

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
March 11, 2009

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the January 14, 2009 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 4 Sudbrook Lane – Rothschild Dental Office – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes of the January 14, 2009 Meeting
Appendix C	Staff Report – 4 Sudbrook Lane

\

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 11, 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. Thomas Repsher
Ms. Magda Westerhout

Not Present

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

County staff present included:

Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak, Diana Itter

Minutes of the January 14, 2009 meeting

Ms. Westerhout moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and passed by acclamation at 6:04 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 4 Sudbrook Lane – Rothschild Dental Office

DRP PROJECT #: 507

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Dick Matz, of Colbert Matz & Rosenfelt, along with architect Jay Brown of Levin/Brown & Associates, presented the project to the panel. The proposed project calls for an addition to a former single-family dwelling that had been converted to office by its previous owner. The purpose of the improvements & addition is for creating dental offices. The proposal is to retain the front of the building and replace a portion of the back of the building with a one-story addition. The addition will also include a basement. The existing front porch on the building will be removed and replaced to accompany a handicap ramp. Materials for the project include hardi-plank siding along with asphalt roof shingles and shutters to match those of the existing building. The siding color will be Navajo Beige with white trim.

The property is zoned R-O and the building, with its proposed improvements, is a class B office building, requiring special exception approval. The hearing for the project is scheduled for April 3, 2009 before the Zoning Commissioner.

A brief history of the project consisted of a proposal for a class A office building with a small addition to the rear. Although the Class A use was previously approved, the plans ended up not working for the applicants desired use of the building.

The Baltimore County Office of Planning issued a staff report which is filed as Appendix C. The applicant addressed some of the concerns of the Planning Office. They stated that they revised the sidewalks and are negotiating with the Councilman and the neighbors regarding creating an entrance off of DiRisio Lane. The applicant would like to remove the county owned fence along the property and providing landscaping instead and is seeking the approval/support to do so. Parking for the offices will consist of one handicap spot at the front and 12 spaces in the rear.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Westerhout commented on the material choice for the project, stating that it was an appropriate use. She suggested replacing the porch exactly as it exists instead of extending it over the ramp. She feels that this will work better for the project as a whole and will still allow for the ramp access. Ms. Westerhout also complemented the applicant for re-siding the entire building.

Mr. Repsher agreed with the idea of removing the fence, if possible and the DiRisio entrance. He also stated that if the entrance is allowed in the rear, the applicant would need to revise the landscape plan to replace the driveline down the side. He suggested a sign would be helpful to identify the parking in the rear for the public. Mr. Repsher also suggested screening the dumpster/trash enclosure. At this time the applicant is not sure whether dumpsters or trash bins will be needed. A possible enclosure could be attached to the building.

Mr. Monk stated that the staff and the panel is supportive of the elimination of the fence. He also suggested revising the landscape plan, if the fence removal was approved. After Ms. Itter from the planning staff discussed the issues of the Pikesville Communities Corporation, Mr. Monk

urged the applicant to continue working with the community to get any outstanding issues resolved, such as the entrance/fence, etc. He suggested taking a redline plan to the hearing to present both possible lot layouts. Mr. Monk also suggested screening the parking on the rear lot from the adjacent neighbors.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Ms. Westerhout to have the plans approved as presented with conditions as follows:

1. Provide sign details
2. Revise porch plans – replace porch as it stands
3. Revise landscape plan – add additional landscaping at foundation and along rear elevation as well as screening the west side of the rear parking lot.
4. Provide trash enclosure details

The Design Review Panel was in support of the proposed access off of DiRisio Lane as well as the removal of the wooden fence, with the idea that more substantial landscaping will be provided. The panel is also ok with the front driveline as proposed, if the access off of DiRisio is not granted.

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. DiMenna and approved by acclamation at 6:52 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:53 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 April 7, 2009