

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
January 13, 2010

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the November 9, 2009 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 304 North Wind Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. Walgreens, 937 York Road – Commercial, Towson

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes of the November 9, 2009 Meeting
Appendix C	Staff Report

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

Call to order

Chair, William Monk, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:04 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Mr. Francis Anderson - RRLR

Not Present

Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. John DiMenna
Mr. Thomas Repsher
Ms. Magda Westerhout

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

Minutes of the November 9, 2009 meeting

Mr. Kann moved the acceptance of the draft minutes as written and the motion was seconded by Mr. Parts and passed by acclamation at 6:05 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 304 North Wind Road

DRP PROJECT #: 511

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Ken Quinn, applicant and owner of the property, presented the project to the panel. The site is approximately 1.5 acres and is comprised of two lots, one of which is vacant. Currently there is a rancher on the site, which is to be razed. The applicant is proposing to build a 2 story colonial house with a walk out basement, in the existing footprint. In keeping with the existing footprint, the owner will be able to limit disturbance to the existing vegetation and large number of deciduous and holly trees on the site.

Access to the site will remain from the existing driveway, which will be extended to reach the proposed dwelling and detached garage. Materials for the project include white Hardi Plank siding along with Azek trim and a shingled roof.

The applicant met with the community at a previous date and those in attendance were happy with the design and layout of the house as well as the limited disturbance of the native landscaping on the site.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Francis Anderson, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Area, questioned the applicant about the materials to be used on the exposed foundation wall. Mr. Quinn stated that a light gray stucco material will be used. Mr. Anderson also questioned the zoning and possible setbacks that may be needed. Mr. Quinn stated that he received a letter from Jun Fernando of the Baltimore County Zoning Office, dated September 10, 2009, which stated that there are no zoning issues on the lot.

Mr. Parts suggested that Mr. Quinn include plans for a connection to the elevator, rather than finding a way to accommodate it at a later date. He also suggested revisiting the elevation facing North Wind Road since it is the most visible elevation from road. Mr. Parts suggested adding a few more windows or increasing the size of the louvres in the eaves. Mr. Parts also noted that there was a door missing on the back elevation off of the dining room, which was in the plan. He also suggested revisiting the rear elevation to adjust the windows so that they appear more symmetrical.

Mr. Kann agreed with Mr. Parts' comments. He commented on the nice organization of the project and suggested revising the bay window and arched window type so that all of the windows look more symmetrical. Mr. Kann was also concerned with the amount of foundation wall to be exposed. He stressed the importance of choosing a nice stucco finish that will be attractive.

Mr. Rykiel questioned the applicant about the location of the A/C units. Mr. Quinn stated that they plan to use a geothermal system, which will not require much on the outside of the house.

Mr. Monk agreed with all of the comments from the other members. He asked the applicant to look at the possibility of a retaining wall being needed at the garage turn around. Mr. Quinn stated that there is an existing retaining wall on the site, which may need to be extended.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

John Clemson, resident of 303 North Wind Road, applauded the owner of the property and his sensitivity to the site. He commented on the large numbers of native landscaping on the site and thanks the owner for limiting disturbance to the existing landscaping.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Anderson to approve the project with the following condition:

1. Revise the rear and side elevations – window layouts and symmetry

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and approved by acclamation at 6:35 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: Walgreens, 937 York Road

DRP PROJECT #: 512

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Towson

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Michale Ertel, of MJ Consulting representing the applicant and engineer, presented the project to the panel. The site, located at 937 York Road currently has an existing auto service building on it. The applicant plans to redevelop the .762 acre site, zoned BR, and construct a freestanding Walgreens pharmacy/retail drug store with a drive-thru window. The first floor is to be 8,580 SF with a 3,780 SF basement for storage/service. The building has been downsized from the standard Walgreens size to accommodate the site.

The applicant is proposing to redevelop the property on 2 lots with an additional county-owned right of way property, which the applicant has petitioned to acquire from the county. The applicant has asked for and has been granted variances for setbacks. The main entrance to the site will be off of York Road, with a right turn in and out of the site and left turn from York Road heading south into the site, but no left turn out of the site, due to the State Highway Administration regulations. There will also be an additional entrance/exit to the site at the rear, via the alley behind the building.

A drive-thru lane is proposed at the south side of the building, which will exit into the alley. Currently the alley is two way from Fairmount Avenue to the existing building. The applicant is asking Public Works to allow the alley be two way from Fairmount Ave to the drive- thru lane to encourage people to leave the site going north and go immediately to Fairmount Avenue. Parking on the site will be accommodated by 43 parking spaces. Stone columns and metal fencing are proposed next to the main entrance and alongside the parking bays. Fencing is also proposed along the angled parking areas with a walkway out to the street. At the existing bus stop on Fairmount Avenue before the alley, the sidewalk will be extended out to meet Fairmount Avenue so that people waiting at the bus stop would have more space to stand and not walk across the grass. The building will be serviced via the alley and space is provided for a 65 foot loading dock. A dumpster enclosure will be placed at the end of building and will be completely enclosed. The applicant proposes to rebuild the alleyway that is along their building and also provide fencing for the residents facing the alley.

