

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
July 8, 2009

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the June 10, 2009 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 1114-1116 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes of the June 10, 2009 Meeting
Appendix C	Staff Report

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
July 8, 2009

Call to order

Chair, William Monk, 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
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Ms. Betsy Boykin
Ms. Magda Westerhout

Not Present

Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. John DiMenna
Mr. Thomas Repsher

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

Minutes of the June 10, 2009 meeting

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

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 1114-1116 Reisterstown Road

DRP PROJECT #: 509

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Judy Floam, of Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Inc. presented the project to the panel. Architect, John Chalk presented the architectural details. The existing property is currently comprised of two adjoining lots, each developed with a one-story commercial building, which are both to be removed. The combined area of the properties is .39 acres, zoned BL. The property has frontage on Reisterstown Road, Sudbrook Lane, and DeRisio Lane.

The proposed development is a two-story building (approximately 100 by 52 ft.) facing Reisterstown Road, with retail uses on the ground floor and offices on the second floor. Parking will be provided at the rear of the building, with access from DeRisio Lane. Each retail space will have a separate entrance on Reisterstown Road. Access to the retail uses will also be available from the parking area at the rear of the building. The offices on the second floor will be accessed from an outdoor corridor at the rear of the building. Materials for the building include a primarily brick base with smooth and split face accents. The corner element will be primarily split face. The windows are to be black metal bays along with awnings, which will be used for signage.

The applicant is requesting 0' front and side yard setback variances which are consistent with the Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines, as they bring the building forward on the site to the street wall. A parking variance was also requested for 25 parking spaces in lieu of 36 parking spaces and a setback of 1' from a parking space to the right of way in lieu of the required 10'. The zoning hearing is scheduled to take place on July 28, 2009.

The landscaping is proposed to be provided on site as well as the streetscape along Reisterstown Road. The Pikesville Chamber of Commerce has implemented planters along Reisterstown Road and the applicant intends to continue with implementation of the planters at this location as well. Trees and shrubs will be provided along Sudbrook and DeRisio Lanes. Ornamental trees are proposed within the parking lot. Ms. Floam stated that they would like to use a mix of grasses, perennials, and trees such as magnolias, dogwoods, evergreens, and ginkos.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Boykin was concerned with the trees that were proposed for the planters and their possible interference with the power lines and the proposed awnings. Ms. Floam stated that they are coordinating the streetscape plans with the Pikesville Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Boykin also questioned the means of lighting for the building. Mr. Chalk, architect, stated that he would like to uplight the building and possibly provide lighting along the main walkways. Ms. Boykin suggested adding site lighting along Sudbrook Lane.

Mr. Monk suggested providing lighting along the main sidewalk off of the public sidewalk. Mr. Chalk stated that he would look at providing some uplighting from the landscape beds.

Ms. Westerhout commented on the thorough presentation from the applicants. Her main concern was the entryway to the back of the building, off of Sudbrook Lane. She suggested making the

entryway more prominent, similar to the main corner at Reisterstown and Sudbrook and it was also suggested that it be lit due to security reasons, with employees exiting the offices on the second floor. Mr. Monk suggested flaring out the sidewalk where it meets the public sidewalk. Ms. Westerhout also suggested adding more windows to the rear elevation as well as masonry to break up the brick. Mr. Chalk stated that he could possibly add some smaller windows and bump out panels.

Mr. Rykiel was concerned with the proposed dogwood trees for the parking area. He felt that these may not be the best for a parking lot and he suggested using ginko instead. Mr. Rykiel also suggested making the individual store fronts larger to give them more window space and create more interest along the street frontage. Mr. Chalk stated that he is willing to work to revise the plans to get the best possible outcome for his client and the community. Mr. Rykiel also suggested using evergreens along the parking lot perimeter for screening to comply with the Pikesville Guidelines (42' height).

Mr. Monk suggested that the applicants coordinate their revisions with the Office of Planning as well as the Pikesville Community and the Pikesville Chamber of Commerce with regards to the site details as well as architecture and streetscape prior to the zoning hearing.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS

Alan Zuckerberg, President of the Pikesville Communities Corporation (PCC), stated that he would be speaking on behalf of the PCC and the Ralston Community. The President of the Ralston Community was unable to make it to the meeting. Mr. Zuckerberg stated that the Ralston Community is upset with the treatment of DeRisio Lane, which was supposed to serve as a transition from the residential community to Reisterstown Road. He also commented on the design of the building and its conformance with the Pikesville Guidelines. He stated that there were no lintels used on the building and the mix of colors and materials were not compatible with other commercial buildings in the area. He asked that more character be given to the building to fit in with the village type theme that the guidelines suggest. Mr. Zuckerberg was also concerned with the lack of details on the rear elevation and the parking, all of which are visible to the Ralston Community. He was also concerned with the storefronts and their compliance with the guidelines.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Revise building design – Front façade (first floor retail windows, awning scale), Rear façade (provide more details – windows, masonry, etc.)
2. Revise streetscape plans – Coordinate with Pikesville Chamber of Commerce and define exact tree types, planter box materials, and possible paving textures and determine who is responsible for installation.
3. Revise Sudbrook Lane entrance to rear stair tower
4. Revise landscape plans – provide streetscape details as well as plant types and size in planter beds along Sudbrook Lane. Revise ornamental tree type for parking area.

The applicants are to coordinate revisions with the Planning Office as well as the Pikesville Community prior to the zoning hearing. All final plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Boykin and approved by acclamation at 7:08 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 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 November 9, 2009