

* Note - Amendments shown in bold.

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
July 11, 2007

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Items for vote by the Design Review Panel

1. Jesuit Rectory House/Enten Property – 518 Chestnut Avenue
Residential, West Towson
2. Butchart Property – 7821-7823 Ellenham Avenue
Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
3. McDonald's – 502 Reisterstown Road
Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A Agenda

Appendix B Minutes of the April 11, 2007 Meeting

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
July 11, 2007

Call to order

Chairman, Geoffrey Glazer, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County Design Review Panel to order at 6:05 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. Geoffrey Glazer
Mr. Dean Hoover
Mr. Thomas Repsher
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Mr. Jack Dillon (Resident Member – West Towson)
Mr. Francis Anderson (Resident Member – RRLR)

Not Present

Mr. Donald Kann
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Christopher Parts

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, 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 April 11, 2007 meeting

Mr. Repsher moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hoover and passed by acclamation. Mr. Hoover then left the meeting.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: Jesuit Rectory House/Enten Property

DRP PROJECT #: 483

PROJECT TYPE: Residential – West Towson

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Scott Barhight along with Al Rubeling presented the project to the panel on behalf of the applicant, The Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen. The proposed project consists of a rectory to house Jesuit priests who currently reside on the Loyola Blakefield campus. The building will have approximately 16,888 square feet with two main floors and a half basement. There are twelve suites and two guest rooms. All residents will share one common kitchen and all common living spaces. The center of the building will have a chapel for regular worship services. The design intent is for this building to have a residential feel coordinated with the Loyola Blakefield architectural context of Knott Hall. There will be no site lighting or signage.

The Enten house currently exists on the property, which is directly adjacent from Hardigan Field. The Enten house will be razed to allow for the new proposal. The architectural elements of the Jesuit rectory will coordinate with the elements used on Knott Hall, which is part of the Loyola Campus. The materials for the project consist of primarily masonry elements including stucco **and citadel building stone which simulates** butler stone along with an asphalt shingle roof. The windows for the rectory will be operable, residential style windows.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Dillon, residential member for West Towson, questioned the location of the HVAC units. Mr. Rubeling stated that the boiler system will be placed in the basement and the chillers will be placed on the rooftop. Nothing will be placed on grade. Mr. Dillon also stated that he would like to see windows on the end gables of the north elevation, where the stairwells are located.

Mr. Rykiel stated that he liked the revision to the project to remove the dumpsters. He also agreed with Mr. Dillon's comments on the windows. He would also like to see shade trees of some sort along the façade and a formal hedge along the driveway to separate it from the adjacent field.

Mr. Repsher agreed with the other member's comments and questioned the walkway that would connect to the campus. The applicant stated that the walkway was not shown on the plan.

Mr. Glazer also agreed with the previous comments and requested that material samples be submitted.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Mr. Raymond Boulay, of 520 Chestnut Avenue, stated that he was concerned with the scale of the building. He stated that one corner of the rectory is 6 ft. from his property line. Mr. Boulay was also concerned with the removal of mature trees and the retaining wall that runs along the property line. Mr. Boulay also stated that if a buffer is created, he would like to see it on the Jesuit side of the property line. Mr. Rykiel suggested using a Leyland Cyprus along the wall.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Dillon to approve the project subject to the following conditions:

1. Submit final building material samples.
2. No on grade mechanical systems are used.
3. Revise plans to show windows in stairwells at both ends of building.
4. Increase shade trees and define driveway with a hedge.
5. Provide evergreen screening between retaining wall and rectory adjacent to the Boulay property.
6. Show the walkway from the rectory to school on plans.

The revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final approval.

