

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
April 9, 2008

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the March 12, 2008 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 607 Bosley Avenue – Commercial, Towson
2. 1011 Malvern 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 March 12, 2008 Meeting

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

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. Thomas Repsher
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Mr. Francis Anderson (RRLR – Resident Member)

Not Present

Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Dean Hoover
Mr. Scott Rykiel

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, Jenifer German, Krystle Patchak

Minutes of the March 12, 2008 meeting

Mr. Repsher moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Ms. Westerhout and passed by acclamation at 6:05 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 607 Bosley Avenue

DRP PROJECT #: 493

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Towson

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Tim Sanders, of Sanders Designs Architects, presented the project to the panel. The existing building on the lot, which was initially a house later converted to an office building, is owned by Fusco Financial Services. At this time the business is expanding and the applicant is proposing to raze the existing building and construct a 4,300 s.f. office building structure.

The lot is 50 feet wide by approximately 100 feet deep, and is surrounded by office buildings and incidental uses, such as parking lots. Due to the limited lot size, the parking has been maximized at the rear of the site as well as the landscaping and other architectural elements.

The proposed building will be comprised of a primarily brick façade, with period lighting, a traditional porch, roof dormers, and a cupola. The buildings front entry will face Bosley Avenue and a brick pathway will link the front entry to the parking lot in the rear.

Materials for the project include a medium brown/red brick for the facade, and beige hardi-plank siding on the rear along with an asphalt, slate colored roof. A free-standing sign is also proposed at the front of the property facing Bosley Avenue.

All grades on the site are to be maintained and all setbacks have been met.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the main entrance to the building. He suggested that if the front of the building is the main entrance, a more decorative lighting scheme should be used up the side of the building that pedestrians will be walking along.

Mr. Repsher questioned the setback on the north side of the building. The applicant stated the building is fire rated on the north side.

Ms. Westerhout stated that she is in support of the variance requested for an 8ft. setback.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Larry Schmidt, on behalf of the Greater Towson Committee, stated that they are in support of the project. Mr. Schmidt stated that this property is very visible from Bosley Avenue, and he feels that this is a great improvement to the area.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Repsher to approve the project as submitted with conditions:

1. Brick is to be used on side elevation as well as front façade
2. Clarify notch in building on final site plan

A final site plan and architectural drawings showing the revision of the side façade using the same brick material as the front façade should be submitted to the Office of Planning for final approval.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Westerhout and approved by acclamation at 6:18 p.m.

Mr. Glazer suggested that the applicant consider decorative lighting along side of building.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 1011 Malvern Avenue

DRP PROJECT #: 492

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Phil Hoag, owner of the property, stated that he proposes to build a 4000 s.f. house along with a 3-car garage on the site.

Joe Brandli, of Joe Architects Incorporated, presented the proposal to the panel. The former home on the site was demolished in the summer/fall of 2007. At this time the owner plans to construct a two-story single family home in place of the previous structure. The new home will be a Country French style home of approximately 4,000 finished square feet (first floor +/- 2600 s.f. with the remaining 1400 s.f. on the second floor). The home will have a symbolic front facing Malvern Avenue, with an actual front entryway on the side of the home. A driveway is proposed alongside the entryway up to the proposed 3-car garage at the rear of the lot.

Materials to be used on the project include primarily stone along with a drivit/stucco type material. Brick will also be used as a trim around the stone.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Glazer questioned the turning radius out of the garage. The plans depict 20ft, which could be very tight. Mr. Repsher suggested pushing the garage back further on the lot.

Mr. Glazer also questioned the dimensions of the elevations. The applicant stated that the highest point on the elevations of the proposed house sits at approximately 35ft. above grade. The garage height is 15 ft.

Mr. Repsher was concerned about the elevations not matching the foot print shown on the site plan.

Mr. Anderson, resident member for Ruxton/Riderwood/ Lake Roland, questioned the applicant about his involvement with the surrounding neighbors. The applicant stated that they had met with approximately 30 community members and the main concerns were as follows:

- 3-car garage
- Height of home and garage
- Patios – privacy issues

panel meeting. Ms. Westerhout also discussed what she believes are outstanding issues that need to be resolved prior to approval:

- Material boards with actual samples
- Materials identified on elevations
- Height dimensions shown on all elevations

- Elevations of garage showing materials and height dimensions
- Revise turning radius at garage

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Howard Downing, of 1101 Malvern Avenue, questioned the panel about zoning issues on the property in regards to the setbacks and what is considered the actual front and rear of the home. Mr. Glazer informed him that the DRP does not make zoning determinations. Mr. Downing also questioned the landscape plan and if the sizes and calipers of the plantings are to be shown. He was also concerned with the garage being too close to the property line.

Lauren O'Donnell Iannello, of 1009 Malvern Avenue, was also concerned with setback and zoning issues. Ms. Iannello was also concerned with privacy issues due to the mass of the home and the amount of windows. She also suggested moving the house back on the lot to reduce some of the issues discussed.

Dottie Downing, also of 1101 Malvern Avenue, was concerned with the overall massing of the house compared to others in the neighborhood. The Panel assured the residents that as long as the projects adhere to regulations, the DRP does not have the power to stop projects.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Repsher to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Provide materials board with actual samples
2. Revise elevations – Provide height dimensions, identify materials
3. Garage – Provide elevations to show height dimensions and materials
4. Revise turning radius at garage
5. Provide landscape plan with size and species listed and identified

All plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Westerhout and approved by acclamation at 7:10 p.m.

* Note: The applicant should have the plan approved by the Zoning Office for conformance with setback requirements vis a vis the locations of the front door and front setback.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:12 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 May 14, 2008