

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
June 7, 2011

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the April 13, 2011 Meeting

Items for initial discussion

1. Charles Village Pub, 19 West Pennsylvania Avenue – Commercial, Towson
2. 7833 Ellenham Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – April, 2011 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	Staff Report – Charles Village Pub, Streetscape Correspondence
Appendix D	Correspondence – 7833 Ellenham Road

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
June 7, 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

Mr. John DiMenna
Mr. Christopher Parts
Ms. Magda Westerhout (Arrived at 6:50 p.m.)
Mr. Francis Anderson (Resident Member – RRLR)
Mr. William Monk

Not Present

Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Thomas Repsher

County staff present included:

Jeff Mayhew, Lynn Lanham, Diana Itter, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak

It was noted that the agenda will proceed in reverse order.

Minutes of the April 13, 2011 meeting

Mr. DiMenna moved the acceptance of the April 13, 2011 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts and passed by acclamation at 6:01 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1**PROJECT NAME:** Charles Village Pub**DRP PROJECT #:** 526**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Towson**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Tim Sanders, of Sanders Designs Architects & Planners, along with Trey Shamer, also of Sanders Designs and Project Manager for the Charles Village Pub, presented the project to the Panel. The landowner and proprietors were also in attendance.

The Charles Village Pub, abbreviated as "CVP" is located in the heart of downtown Towson in the BM-CT zone. On January 29, 2011 a two-alarm fire burned down the bar and restaurant. The applicants are now proposing to build a replacement structure, which will consist of two floors and a basement, along with an outdoor patio on the main floor and an outdoor deck on the second floor. The main entry point will be from Pennsylvania Avenue, with additional ingress and egress provided in the rear. The second floor will hold additional dining and bar space with a roof deck. The basement will be used for storage and offices.

The front exterior façade facing of the building will reflect the character and architecture of the neighborhood, in both materials and proportions. The façade facing Pennsylvania Avenue will consist of a stone base water table with a cast stone sill at street level with operable windows above. The space between the windows will consist of wood paneling shadowed by a wood-framed canopy with a standing seam metal roof. The second level will have a brick veneer finish with brick trim around the windows, capped off with a cornice. The brick veneer will continue on the second floor walls on the rear and the remaining walls of the rear facade will be finished with stucco. Wrought iron and wood railings are proposed for the rear of the site.

Signage for the site is proposed on the front façade, both on the canopy and a wall mounted sign. Lighting is proposed throughout the exterior of the site, both with up-lighting and down-lighting as well as carriage style lamps and deck lights in the rear.

STAFF COMMENTS:

A Staff Report was prepared for the CVP, and is filed as Appendix C. The report recommended overall approval of the site design and intent. The main recommendation was in regard to streetscape upgrades and the replacement of the sidewalk in front of the building. The applicants are willing to conform to the streetscape requirements.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Ernie Rafailides, of 17 West Pennsylvania Avenue, discussed his concerns with the panel. He was concerned with trash around the site. He suggested having adequate trash receptacles outside of the site to prevent some of these problems. Mr. Rafailides was also concerned with the new proposed entrance. This entrance will block two windows on the inside of his building.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Parts stated that he would like to see additional trash receptacles placed outside of the site and suggested enclosing the dumpster at the rear of the site. Mr. Parts questioned the applicant on possible street-side outdoor dining. He also suggested studying the rear elevation to give it more detail, such as adding masonry piers or container planting. Mr. Parts also suggested using the same railing materials on the rear of the site on both the lower and upper levels.

Mr. DiMenna commented on the detailing of the front façade. He also concurred with Mr. Parts with regard to adding more detail to the rear elevation.

Mr. Monk also agreed with the other panel members.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Provide a dumpster enclosure – meet with the Office of Planning staff to determine the appropriate location and type of dumpster enclosure
2. Update streetscape plans to include a trash receptacle at the front of the site
3. Replace sidewalk on Pennsylvania Avenue side
4. Provide additional details on rear elevation

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Office of Planning for final review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts and approved by acclamation at 6:32 p.m.

ITEM 2**PROJECT NAME:** 7833 Ellenham Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 525**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Laura Thomas, of Melville Thomas Architects, Inc., presented the project to the Panel. The applicant proposes to build a new 1½ story 3,900 square foot “cottage” style dwelling. There is currently a small 1½ story dwelling on the lot composed of stone and wood, which is to be razed and salvaged to the extent feasible. Some materials will be re-used and what is not salvaged will be donated.

The new dwelling will be in keeping with the massing and character of the neighborhood. Porches are proposed on the front and rear of the home, and a 2-car side-load garage is also proposed. The existing landscaping on the site is to be preserved.

Materials for the home include gray Hardi Plank horizontal lap siding and shingles, natural stone, dormers, and white trim. Atlantic shutters are also proposed along with wood, carriage-style garage doors and standing seam metal roofing on the porches and garage.

SPEAKER COMMENTS:

Helen McWilliams, of 7835 Ellenham Road, expressed her concerns to the panel with regards to the massing of the house and setbacks. It was noted that all setbacks will be met. She was also concerned with the water and sewer hookup issues, which are currently being studied. Ms. McWilliams also noted to the panel that a signed agreement was made to have the pump house located on both her property and 7833 Ellenham Road, will be removed at the owners expense.

Jay Merwin, Jr., of 7830 Ellenham Road, was concerned with the construction traffic in the neighborhood. He was concerned with landscaping being destroyed on his property. Mr. Monk suggested that he work with the applicants and contractor to address these problems, if needed. Mr. DiMenna stated that the builder is responsible for damages.

Mary Kane Scholz, of 7840 Ellenham Road, stated that she likes the design of the new home but would like to see the existing house on the lot preserved, as it serves as a piece of history of the neighborhood.

Nancy Horst, of 7819 Ellenham and a member of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission, commented on the existing structure and its importance in the community. She referenced a letter sent to the DRP from the LPC Chairman, Bruce Boswell, which suggested the preservation of the existing structure. Ms. Horst also stated that she would like to have the pump house, if it is removed. Laura Thomas, Architect, stated that the existing house is very charming but not feasible for the new owners. She assured Ms. Horst that they will recycle as much of the house as they can and they are working with Second Chance to ensure that this will be done.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Anderson, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Area, questioned the applicants about their meeting with the community. It was stated that the applicants did meet with the community, and the same issues with regards to the massing and removal of the existing structure were the main concerns. Mr. Anderson also suggested that he would like to see the existing structure preserved, but it is the right of the owner to build a new structure. He stated that the new structure works well with the community. He suggested creating a detached garage or skewing the garage to give less of a presence on the street. Mr. Anderson also suggested using a different material for the standing seam metal roofing.

Mr. Parts stated the preservation of the existing house is not within the purview of the Design Review Panel. He feels that the massing and character of the proposed structure works within the community. Mr. Parts also suggested projecting the center of the house and pushing the two wings back on the site to reduce the massing along the street. Ms. Thomas, on behalf of the applicant stated that they have studied the site and the placement of the structure and tried to pick the best location, with regards to grading and landscaping issues.

Mr. DiMenna concurred with Mr. Parts' comments. He also stated that standing seam metal roofing is typical for porches, but could be replaced with a more soft material on the garage and dormers.

Ms. Westerhout reiterated that the charge of the panel is to study the design, and she feels that this home will be a sensitive addition to the Ruxton neighborhood.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Ms. Westerhout to approve the project as designed with one condition:

1. Applicant must have one additional meeting with the neighbors to address design and concerns.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts and approved by acclamation at 7:25 p.m. Mr. Anderson voted against the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 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 9/14/2011