

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
May 13, 2009

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's agenda**

**Minutes of the April 7, 2009 Meeting**

**Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel**

1. 207/209 East Joppa Road – Commercial, Towson

**Adjournment of the Board Meeting**

**Baltimore County Design Review Panel**  
*Appendices*

**Appendix A**

Agenda

**Appendix B**

Minutes of the April 7, 2009 Meeting

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
May 13, 2009

**Call to order**

Acting Chair, Magda Westerhout, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:03 p.m. The following panel members were:

**Present**

Mr. William Monk  
Ms. Betsy Boykin  
Mr. Thomas Repsher  
Ms. Magda Westerhout

**Not Present**

Mr. Donald Kann  
Mr. Derrick Burnett  
Mr. Christopher Parts  
Mr. Scott Rykiel  
Mr. John DiMenna

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

**Minutes of the April 7, 2009 meeting**

Mr. Repsher moved the acceptance of the draft minutes and the motion was seconded by Ms. Boykin and passed by acclamation at 6:35 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

## **ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 207/209 East Joppa Road

**DRP PROJECT #:** 506

**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Towson

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The site is located on the south side of Joppa Road and it consists primarily of two existing structures and paving. One structure located on the east of the property serves as a salon with offices on the second floor, while the other is a food service establishment with offices on the second floor.

The proposal calls for an addition to the food service building for separate retail purposes, specifically a liquor store. A liquor license was granted for the business at a hearing in February 2009. The addition will consist of 3,672 gross square foot on two floors and will occupy the space of existing paved surfaces. The lower level of the structure will be grade accessible, with the upper level being accessible via a ramp from the north side of the property. The lower level will be used for storage; the upper level for package foods sales.

This project was initially presented to the panel at the April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting. At that time the project was denied with the following conditions:

1. Provide details of dumpster location and enclosure
2. Provide building material samples – brick, roofing materials, window materials, door materials
3. Provide a detailed landscaping plan with planting materials defined, and adhere to Towson streetscape standards
4. Provide signage details
5. Provide a lighting plan and detail of lighting fixtures
6. Provide details for the rear parking area – address turning radius, retaining wall (design & materials)
7. Provide information on site drainage and storm water management and how they will be addressed.

At this time the applicant has revised the location of the dumpster and it will be located to the west of the building and accessed via a gate. The building materials were presented to the panel, with the brick matching the existing and the roof being a gray aluminum to match the existing slate. The window glazing will be green. The landscape plans were revised to adhere to the Towson Streetscape Standards and all plant species were labeled on the plans. Signage details were also presented to the panel, the applicant is planning to use the existing free-standing sign and add a panel for the liquor store. All lighting proposed will be very minimal and fixtures will match the existing. The turning radius in the rear parking area was revised to accommodate vehicles of multiple sizes. The applicant also presented a letter from the a copy of a letter to the director of DEPRM, which stated that the addition is less than 5,000 sq. ft. in area, therefore it is exempt from storm water management requirements.

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Ms. Boykin questioned the landscaping and its adherence to the streetscape standards. Ms. Lanham stated that the Office of Planning worked along with Avery Harden to coordinate the streetscape details. Ms. Boykin was concerned with the use of English Ivy along the rear wall.

Mr. Link stated that the ivy was proposed to screen the wall. Ms. Boykin suggested using a Princeton Elm for the front planters.

Mr. Repsher also questioned the plant materials being used for the front. Mr. Link assured the panel that Mr. Harden had approved the plant types. He also questioned the use of mulch in the shrub beds.

Mr. Monk was concerned with the dumpster location. He questioned the applicant about the idea of a trash compactor. Mr. Monk also suggested enclosing the dumpster to keep all debris from exiting the site. He also commented on the landscaping improvements along the front of the site. Mr. Monk was also concerned with outside signage such as banners/posters being hung from the railings, etc.

Ms. Westerhout questioned the colors of the sign panel. She suggested that the white panel as shown in the graphic presented to the panel, could put off a glare.

### **SPEAKERS COMMENTS**

Ms. Phyllis Yingling, of the Ridgely Condo Association, was concerned with the outside advertising that usually comes with a liquor store, such as the usual banners/posters etc. She does not want to see any outside advertising on the building.

Mrs. Gupta, owner of the property, understands the concern of the community and the panel regarding outside advertising but she feels that they will need to do some advertising to help their small business to be successful. Ms. Westerhout stated that permits will be needed for additional outside signage (signage inside the windows is ok).

### **DISPOSITION:**

A motion was made by Mr. Monk to have the project approved as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Enclose Dumpster – Provide 2 gates to fully enclose
2. Submit colors and materials proposed for pylon sign
3. Any additional outside signage must be approved by Baltimore County

Revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 6:31 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 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 (1), (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 06/10/2009

