

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 12, 2008
DRAFT

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the January 9, 2008 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. SunTrust Bank – Commercial, Towson (Third Review)
2. 100 Estes Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland (Second Review)
3. 319 South Wind Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
4. 1210 Berwick Avenue – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland (Second Review)

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A

Agenda

Appendix B

Minutes of the January 9, 2008 Meeting

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 12, 2008
DRAFT

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. Christopher Parts
Mr. Dean Hoover
Ms. Kathy Palencar (Resident Member – RRLR)

Not Present

Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Thomas Repsher
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Donald Kann
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Mr. Scott Rykiel

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, Krystle Patchak

Minutes of the January 9, 2008 meeting

Mr. Hoover moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Mr. Parts and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: SunTrust Bank (Third Review)

DRP PROJECT #: 488

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial Towson

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The SunTrust Bank Corporation is proposing a bank at the corner of Washington Avenue and York Road, in Towson, Md. The proposal calls for a branch bank with drive-thru lanes, on a 1.74 acre parcel of land, which is zoned BMCT.

This project was previously presented to the panel at both the December 12, 2007 and January 9, 2008 meetings. At the initial meeting the panel asked the applicant to revise the plans and building elevations to address the overall site layout and site circulation. This was later revised and at the January 9, 2008 meeting the panel asked that the applicant participate in a work session to work out the issues of the project. A work session was held with county officials and as of March 12, 2008 the Planning Office has received the final site plan and recommended approval of pending the following comments:

1. Remove one of the three drive-thru lanes and tighten up the paving width to reflect this change.
2. Show dashed lines that show the two future "pad" sites boundaries
3. Reword the label "Future Pad Site" to read as Future Development Site
4. The site falls within the Amenity Open Space Area, see page 245 through 253 of the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies. Streetscape and decorative lighting improvements are required on Washington Avenue and Joppa Road.

Adam Morman, of Daft McCune Walker, presented a revised site plan to the panel which depicted the revisions based on issues 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Morman stated that the three drive-thru lanes are needed due to the fact that one lane is used for night drop off and an ATM.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the materials for the sign on the parapet. The applicant stated that individual letters are proposed along with a stand-alone symbol, but they are open to any additional suggestions.

Mr. Parts question the location of the pedestrian walkways from the parking lot to the entrance. Mr. Morman stated that there is a walkway that runs from the lot and along Washington Avenue to the plaza at the corner. Mr. Parts also commented on the size of the columns supporting the drive-thru canopy. He suggested making them larger to support the large canopy and/or reducing the height/mass of the canopy. He also suggested extending the brick up the cornice to the top of the building to take away from the wide sign band. Mr. Parts also suggested giving the windows on the rear elevation more of a vertical proportion.

Mr. Glazer then thanked the applicant for working with the adjacent property owners and the county to come up with a better proposal for the site and the prominent corner.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Parts to approve the revised site plan with the following conditions:

1. Conform to issues 2, 3, and 4 raised by the Planning Office
2. Address proportions discussed by panel
 - Rear windows – Vertical proportions
 - Signage element – Continue brick up cornice to top of building to enhance sign band
 - Canopy/support columns – Reduce height/mass of canopy and/or make columns larger

Revised plans and elevations that address the conditions are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final administrative approval.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoover and passed by acclamation at 6:14 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 100 Estes Road (Addition – Second Review)

DRP PROJECT #: 489

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Dusky Holman, of Gildea & Schmidt, explained the overall proposal to the panel. The proposal calls for the renovation and addition to the existing structure located at 100 Estes Road. The existing structure is dilapidated in nature and the applicant intends to removal all interior sheetrock and insulation in order to inspect the structural integrity of the structure and update the HVAC, electrical, and plumbing systems.

This project was previously reviewed by the panel at the January 9, 2008 panel meeting. At that time the project was denied and the applicant was asked to revise and resubmit the project to address the following issues:

1. Revise driveway width
2. Revise elevations – (Proportions of front door, arched windows)
3. Landscape plan – Show plans for proposed landscaping
4. Meet with community to gain feedback on proposal and address concerns

As of March 12, 2008 the applicant has met with a group of approximately 15 residents who were pleased by the project. Mr. Holman stated that there was one major issue that was raised by a resident who was concerned with runoff issues. He stated that the resident submitted a letter describing a restriction (that no swimming pool be constructed) to be placed in the deed for the future regarding this issue. Mr. Holman agreed to this restriction.

