

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
March 9, 2011

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the January 12, 2011 Meeting

Item for initial discussion

1. 7345 Brightside Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

Item for continued discussion

2. University BP, 520 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – January 12, 2011 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	Resident Letter, 7345 Brightside Road
Appendix D	Staff Memo; Additional Correspondence

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 9, 2011

Call to order

Chair, 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	Not Present
Mr. Christopher Parts	Ms. Betsy Boykin
Mr. Thomas Repsher	Mr. John DiMenna
Ms. Magda Westerhout (Arrived at 6:08 p.m.)	Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. William Monk	Mr. Scott Rykiel
Mr. Francis Anderson (Resident Member – RRLR)	Mr. Derrick Burnett

County staff present included:

Jeff Mayhew (Acting Director), Lynn Lanham, Diana Itter, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak

Minutes of the January 12, 2011 meeting

Mr. Parts moved the acceptance of the draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1**PROJECT NAME:** 7345 Brightside Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 522**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Architect, Peter Ratcliffe presented the project to the panel. The owners of the property, Patty and Chuck Morton were also in attendance. The project calls for the construction of a new residence located at the west end of Brightside Road near Lake Roland. The lot is approximately 1 acre and was the result of a minor subdivision plan that was approved in June 2010. The design of the proposed home is in keeping with the distinct classical look of the other dwellings on Brightside Road. The house is tucked into the site within the limits of the building envelope, which is defined by the grades, setbacks and septic reserve area. A detached garage is also proposed in the rear yard, with architectural features similar to the house design. The shape of the proposed home allows for a central court for outdoor entertaining.

Materials for the proposed home include stone and clapboard siding along with timber accents. Faux slate shingles and architectural grade shingles are being evaluated for the roof and all materials will be neutral in color to fit in with the existing neighborhood.

Landscaping for the site will be provided by some existing trees on the site as well as proposed foundation plantings around the site. Permeable parking surfaces are proposed along with garden paths and trees and shrubs to help with the run-off on the site due to the grading.

The applicant met with the community association as well as the immediate neighbors to discuss the proposed plans. After meeting with the neighbors, revisions were made to reduce the massing of the house to 5,863 square feet as well as reduce the grading on the site. The reduction in house size pulled the house further away from the north property line. Mr. Ratcliffe stated that the design of the house attempts to keep the massing down to give the structure a 1 ½ story look. The location of the garage was also moved away from the property line to address the concerns of a letter that was received from Mr. Goodier, and adjoining property owner. These changes also eliminated the need for a retaining wall on the site. The letter is filed as Appendix C.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Mr. Richard Swartz, of 7340 Brightside Road, commented on the site changes that were made as the result of the meeting with the community. He was pleased with the applicant's willingness to work out issues and concerns.

Ms. Mayer Baker, of 7332 Brightside Road, was concerned with runoff issues as well as traffic issues due to the narrow driveway and roads in the area. She stated that the heavy equipment could be damaging to the roads and neighboring properties. The applicant assured Ms. Baker that they are willing to work with the neighborhood to address any issues or conflicts that may occur during construction.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Repsher asked the applicant to clarify the finished elevations of both the house and garage. Mr. Ratcliffe stated that the garage was 309.5 feet at the door and the home was 311 feet at the

first level. Mr. Repsher also commented that the run-off on the site could create some issues. He expressed that a lot of water will be flowing along the front of the garage and suggested installing a drain in the driveway to help with this issue. The applicant stated that they have been working with the county and McKee and Associates to work out these issues with regard to grading and storm water runoff.

Mr. Parts commented on the architecture of the home. He suggested revisiting the front entrance to create a more prominent entryway.

Mr. Anderson, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Area Improvement Association, praised the applicant for adjusting the massing. He suggested that the applicant provide a more detailed landscape plan for review along with a revised grading plan.