Mr. Repsher seconded the motion and it was passed by acclamation at 6:30 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: Butchart Property

DRP PROJECT #: 482

PROJECT TYPE: Residential – Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Ruxton Cottages, LLC is proceeding with a subdivision of the property known as 7823 Ellenham Avenue and proposes the redevelopment of the property, which encompasses about an acre. The site is zoned DR 3.5. The new proposal, which was presented by J. Patrick Gill of Gill Properties LLC, consists of razing the existing residence, along with a portion of the existing driveway that will no longer be used. Two new residences will be built on the subdivided property. The new residence on lot 1, known as the “Rockwell House” will be comprised of approximately 3,800 finished feet above grade, and will use part of the existing driveway on Ellenham. The home will be constructed in a primarily classic gambrel design, with the use of flag stone and painted board and batten siding. The home will also feature a cupola on the top along with shutters on the front elevation. The residence on lot 2, known as the “Vanderhorst House,” will be comprised of 3,600 finished feet above grade, and a separate driveway off of Roland Road will serve it. The existing pool and pool patio along with the detached garage will be maintained. The home will be constructed of primarily cut blue stone with shutters and an asphalt shingle roof.

Proposed landscaping for the site includes foundation plantings on both lots to tie in with the existing trees on the site. The storm water management will need to be improved on the property and a study will be made in the future.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer was concerned with the size of the cupola and height of the ridge on the “Rockwell House,” lot 1. He suggested lowering the height 4 feet. Mr. Repsher **suggested creating another gambrel or hip in the roof to reduce the scale.** Mr. Repsher also questioned the grade of the driveway for lot 2, which is 14%. The grade of the driveway could be reduced by lowering the elevation of the house **or** garage.

Mr. Anderson is concerned with the height of the home on lot 1, he also commented on the idea of no shutters on the rear of the home. Mr. Anderson was also concerned with the screening of lot 1 and the existing fir trees. He would like the existing screening to remain. Mr. Anderson also commented on the windows on the rear of the house on lot 2, that appear to be off center. He would like them to be more asymmetrical.

Mr. Glazer was concerned with the storm water management issues on the property. Since the properties to the left and right of the driveway on Roland Avenue are below grade, and most of Roland Avenue does not have curbs, he feels drainage will be an issue. Mr. Glazer suggested using a swale and conducting a study. He also addressed the issue by community residents about off site road improvements. The applicant is not proposing any off site road improvements. The height of the home on lot 2, the “Vanderhorst House” was also questioned. Mr. Glazer suggested lowering the height of the roof **a bit.** Mr. Gill assured the panel that both roof heights meet county code. The existing pool area was also questioned by Mr. Glazer. The applicant stated that the fence will be replaced and some of the existing hemlocks will be removed.

Mr. Rykiel questioned the HVAC systems on the property. Mr. Gill assured that panel that the units, located behind the garage on lot 1 and off of the right elevation on lot 2, will be properly screened.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Dan Fesperman, of 7827 Roland Avenue, commented on the applicant's willingness to address the concerns of the community. He stated that his remaining concerns consist of the height of the homes and the landscape screening. He would like any buffers to be replaced if destroyed and any more proposed screening will be welcomed. Mr. Gill assured the panel that he is willing to work with them. Mr. Fesperman also noted that an easement was granted to him from Mr. Gill that states that the garden area that Mr. Fesperman uses, which currently sits on the site, will remain his. Mr. Glazer suggested noting the easement on the site drawing.

Geraldine Heisel, of 1808 Roland Avenue, stated that her main concerns are with the drainage issues. She has seen problems like this before in the area.

Nancy Horst, of 1813 Roland Avenue, also commented on Mr. Gill's willingness to work with the community and adjacent neighbors.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Anderson to have the project denied. He would like the applicant to resubmit the project with the following conditions:

1. Revise landscape plan to show appropriate screening and preserved trees
2. Depict appropriate storm water management issues, particularly how the drainage onto Roland Avenue will be controlled.
3. Revise roofline on both homes.
4. Revise cupola plans on lot 1 house, "Rockwell House."
5. Revise the rear elevation of the "Vanderhorst House" on lot 2 **to make window layout more symmetrical.**
6. Note material selections on the plans.
7. Clearly define easement on plans.
8. Amend LOD system to show all existing trees on site.
9. Submit corrected house elevations for both lot 1 and 2 without markup notations.
10. Place a note on the plan that the fir trees **used for screening that are** damaged during construction will be replaced.
11. Address tree protection measures on the proposed landscape plan.
12. Locate HVAC units on the plan.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and passed by acclamation at approximately 7:45 p.m.

