

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 14, 2007

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Items for vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 1512-1514 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville
2. 8214B Bellona Avenue – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A Agenda

Appendix B Minutes of the December 13, 2006 Meeting

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 14, 2007

Call to order

Chairman, Geoffrey Glazer, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County Design Review Panel to order at 6:00 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. Geoffrey Glazer
Mr. Dean Hoover
Mr. Thomas Repsher
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Jamie Cahn (Resident Member – RRLRAIA)

Not Present

Mr. Derrick Burnett
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Ms. Betsy Boykin

County staff present included:

Lynn Lanham, Jenifer German, Krystle Patchak, Diana Itter

Review of today's agenda

There were no changes to the published agenda, which is filed as Appendix A.

Minutes of the December 13, 2006 meeting

Mr. Parts moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hoover and passed by acclamation.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 1512-1514 Reisterstown Road (Second Review)

DRP PROJECT#: 477

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Site Engineer, Burton English, and architect, Jonathan McGowan presented the revised project to the panel. The applicants have acquired the commercial property at the northwest corner of Reisterstown Road and Old Court Road, formerly known as the Sheridan Building. The existing building on the site will be razed to construct a new 4,000 square foot, one story masonry building for office or retail use in conformance with the current BL zoning. Parking on the site will meet the 20 spaces required, with 19 typical spaces, 1 handicapped space and 1 loading space. All parking will be moved to the rear of the site and screened along Old Court Road by a proposed retaining wall. An existing 24' entrance to the site from Reisterstown Road will be retained for access in and out of the site, with right turns only permitted when exiting the site. Pedestrian access will be provided between the transit stop on Old Court Road and the building entrances.

The proposed building has been moved forward on the site to address the corner and comply with locating the building closer to the street. Materials and building design have been re-worked to coordinate with the Pikesville Design Guidelines. The proposed building will be constructed of brick with aluminum frame windows and awnings. Due to the building being moved forward to the corner, a variance will be needed to allow a 10' building setback. A variance to the Landscape Manual will also be requested to allow for a six foot planting strip, due to the odd shape of the site and existing sloped topography.

This is the second review for this project. At the previous review of this project, which was held on October 13, 2006, the panel asked the applicant to adhere more to the Pikesville Guidelines and to work more with the local community groups to gain feedback on the proposal. After meeting with the community the applicant came up with two designs for the building including one with a semi-circular element and one with a rectangular element that was the center point of the building. Both designs were presented to the panel at the meeting.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

There were no speakers signed in to speak on behalf or against the proposed project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer commented on the revisions and improvements to the overall project. He questioned the semi-circle elements on the building and asked for input from the other panel members regarding the element.

Mr. Parts agreed with Mr. Glazer about the improvements made to the project. He feels that the semi-circle element makes the site more interesting and helps to address the corner.

Mr. Hoover and Mr. Repsher agreed with Mr. Parts and they both felt that this project will be an asset to the community.

Mr. Glazer stated that the panel is not setting a precedent with this project in regards to the Pikesville Guidelines. This project is being reviewed as an individual project and it is located on a very unique, small piece of property on a very busy corner, therefore the panel feels that this projects design best fits the site and the surrounding community.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Parts to approve the project as submitted with the semi-circle element. The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation.

Mr. Kann recused himself from the panel for this project.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 8214B Bellona Avenue (Third Review)

DRP PROJECT #: 478

PROJECT TYPE: Residential – Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Stuart Kaplow, representing the property owners Demos and Nancy Anastasiades, and architect for the project, Stuart Macklin, presented the revised project to the panel. The applicant is proposing a 2-story single-family detached dwelling with an attached two-car garage. The exterior of the home will consist of an asphalt roof and an almond color vinyl siding along with bay windows and shutters on all four sides. The proposed home will share a driveway with the existing home at 8214 Bellona Avenue. The home sits back from the road and will not be visible from any public road. A building permit was actually issued for this property in February of 2004, when no Design Review Panel guidelines were in place for the property. Since no action was taken after issuance of the permit, the applicant had to re-apply for a permit resulting in having to go through the DRP Process. The applicant is now presenting his plans to the panel for the third time.

At the previous meeting, which was held on December 13, 2006, the panel asked the applicant to resubmit the project with conditions. The conditions are listed in the minutes from the previous meeting, which are filed as Appendix B.

