJ Fawver, AICP, CNU-A, Planning Director; David Soto, Planner I; and Jan Sanders, Recording Secretary.

ITEM 1: Public Comment: Citizens who desire to address the Downtown Amarillo Urban Design Review Board with regard to matters on the agenda or having to do with policies, programs, or services will be received at this time. The total time allotted for comments is three (3) minutes per speaker. The board may not discuss items not on this agenda, but may respond with factual, established policy information, or refer to staff. (*Texas Attorney General Opinion. JC-0169*) If you wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda, please hold your comments until that item is introduced.

No comments were made.

ITEM 2: Approval of March 9, 2017 Downtown Urban Design Review Board meeting minutes.

Acting Chairman Camp asked for corrections, deletions or changes to the minutes of March 9, 2017. Motion was made by Ms. Bulla, seconded by Mr. Cox, to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

**ITEM 3: COA-17-08 A request for approval, as required per Section 4-10-22 of the Downtown Urban Design Overlay District ordinance, for proposed new construction at the following location: 609 S Grant St, legally described as Lots 8, 9 & 10, Block 353, Mirror Addition.**

Mr. Soto advised the project is new construction of a warehouse building for H&R Foods. The new building will increase the storage capacity for the applicant. Mr. Soto stated upon receipt of an application, staff reviews four categories of standards, walkway corridor, building edge, street grid and parking, and signage. The walkway corridor is further broken into street trees, sidewalk standards and pedestrian light standards. Mr. Soto advised the application does meet the requirements of the walkway corridor and signage has not been requested. The request is asking the board to grant four variances from the applicable standards. These variances include 1) a variance from the maximum setback allowed of 5' from the property line, 2) a variance from the requirement of significant transparency with windows on the new addition due to the fact the project is within an industrial area, 3) a variance from the maximum allowed fence height of 6' to allow for a 7' fence, and 4) a variance from 75% minimum transparency for a fence, to allow a fence with 0% transparency to construct a masonry screening wall. Mr. Soto stated given the project is industrial in nature compared to the typical mixed-use public amenities within this district, staff believes the request is appropriate and recommends approval as submitted. Mr. Soto introduced Scott Stark, applicant, and advised Mr. Stark would be able to answer any additional questions.

Ms. Bulla inquired if the Traffic Department had reviewed the project for a possible increase in traffic. Ms. Fawver stated the City does not perform traffic impact assessments, as typically the zoning of the property influences traffic patterns. The City reviews a set of standards such as, is the project sited on the location where it should be upon the property, and are there any corner visibility issues. Ms. Bulla inquired if any discussion was held with the applicant about extending the landscaping and/or screening of the existing building. Mr. Soto advised the DAUDS reviews the request which is being developed today, and not the existing site. Ms. Fawver stated the DAUDS cannot force the applicant to increase their landscaping and/or screening to the existing site, but does have the option to add the amenities.

Ms. Heinen inquired about the definition of a setback in relation to the fence. Mr. Soto advised the setback is from the property line to the actual building, and therefore does not begin at the location of the fence. Mr. Stark stated the request of a 7' masonry wall is strictly for eye appeal as truck bays will be on the other side of the fence.

A motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for this project as submitted, with four variances, was made by Dr. Jennings. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bulla, and passed unanimously.

**ITEM 4: Report on variances granted by the Downtown Design Review Board dating back to 2010.**

Ms. Fawver gave the board a handout and a brief presentation on the variances approved by the board since 2010. The report shows 28 requests have been heard by the board and is a small percentage of the applications submitted to the Planning Department. The remaining applications are handled administratively.

ITEM 5: Consider future agenda items

Acting Chairman Camp stated he would like to further discuss the possibility of putting together a subcommittee on warehouse district design on the next agenda. Ms. Fawver advised staff has been discussing this item and may suggest a variety of methods, such as an overlay, an additional section added to the guidelines, or another approach, whereby stating these potential pieces may have some special challenges and here are some additional guidelines.

No further comments were made, Acting Chairman Camp adjourned the meeting.



---

AJ Fawver, AICP, CNU-A  
Planning Director