ITEM 3

PROJECT NAME: McDonald's

DRP PROJECT #: 481

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial - Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Stanley Fine, of Rosenberg Martin Greenberg LLP, introduced the franchise owner, Robert Houck and Lee May, engineer for the project, to the panel. Mr. Lee stated that the property is located in the urban convenience area of the Pikesville design guidelines area and is zoned two-thirds BL and one-third DR 5.5.. The proposal calls for a rebuilding of the existing freestanding McDonald's restaurant, which was originally opened in February, 1967. The proposed building location, orientation, and overall site circulation will be similar to the existing. The two existing entrances on Reisterstown Road will be utilized for access to the site. The drive-thru lane, including the stacking will be improved with the proposed layout. The northwestern entrance is shared with the adjoining strip center. This entrance and the access aisle along the northwest side of the site are encumbered by a 20-foot wide easement and right-of-way area. No changes to the easement area are proposed with the redevelopment of the site. A parking variance will be requested.

The exterior of the building will have a brick façade accented with variations in brick depth and color to provide a visual interest. EIFS material will also be used on a vertical element. Signage will include a small identification sign, approximately at 16 feet in height.

After reviewing the Office of Planning's comments on the proposal the applicant decided to reduce the front driveline to 12 foot and use brick pavers and a variation in surface elevation to delineate this area as a pedestrian area. The EIFS material was also removed from the proposal and replaced with a red brick. The height of the sign will also be reduced as suggested by the Office of Planning.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the parking variance issue and the number of spaces now available on the site. The applicant stated that a study was done and they are sure that there is an adequate amount of parking on the site, even in peak hours. He also questioned the communication with the surrounding community. Mr. Fine stated that they have met with the Pikesville Chamber of Commerce as well as other surrounding community groups. Ms. Itter, from the Office of Planning stated that the Pikesville Chamber of Commerce strongly encouraged the shared parking with the neighboring strip center.

Mr. Rykiel questioned the one story proposal. He referred to the guidelines as it pertains to a second story, the location of the building and elimination of the driveline between the front of the building and Reisterstown Road. Mr. Glazer stated that it would be simple to give the perception of a false second story. He suggested raising the parapet and using punch out windows. These changes could be made without affecting the branding image and the design of the monument sign.

Mr. Repsher applauded the applicant on the revitalization of the building. He questioned the HVAC equipment locations. The applicant stated that the parapet could be adjusted and used to screen the equipment, which would be located on the interior roof.

Signage was another issue discussed by the panel. Several panel members questioned the location of the sign blocking the view of drivers exiting the site. The applicants stated that they will provide a larger landscaped area at the front of the building and surrounding the sign. The panel asked for accurate drawings to be supplied showing the exact location and dimensions of the sign and surrounding landscape area.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Reverend Hipkins, of the Ames Sudbrook United Methodist Church located on the opposite side of Reisterstown Road voiced her concerns over the traffic problems in the area. She was also concerned with the safety pedestrians in and around the site.

Bonnie Ruff, also of the Church, shared some of the same safety concerns. Other concerns include the health of people and the noise created from the demolition of the existing building. Mr. Glazer assured her that the county has standards for these issues that must be met. Ms. Ruff also questioned the construction time, which was stated to be approximately 3 months.

Mr. Fine stated that the applicants are willing to work with the Church and answer any of their questions and concerns.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Rykiel made a motion to deny the project and have it resubmitted at a later date with the following revisions:

1. The design should reflect the Pikesville Design Guidelines and Office of Planning Comments.
2. Revise façade and building height. One option is to raise the parapet and add some punched windows to give the feeling of additional height.
3. Revise location of signage and accurately depict its location and dimensions on plans.
4. Move the building forward a few feet and provide special paving on front drive lane.

Mr. Repsher seconded the motion and it was passed by acclamation at approximately 8:42 p.m..

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 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 (l), (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 September 17, 2007