

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
June 9, 2010

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the March 10, 2010 Meeting

Items for discussion and vote by the Design Review Panel

1. 1438 West Joppa Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. 7115 Bellona Avenue – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
3. 7606 Curving Lane – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
4. University BP, 520 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Baltimore County Design Review Panel
Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes of the March 10, 2010 Meeting
Appendix C	Staff Report – University BP, 520 Reisterstown Road

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
June 9, 2010

Call to order

Chair, William Monk, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:02 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. John DiMenna
Mr. Thomas Repsher
Mr. William Monk
Mr. Francis Anderson (Resident Member – RRLR)

Not Present

Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Derrick Burnett
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Scott Rykiel

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Diana Itter

Minutes of the March 10, 2010 meeting

Mr. Monk moved the acceptance of the draft minutes as written 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: 1438 West Joppa Road

DRP PROJECT #: 515

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Herb Dripps, applicant and owner of 1438 West Joppa Road, presented the project to the panel. The project consists of constructing a new home, of approximately 3,000 s.f. in the “Arts and Craft” style with a Butler Stone base and Hardie Board Siding as well as asphalt shingles. Also proposed is a separate gate house/garage located at the front of the site. The accessory structure is the subject of a variance, Case No. 2010-289.

The applicant is trying to preserve existing landscaping on the site and minimize grading as much as possible while working with certain constraints such as a County sewer easement, property setbacks and difficult topography. Existing landscaping on the site includes magnolia trees, holly trees, and evergreens. Retaining walls will also be needed on the site and will be constructed of stone or faux stone materials.

The applicant met with the neighbors as well as the Ruxton Riderwood Community Association prior to the Design Review Panel Meeting.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Fran Anderson, resident member of the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Improvement Association, questioned the setback of the accessory structure from the front of the site. The applicant noted that it was 25' from the property line. Mr. Anderson also commented on the good quality and design of the accessory structure. His main concern is the landscaping between the accessory structure and Joppa Road. He feels that more needs to be done to screen the building. Mr. Anderson also questioned the storm water management issues on the site. The applicant stated that a drain will be placed in the driveway to carry the water to a pond.

Mr. Repsher commented on the accessory structure. He questioned the use of the architectural panel doors on the lower level facing Joppa Road. The applicant stated that they were used as a decorative element to make it look like a barn type building. He is not sure if they will actually be used as functional doors or not and this will be determined as they begin building. Mr. Repsher also commented on the driveway turn around out of the garage, attached to the main house. As shown, it will be placed on top of the sewer lines. Mr. Dripps stated that it will be rotated to avoid this problem.

Mr. Parts questioned the materials to be used for the accessory structure. Mr. Dripps stated that the materials and architectural style will match the proposed house. Mr. Parts also commented on the use of the cupola on the accessory structure. He understands that it was used to give the building prominence but does not feel that it is the right solution. He suggested using an eyebrow dormer, which will serve as a quieter solution. Mr. Parts also commented on the water table in relation to the grade on the drawings. He feels that it may be counterintuitive and suggested that the applicant take another look at it.

Mr. DiMenna questioned the staff on the position of the community association in regards to the variance for accessory structure in the front yard. Ms. Itter stated that she has not heard any official comment as of yet. She also stated that they are working with Mr. Dripps on his plans.

Mr. DiMenna was concerned with the scale of the accessory structure and its appearance from scenic Joppa Road.

Mr. Monk commented on landscaping in regards to the accessory structure. He felt that the building needs to be softened from the road, and suggested providing additional landscaping, possibly evergreens, to screen it from the road.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

There were no members of the public in attendance to speak on behalf of this project.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Reposition turn-around area to avoid sewer easement.
2. Provide additional landscaping around the accessory structure.
3. Remove the cupola on the accessory structure.

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and approved by acclamation at 6:31 p.m. It was also noted that the Panel voted in favor of supporting the variance, in regards to the accessory structure.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 7115 Bellona Avenue

DRP PROJECT #: 514

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Kevin Benhoff, on behalf of Benhoff Builders, presented the project to the panel. Benhoff Builders is proposing to build an approximately 3,000 square foot 1½ story single family home, with a side loaded attached 2-car garage on a .588 acre lot. The garage will create a front courtyard access to the home. The home has been engineered to fit comfortably within the building envelope, requiring no special zoning exceptions or variances. A driveway easement with 7111 Bellona Avenue exists on the site.