Revisions that were made to the project in regards to the panel's previous comments included shifting the home 90 degrees and scaling down the house. The applicant proposed a new roofline for the home, which included a 4-sided hip, which would reduce the massing of the roof. The applicant also proposed porches for both the rear and front of the home, one with a flat roof and the other with a trellis roof. The rear of the building will be brought out 2ft in one area and set back in the other to give the home more depth. The applicant has met with the community per the recommendation of the Design Review Panel.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Nancy Horst, of the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Area Improvement Association, complimented the applicant on the redesigned proposal. She stated that the community is mostly concerned with the potential runoff problems. As a potential solution to runoff concerns, Ms. Horst suggested the idea of a rain garden.

Michael Hupp, resident of 8214 Bellona Avenue, stated that he missed the community meeting. He commented on the new orientation of the home and he stated that his main concerns include landscaping and drainage and sewer issues. Mr. Hupp stated that he was not given exact details on the drainage issues and he would like to see more detailed plans.

Alex Paredes, of 1211 Robinhood Circle, stated that he is concerned with the overall massing of the home. He also commented on the new orientation of the home. Mr. Paredes stated that no one in the community wants the home to be built and he would like the water runoff issues to be looked at very closely. He feels that this location receives significant runoff from a lot of the

surrounding communities. Mr. Glazer assured Mr. Paredes and the other community members in attendance that the panel cannot prohibit someone from building a home, as long as the requirements are met.

Jane Bowling, of 8212 Bellona Avenue presented the chart to the panel that was handed out at the previous meeting by another community member, which outlines the massing and scale of the other adjacent homes in the area.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Parts commented on the runoff issue, he feels that the water draining into the ground would work best to slow down the flow of water. He also had concerns with the window alignment on the sides and rear of the home. Mr. Macklan, architect for the site, stated that adjusting the windows should not pose a problem. Mr. Kaplow stated that the window arrangement was designed for privacy and to accommodate neighbors concerns. Mr. Parts also commented on the roof overhang at the garage entrance.

Mr. Hoover was concerned with the sewer access and where it is located on the property and property line issues. The shed belonging to the resident at 8214 was also discussed. A portion of the shed currently sits on the 8214B property. The applicants are willing to work with the owner of the shed if an agreement can be made and the proposed paving will fit.

Mr. Kann questioned the small hipped roofs over the windows on the front of the home. He was also concerned with the placement of the windows, especially those close to the corners of the home. He suggested shifting the windows farther away from the edges of the home.

Mr. Repsher questioned the boundary survey and record plat. He would like also to see the true sewer locations. Mr. Repsher also commented on the discrepancies between the plans. He stated that all of the plans are not coordinated. They all need to be accurate and correspond with one another. Mr. Repsher also commented on the drainage issues and he stated that the downspouts leading to splash blocks would be the preferable way to go. Mr. Hoover agreed with Mr. Repsher's idea.

Mr. Cahn, resident member for Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland, questioned how the home is comparable to other homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Kaplow stated that there is a mix of homes and sizes of homes in the area. Mr. Cahn also stated that the panel needs to see material samples. Mr. Cahn also questioned the landscape plan, he would like to see what is truly existing and what will be removed. The drainage plans were also a concern of Mr. Cahn's.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Repsher made a motion to have the project resubmitted. Mr. Parts outlined the following conditions:

1. Study window placement
2. Resolve issues regarding shed and sanitary connections with neighbor
3. Depict correct sanitary connection locations
4. Re-work massing of window dormers
5. Address corner trim of siding (present accurate material samples)
6. Submit a complete and cohesive package where all plan drawings & architecture are clearly and accurately portrayed and coordinated.

7. There is no issue with basic building massing

Mr. Repsher accepted the conditions presented by Mr. Parts and the amended motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and passed by acclamation.

Note: It is suggested that a field survey site plan sealed by a professional surveyor be provided with the next submission.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:35 p.m.

Code Statement: Section 32 – 4 – 203 (i) (2) of the Baltimore County Code states, *The Panel's recommendation is binding on the Hearing Officer, and on the agencies under subsection (1), (Directors of the Office of Planning, the Department of Permits and Development Management and the Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management), unless the Hearing Officer or agencies find that the Panel's actions constitute an abuse of its discretion or are unsupported by the documentation and evidence presented.*

Approved as of April 11, 2007