Ms. Westerhout agreed with the statements of Mr. Anderson and commented on the nice design of the house.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Revise grading plan
2. Provide detailed schematic landscape plan with species

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Westerhout and approved by acclamation at 6:41 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: University BP, 520 Reisterstown Road

DRP PROJECT #: 505

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project known as University BP, is located between Milford Mill Road, Reisterstown Road, and Linden Terrace. At this time there is a gas station and convenience store located on the site along with two houses that are used as office buildings. The owner, University BP LLC Properties, intends to build a roll-over carwash and a carryout restaurant building attached to the existing gas station and convenience store portion of the site. The site parking will be expanded to meet current parking criteria as well as landscaping on the site to conform with the Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines.

This was the third review of this project before the Design Review Panel. The project was last reviewed at the June 9, 2010 meeting at which time the following conditions remained outstanding:

**The comments in italics state how the current submittal addresses the issues.*

1. Coordinate all plans with no missing elements.
Plans presented seem to coordinate
2. Remove guard rail.
Noted to be removed on the site plan
3. Provide design solution for Linden Terrace sidewalk & landscaping.
Sidewalk and proposed landscaping showing on landscape plan
4. Remove parking space # 1.
Parking space has been moved to allow for more landscaping
5. Provide details of dumpster (location and masonry screening) on the plans.
Dumpster has been added to both plans and detail is on landscape plan
6. Provide signage details & location – existing & proposed.
Sign location is shown. A new monument sign is proposed.
7. Reposition parking spaces #31-35 & also #24-27 – Add landscape aisle and/or sidewalk. Parking space #14 may be a diagonal space.
Parking has been removed and reconfigured
8. Revise landscape plan and add planting islands to parking lot.
Parking islands have been added where requested
9. Revise architectural elevations – windows, brick, rear elevation detail.
Elevations have been revised and included in packet. All EFIS changed to masonry brick/block.
10. Provide fence details.
Privacy fence details have been included in the packet
11. Clarify that service bays may be included as parking spaces by checking with the Zoning Office.
It is not clear from the submission whether this was checked.

John Chalk, of JPC Architects, presented additional details to the panel. The proposed monument sign will be constructed of metal and will be illuminated from the inside. Mr. Chalk also discussed the dumpster, which will be constructed of brick/block with a trex fence. The roof on the proposed buildings will be metal, in BP green. Primary materials for the proposal include

brick along with decorative CMU and tile accents. The rear of the existing building will be refaced with brick.

SPEAKER COMMENTS:

Mr. Bryan Kuebler, a Sudbrook Park Resident, commented on the improvements to the site. He questioned the applicant on the existing canopy and any plans to renovate it. Mr. Chalk stated that he is working with the property owner to make some improvements to the canopy. Mr. Kuebler also questioned the location of the oil tank on the site. The applicant's representative stated that the tank is to be relocated to the interior of the service garage. Traffic in/out of the site and the car wash was also a concern.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Parts commented on the ground-mounted sign. He suggested that the applicant study the location of the sign to address visibility issues. Mr. Parts also suggested pulling the curb line closer to the building next to parking spaces 11 and 12.

Mr. Repsher suggested that the applicant study plant type and placement along the front of the property to also address visibility issues due to the placement of the sign.

Ms. Westerhout commented on the revised site plan and layout and the significant improvements to the site. It was suggested that the canopy be cleaned up and re-painted as part of the site renovation.

Mr. Monk urged the applicant to use pavement markings as well as directional signs to address traffic flow on the site. He suggested using a crosshatch adjacent to space 28 to prevent parking as well as providing a directional sign for the car wash entry lane. Mr. Monk also commented on the improvements to the site and commented on the applicants ability to address the outstanding issues.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Revise plans to address location of monument sign - address visibility issues, label materials
2. Revise landscape plan – address sign location & visibility (height of sign is okay)
3. Round and plant corners of stacking lane; place tree at SW corner of property to provide screening
4. Revise elevations – Rear of building to be brick (label all materials)
5. Provide additional signage – directional sign for car wash; pavement markings
6. Revisit area between building and parking space 29 and stripe next to spaces 32 & 28 to prevent conflicts
7. Align curbs at car wash exit and move parking spaces 11 & 12 south
8. Paint and clean-up canopy

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 7:30 p.m. All revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 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 4/13/11