Materials for the project include Hardie Siding and Butler Stone masonry along with Azek trim and shingle roofing. The porches will have standing seam metal roofing. The garage doors will be in the carriage style.

The conceptual landscaping for the site includes planting beds, perennials and evergreens as well as accent trees. The applicant intends to keep as much existing landscaping on the site as possible. An existing magnolia tree at the center of the site is one of the most desired trees to be retained.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Mr. Edward Eby, of 6406 Pratt Avenue, stated that the home is not in keeping with the existing neighborhood. The nearby Applewood Community has houses that are situated close to the road. Mr. Eby also suggested moving the AC system to the opposite side of the house and grading the site as much as possible to have the house sit lower. He also suggested using taller landscaping materials along the property to screen the site.

Ms. Mary Beth Beardry, of 7111 Bellona Avenue, stated that she would like the house set back on the lot as shown on the plans. She was concerned with the landscaping and the use of taller trees possibly blocking the view of the site.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Fran Anderson, resident member, commented on the screening of the site from the Pratt Avenue house. He suggested moving the proposed evergreens back to the rear of the lot. Mr. Anderson also commented on the landscaping at the entrance to the site. He suggested that the applicant study it to assure that it will be small and low to prevent potential problems. Mr. Anderson also commented on the storm water management. He suggested having it drain to the lot from the driveway and possibly use natural swales.

Mr. Repsher asked the applicant to provide a grading plan for the site. He commented on the 8'-12' grade change on the site and suggested pulling the house forward slightly, still to saving the existing magnolia tree. He also suggested providing a detailed landscape plan.

Mr. DiMenna commented on the location of the house on the site. He suggested moving the house forward on the lot and he also concluded that another tree could possibly be saved by doing this. He also felt that the marketability of the house would be reduced by a shallow rear yard.

Mr. Parts commented on the architecture of the house. He suggested using steeper dormers on the second floor of the house and possibly transom windows above the rear dormer to give it more detail. He also commented on the garage location at the front of the dwelling and suggested that more detail be given to its architecture.

Mr. Monk commented on the landscaping on the site. He suggested that a landscape plan be prepared to address landscaping and screening issues.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Mr. Anderson to have the project resubmitted at a later date to address the following issues:

1. Provide grading plan.
2. Provide landscape plan – Address screening issues.
3. Revise plans – location of house on site, architectural details (dormers, garage).
4. Conduct meeting with neighbors to address issues/concerns.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 7:15 p.m.

ITEM 3

PROJECT NAME: 7606 Curving Lane

DRP PROJECT #: 517

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Henry Abrams, of 7606 Curving Lane and Jane Treacy, Architect, presented the project to the panel. The project consists of an addition to a one-story ranch style house. The footprint of the house is in the shape of a "T" and the existing materials include painted wood shingles and fiberglass roof shingles.

The proposed changes include:

1. A one-story addition plus full basement (fully exposed on the south face) on the south side. (Approximately 20 ft. by 38 ft.)
2. Expansion of the existing rear porch area and screen porch enclosure.
3. Construction of rear deck – providing access down to grade from the addition.
4. Construction of open front porch.

The exterior materials are to be painted board and batten. The roof will remain fiberglass shingles except for the front and rear porches, which will be painted and include standing seam roofs. There will be no reshaping of the existing contours or grade and there are no immediate plans for significant landscaping.

The existing house gross square footage is 2080 and the proposed changes accommodate an additional 1574 SF.

Mr. Abrams stated that all neighbors are in support of the plans.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

A resident of 1412 Malvern Avenue stated that he was in support of the project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Anderson, resident member, asked the applicant to provide foundation landscaping, due to the fact that the foundation is exposed.

Mr. Parts suggested providing a stone foundation or a faux stone foundation, which was not an acceptable alternative for the Abrams.

Mr. DiMenna asked what materials are being used for the overhang and diagonal braces (brackets) on the south elevation. Ms. Tracy indicated they were clad with Hardie Plank.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the plans subject to the following conditions:

1. Provide landscape plan – Foundation plantings.

The landscape plan is to be submitted to the Office of Planning for review and final approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 7:40 p.m.

