

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
January 14, 2009

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the December 10, 2008 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. University BP Properties – 520 Reisterstown Road & Linden Terrace

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes of the December 10, 2008 Meeting
Appendix C	Staff Report – University BP Properties

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
January 14, 2009

Call to order

Chairman, William Monk, 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. William Monk
Mr. John DiMenna
Mr. Donald Kann
Ms. Betsy Boykin
Ms. Magda Westerhout

Not Present

Mr. Thomas Repsher
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Scott Rykiel

County staff present included:

Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak, Diana Itter

Minutes of the December 10, 2008 meeting

Mr. DiMenna moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Mr. Monk and passed by acclamation at 6:07 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: University BP Properties – 520 Reisterstown Road & Linden Terrace

DRP PROJECT #: 505

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Engineer, Cornelia Marin of Gerhold Cross & Etzel, presented the project to the panel. The property is located between Milford Mill Road, Reisterstown Road, and Linden Terrace. Currently the site houses a gas station and attached convenience store along with two houses that are used as office buildings on the two rear lots. The proposed area combines four total lots, two of which are zoned BL AS and two that are zoned RO. The owner intends to raze the two houses on the rear lots and construct an extension to the convenience store along with a carry-out restaurant, a car wash and an office building all of which will be one body of a building. The applicant seeks to match the architecture with the area and make the whole property look more like the surroundings and comply with the new Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines.

At this time the owner would like to complete the project in phases with phase one including the extension of the convenience store, the carry-out restaurant, and the car wash. The applicant stated that in approximately 10-20 years the office building portion is proposed to be built.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Monk had staff review the details of the prepared staff report for the panel. The staff report is filed as Appendix C. There were many issues that staff raised with regards to landscaping and other elements that must comply with the Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines.

Mr. Monk questioned the size of the handicapped spaces. He asked the applicant to check with the county code to make sure that they are meeting all requirements, with regard to spacing and parking counts. He also commented on the possible dumpster location and enclosure/screening materials. Mr. Monk also commented that he would like to see more details on the signage, both existing and proposed.

Mr. DiMenna questioned the engineer about the possible issues with the ingress/egress at the Millford Mill entrance. He was also concerned with possible stacking issues from the car wash and the possible traffic that could arise on Reisterstown Road.

Ms. Westerhout commented on the phases of the project. She suggested that the engineer present phase 1 of the project in the future and then phase 2 at a later time, due to the fact that it may never actually be built. Ms. Westerhout suggested revising the site plan to show only phase 1 with the revisions as noted in the staff report.

Mr. Kann suggested that the engineer and architect revise the building footprint and reconfigure the parking area. He feels that the site can be reconfigured to improve circulation and provide better pedestrian circulation.

Ms. Boykin also suggested revising the parking layout as well as open space and SWM on the site. She also noted that she agreed with staff comments as noted in the staff report and suggested

that the applicant revisit the lighting issues and find a better light element that will fit with the Pikesville guidelines.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Mr. Alan Zuckerberg, of the Pikesville Communities Corporation, commented on the existing signage. He suggested using a smaller village type sign for the site. He was also concerned with the potential safety hazard of the Milford Mill entrance, a possible no left turn was suggested. Mr. Zuckerberg also suggested that the details of the storm water management plans be presented in the future and he also commented on the aluminum frame windows and the possible coloring of them.

Mr. Bryan Kuebler, of the Sudbrook Park Community, thanked the panel for all of their comments. He questioned the new location of the oil reclamation tank, due to the new construction and potential hazards. Mr. Kuebler also commented on the use of EIFS and vinyl siding, he stated that those materials do not hold up very well in the long term

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Kann to have the project tabled. At this time it was asked that the applicant coordinate all plans and work with the architect and others before resubmitting the project for review. The panel would like to see the project revised and plans be split up into phases.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Westerhout and approved by acclamation at 7:27 p.m.

Mr. Monk asked the panel to review the plans and submit any ideas they may have to the planning staff within a week. The staff will then review the plans and revisit the revised plans with the applicant to determine when the project will return back to DRP.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 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 March 11, 2009