

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
September 14, 2011

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the June 7, 2011 Meeting

Item for initial discussion

1. 28 West Pennsylvania Avenue – Commercial, Towson

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – June 7, 2011 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	Staff Report – 28 West Pennsylvania Avenue

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
September 14, 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. Thomas Repsher
Mr. Christopher Parts
Ms. Magda Westerhout
Mr. William Monk

Not Present

Mr. Derrick Burnett
Mr. Scott Rykiel
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. John DiMenna

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent

Minutes of the June 7, 2011 meeting

Ms. Westerhout moved the acceptance of the June 7, 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:** 28 West Pennsylvania Avenue**DRP PROJECT #:** 527**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Towson**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Adam Carballo, architect, along with Ery Battok and Jeff Gold, presented the project to the panel. The Adolf building, also known as 28 West Pennsylvania Avenue, is located in the heart of downtown Towson in the BM-CT zone. In December of 2010 a fire destroyed the building and most of the original structure was damaged beyond repair. At this time, the owner and architect intend to rebuild the structure for an office tenant(s) on roughly the same footprint of the existing structure. The new structure will offer approximately 4,000 SF of rentable office space over two floors. Improvements to the new building will include a sprinkler system and an elevator as well as compliance with all ADA regulations.

The exterior of the building will be designed to resemble a traditional storefront at street level with large windows and a second floor with a brick façade. The side facades will include stucco with an 8' wrap of brick material around the corners. The front entrance will be at ground level, with off-street private parking in the rear. Existing 4' sidewalks will be reconstructed on both sides of the building. The existing trees and front lawn area will remain. High quality materials are proposed throughout the building. The owner is committed to rebuilding to a Class A office building standard.

A Staff Report was prepared for the project, and is filed as Appendix C. The report recommended overall approval of the site design and intent.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

There were no members of the public signed up to speak regarding the project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Westerhout questioned the applicant on the materials to be used on the rear elevation. It was noted that the rear façade will be stucco with four windows along the first and second floors. The front elevations of the building will use a standard running band brick and a fypon cornice. Ms. Westerhout also gathered further clarification of the site, including the 22" grade change from the rear to front of the site. The front elevation will be at grade and ADA accessible with no steps. The step at the side entry door will be eliminated to accommodate ADA access. Mr. Monk suggested that the applicant meet with John Bryant to discuss the ADA issues and ensure compliance. It was also suggested that the applicant check on the number of egress points and provide a detailed rear elevation for review. Ms. Westerhout was also concerned with the large brick area above the windows on the front elevation.

Mr. Repsher questioned the applicant on the drainage and the use of rain leaders. The applicant stated that the drainage outfalls will be buried and tied to the existing storm drain in the alley. He also questioned the use of fypon along the front windows down to grade. Ms. Westerhout suggested using cementitious siding. Mr. Repsher also suggested that the applicant consider using foundation plantings along the building or hardscape the front lawn area to reduce the

maintenance, all in an effort to create a more attractive entrance. Lighting along the front of the building was also suggested to enliven the façade.

Mr. Parts suggested that the rear elevation get more attention and detail. He also suggested possibly adding landscaping along the rear. A buffer between the rear building face and parking lot would also prevent cars from hitting the rear of the building. A masonry base was suggested to provide building protection on all elevations. Mr. Parts also suggested having a canopy above the side door and revising the front façade to provide more brick and less fypon. He also commented on the front door and the need for weather protection of some sort.

Mr. Monk was concerned with the rear elevation along with the foundation of the building and the parking, pedestrian access and dumpster details.

All panel members agreed that a full site plan must be provided with topography. Architectural elevations and details of the cornice and rear elevation are also needed. The location of the trash/dumpster receptacles as well as the mechanical equipment locations should also be shown on the plans.

DISPOSITION:

A motion was made by Ms. Westerhout to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Provide a rear elevation – label all materials, show dumpster and HVAC locations
2. Provide landscape plan – show topography, consider hardscape design at front of property
3. Revise front elevation – consider upgrading design and materials as discussed
4. Provide additional details for materials to be used at grade
5. Provide lighting plans
6. Meet with John Bryan (410-887-3987) to discuss ADA issues and access requirements

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 7:00 p.m.

The applicant agreed to submit revisions by Monday, September 19, 2011. Staff will coordinate review of revisions with panel members in attendance.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01 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 Department of Planning, the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections and the Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability), 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 December 14, 2011