ITEM 4

PROJECT NAME: University BP, 520 Reisterstown Road

DRP PROJECT #: 505

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

John Chalk, architect for the project, presented the plans to the panel. The proposed project calls for adding onto the existing service station and convenience store located at 520 Reisterstown Road. The additions are to include a carryout restaurant and a rollover car wash, both of which will be attached to the existing gas station and convenience store. Mr. Chalk also acknowledged to the Panel the need to substitute a contrasting brick for the EIFS on the front elevation of the building. The site parking will be expanded to meet current parking criteria. Landscaping will also be completed on the site to conform with the Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines. Bruce Doak, surveyor from Gerhold Cross & Etzel, indicated that a landscape plan will be prepared by Human & Rohde.

The front half of the property is currently zoned BL AS (Business Local), which allows a restaurant as a use in combination with a service station. The rear half of the property is zoned RO (Residential Office). A carryout restaurant and a drive-through car wash are permitted uses in the BL AS zone. A special hearing for the commercial parking in the residential zone and a special exception relief to permit the roll-over car wash and drive-in (carry out) restaurant was granted on February 1, 2008 with specific conditions as outlined in the zoning commissioner's order (Case# 08-212SPHXA). The hearing was appealed by People's Council to the County Board of Appeals and that hearing date has been postponed.

The project was previously reviewed at the January 14, 2009 DRP meeting. At that time the project included the construction of a Class B office building on the site as well as the additions of the car wash and carry out restaurant. The project was tabled and the applicant was asked to coordinate all plans and work with the architect and others before resubmitting the project for review. The panel also suggested revising the plans and splitting them up into phases. The applicant has eliminated the Class B office building from the current request and will not be phasing the project as was previously presented.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Ms. Sindy Rommel, of 3 Milford Mill Road & representing Prologue, questioned the plans and the removal of the 2 houses on the site. The applicant stated that the houses will not be razed. Ms. Rommel stated that she would like the trees to remain on the site and the fence to be razed as well as a clean up of the whole property.

Mr. Alan Zuckerberg, of the Pikesville Communities Corporation, commented on the type of windows to be used. He also asked that the applicant meet with the community association in regards to the color of brick and sign details. The applicant stated that the only sign to be added would be a car wash sign, in the existing pylon sign. Mr. Zuckerberg was also concerned with stacking of the cars for the car wash, the internal circulation of the site as well as the DRP process in accordance with the Board of Appeals.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Repsher commented on the fact that the plans were not coordinated. He also stated that the U-Haul vehicles currently on the site need to be moved. He suggested revising the landscape plan to enhance the site. Mr. Repsher also commented on omitting the wheel stops near the air & vacuum location. Mr. Repsher also asked for a detail of the fence. It was also suggested that the guardrail on Linden Terrace be removed.

Mr. Parts questioned the use of materials. Masonry details were given to the panel, but not shown on the elevation. He suggested revising all of the plans so that they coordinate. Mr. Parts also suggested that the elevation facing Milford Mill Road be revisited to incorporate some common elements from the Reisterstown Road façade.

Mr. DiMenna commented on the front elevation. Specifically, on the 2 gable ends, he suggested that the brick be expressed differently. Mr. Repsher then commented on the height of the roof and expressed concern over whether or not it will be high enough to hide the equipment on the roof.

Mr. Monk stated the importance of the site, due to its high visibility in Pikesville. He suggested that the applicant revise all plans so that everything coordinates.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Monk made a motion to have the project resubmitted at a later date to address the following issues:

1. Coordinate all plans with no missing elements.
2. Remove guard rail.
3. Provide design solution for Linden Terrace sidewalk & landscaping.
4. Remove parking space # 1.
5. Provide details of dumpster (location and masonry screening) on the plans.
6. Provide signage details & location – existing & proposed.
7. Reposition parking spaces #31-35 & also #24-27 – Add landscape aisle and/or sidewalk. Parking space #14 may be a diagonal space.
8. Revise landscape plan and add planting islands to parking lot.
9. Revise architectural elevations – windows, brick, rear elevation detail.
10. Provide fence details.
11. Clarify that service bays may be included as parking spaces by checking with the Zoning Office.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 8:50 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 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 July 14, 2010