The driveway width was revised and tapered to still allow for the amount of spaces needed and allow maneuverability. The landscape plan was also revised to accurately depict the existing and proposed landscaping.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the outcome of the community meeting. Mr. Holman stated that most residents were pleased with the project, except for the runoff concern, and he offered to keep them informed along the way.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Parts to approve the revised project as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Palencar and approved by acclamation at 6:21 p.m.

ITEM 3

PROJECT NAME: 319 South Wind Road (Addition)

DRP PROJECT #: 491

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Dan Bursai of P.W. Ratcliffe Architects, presented the proposal to the panel. The proposal calls for an addition exceeding 50% of the existing structure to an existing rancher style house. A two-story addition will be added to the rear of the existing structure along with a second level being added to the front of the structure. The existing garage on the site will remain.

The exterior of the structure, along with the garage, will be completed in Western Red Cedar shake shingles. All exterior trim and entrance doors will be painted white and exterior decorative shutters will be also be used, constructed of cedar.

There will be no significant grading changes on the site and no trees are to be removed. Landscaping is proposed on both sides of the lot to provide screening where there are gaps in the existing landscaping.

The applicant has met with the community members prior to the meeting and all were pleased with the project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the exterior materials to be used. The applicant stated that the exterior will be completed primarily in cedar plank, with masonry to be used on the porches, and cedar shutters.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Parts to approve the project as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Palencar and approved by acclamation at 6:31 p.m.

ITEM 4

PROJECT NAME: 1210 Berwick Avenue (Second Review)

DRP PROJECT #: 485

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Kevin Michels of West Wind LLC, is proposing a single family, 3100 square foot home with a connected two car garage, deck, and finished basement. The site is comprised of a little under .5 acres, with an asphalt driveway access off of Berwick Avenue. The materials for the project include a primarily brick exterior along with divided Pella windows and hardi-plank, white siding. Workable black shutters are proposed for the front elevation of the home. There is also a privacy fence proposed along a portion of the property boundary at 1214 Berwick Avenue.

This project was previously reviewed by the panel at the January 9, 2008 panel meeting. At that time the project was denied and the applicant was asked to revise and resubmit the project to address the following issues:

1. Revise site plan – Show sidewalks, drive-lanes, deck
2. Revise landscape plan – Show caliper sizes of all trees
3. Meet with community to gain feedback on proposal and address concerns

As of March 12, 2008 the applicant has revised both the site plan and landscape plan. A meeting with the community took place on February 2, 2008 and the plans were discussed with the surrounding neighbors. Overall concerns were with landscape screening and runoff. Mr. Michels revised the landscape plan to accommodate the concerns. He also stated that he was not able to reach a compromise with the neighbors at 1214 Berwick Avenue.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the screening facing 1214 Berwick Avenue. Mr. Michels stated that he proposes a 6ft. privacy fence at that location along with additional plantings.

Mr. Hoover complimented the applicant on his effort to meet with the community. He also suggested using a swale to handle the potential runoff problems. The applicant should make sure that the swale does not concentrate water in a way that it would create erosion (max 3cfs).

Mr. Parts commented on the fact that the home meets all codes and that side-loaded garages are typically preferred for aesthetic purposes.

Ms. Palencar questioned the use of the privacy fence vs. additional landscaping for screening. Mr. Michels explained that there is very little soil available on that area of the lot, due to the driveway and property line.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Felicia Scrivener, of 1214 Berwick Avenue, voiced her concerns to the panel. She questioned the plantings to be used at the screening fence, she was told that climbing hydrangeas would be used, which would be hard to maintain. Ms. Scrivener also stated that she has met with Richard Klein of CEDs who suggested that she retain a stormwater engineer to review the project. The engineer

was unable to attend the meeting. She also suggested moving the home forward on the lot or turning the garage to the front of the home. She also mentions issues with lighting, car exhaust, and screening.

Charles Carroll, President of West Wind LLC, stated that his company is the second purchaser of this property, which has been involved with the county since May of 2002. Mr. Carroll stated that the neighbors of this property continuously have issues with the property and cannot reach a compromise.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Parts to have the project submitted to the Planning Office for final approval after the following conditions have been met:

1. Resolve drainage issues by redesigning the swale
2. Discuss adding landscape screening on the 1214 Berwick Avenue side of the fence.

The Planning Office will review the final plans and grant final approval.

Mr. Glazer informed the applicant and the surrounding neighbors in attendance that the Planning Office cannot require landscape planting on the adjacent owners property.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Palencar and approved by acclamation at 6:58 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.*