Richard Polan, architect for the project, presented the architectural details to the panel. The front elevation of the building will fit the basic Walgreens prototype and be comprised of a primary brick material with rock cast details and brick insets of stone along the front. The main entry tower will have additional detailing and articulation along the cornice. The rear and side elevations will also be brick with the rear having additional glazed tile inlays for detailing and different brick patterns to help with noise buffering. A slate and cast stone water table is proposed around the entire building.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Parts directed the panel and the applicants to visit the Towson Design Guidelines, which address this site as a gateway to Towson. Specific details ask for the site to have a gateway type feature and a building that sits up to the street. Mr. Parts felt that the proposed project did not address the guidelines. Mr. Ertel stated that the building had to be pulled back to accommodate parking and circulation with the drive-thru lane. Mr. Parts suggested relocating the building and

drive-thru similar to the Burger King. He commented on the architecture but suggested revising the plans to get a better layout that would fit with the guidelines.

Mr. Kann agreed with Mr. Parts and suggested that since the site is a prominent one for Towson, it should comply with the guidelines and fit with the future of Towson. Mr. Kann suggested adding more pedestrian access points into the building and carrying the brick detailing on the rear elevation to all sides of the building. He also suggested including a more finished railing at the loading dock on the rear elevation due to its high visibility.

Mr. Rykiel agreed with the other members about pulling the building closer to the street. He also suggested using a brick paving pattern to address the striped areas proposed in the parking lot and adding a wider walkway at the main pedestrian access point to the site. Mr. Rykiel also suggested moving the dumpster enclosure to the drive lane side of the building to cause less traffic disruption. He commented on the proposed landscaping on the site and suggested that the applicant add more plantings at the gateway entrance to the site. Mr. Rykiel also suggested rearranging the tree placement at the northeast corner to accommodate a different parking arrangement. The applicant will work with zoning to see what will be acceptable.

Mr. Monk agreed with Mr. Rykiel. He stressed the importance of the sidewalk at the main corner and it being widened to be more inviting to pedestrians at the corner. He also liked the idea of textured paving being used. Mr. Monk was concerned with the brick/fencing at the public right of way and the possibility of cars pulling forward and hitting the structure. He suggested pulling the curb in to serve as a wheel stop. Mr. Monk stated that by pulling the curb back 2-3 ft. could provide for additional planting between the fencing and curb. Mr. Polan and Mr. Ertel stated that they will have to do a survey and work with the numbers to see what would be possible.

Mrs. Jenifer Nugent, of the Office of Planning stated that the office would like to see more landscaping along Fairmount Avenue between the sidewalk and property line. She also stated that the office would like the applicants to study using a brick knee wall with fencing instead of the pillars and fencing. The applicants stated that they will work with Planning Office to see what would be acceptable.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Ms. Leigh Farrell, of 978 Radcliffe Road, stressed the importance of the location of the bus stop. Ms. Farrell did not want the stop moved closer to her community due to the high amounts of trash that accumulates at the site. She liked the idea of having Walgreens provide trash cans and monitoring the site. Ms. Farrell was also concerned with the drive-thru exiting into the alley, which is primarily one way. Cars in the drive-thru line will be directly facing the homes at the adjacent community. The applicants stated that they are providing fences for the residents to block the lights and will assure them that the alley access will work.

Mr. Mike Farrell, of 978 Radcliffe Road, asked that the applicants study the logistics of the alley and the turning radiuses. He stated that there are consistently cars parked in the alley and he does not understand how the trucks and traffic will be able to work together.

Mr. Dewayne Ejikeme, representing the Texaco station at 935 York Road, questioned the details of review by the panel. He also questioned what will happen to the new sidewalk as it meets up with his sidewalk. Mr. Polan stated that there is a drive lane between the sidewalks, therefore there will be no direct connection.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Widen pedestrian access from northwest corner
2. Pave staging area at bus stop
3. Re-orient dumpster enclosure opening to the south, provide details
4. Provide public trash receptacles at feature street corner entry and also at bus stop
5. Provide textured paving inset from street corner to entry tower through the parking lot
6. Extend textured paving and/or curbed landscape to include triangular transition areas at parking stalls
7. Add knee wall to act as screening
8. Shift curb line along York Road 2.5' to prevent vehicular damage to fencing feature
9. Revise curb height within parking lot along York Road – make 9 inches high to act as wheel stop
10. Show variety of planting at corner entrance
11. Shift parking, add one parking space at northeast property line along alley
12. Delete one parking space at northeast building corner and add planting bed with tree
13. Eliminate all grass areas within property line
14. Post sign at drive thru encouraging customers to turn off headlights at night
15. Confirm zero-cut-off photometrics at east side of rear alley
16. Revise landscape plan
17. Incorporate signage into wall design
18. Continue ripple effect pattern of the brick used on rear façade
19. Provide railing details for rear façade – high quality
20. Delete note on plans regarding parking variance

All final plans will have to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval.

Mr. Parts stated that the proposal does not address the guidelines and he stated that he would like to see a study done to address different layouts of the building on the site, to better address the guidelines.

Mr. Kann agreed with Mr. Parts and stressed the importance of other configurations being studied.

Mr. Monk did not agree and he presented his original motion, which failed.

Mr. Parts made a subsequent motion to table the project to study other configurations that would better address the guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and approved at 8:33 p.m. Mr. Monk voted against the motion.

Mr. Monk suggested keeping the project moving along as quickly as possible to address the outstanding concerns. A work session was set up for January 20, 2010 to have the applicants meet with the panel and the Office of Planning staff to further address the building configuration on the site.

Another motion was made by Mr. Monk to have the previous motion stand if there are no acceptable alternatives to the site design. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rykiel and passed by acclamation at 8:45 p.m. All members then agreed to continue review of the project at the February meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8: 47 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 10, 2010