

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
February 8, 2012

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the December 14, 2011 Meeting

Item for Introduction

1. 600 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – December 14, 2011 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	Staff Report – 600 Reisterstown Road

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
February 8, 2012

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. Thomas Repsher
Mr. John DiMenna

Not Present

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

County staff present included:

Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak, Diana Itter, Andrea Van Arsdale

Minutes of the December 14, 2011 meeting

Mr. DiMenna moved the acceptance of the December 14, 2011 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and passed by acclamation at 6:06 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 600 Reisterstown Road

DRP PROJECT #: 529

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Pikesville

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Stuart Macklin of Macklin & Kahmi Architects, LLC presented the project to the panel. Also in attendance were Sally Malena of Human & Rohde, Inc., Carla Ryon and Kevin Larrowe of Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Inc. The existing property consists of a seven-story building, with approximately 52,000 SF of office space and 10,000 SF of retail. The applicant is proposing to install complete façade improvements to the entire existing building. The building is approximately thirty years old and is in need of repair. The occupancy of the building will remain the same with restaurants on the first floor and offices on the floors above.

The proposed design consists of a new window wall enclosure along the perimeter of the office space (floors 3-7). The window wall will replace the existing fascia and windows at each office floor with an aluminum and high performance glass assembly with integral sunshade louvers at the four corners of the building. The existing envelope of the building, at ground level, will be clad in stone veneer. The existing surfaces of the stair towers are to be enclosed with stone veneer up to the third floor and with layers of new eifs above the third floor. The stair enclosures are to flank a new aluminum and glass vestibule on the street level, which will define the main entrance of the building. Primary materials for the building will include tinted vision glass, a blue shade glass, and a blue reflective glass with spandrels used for detailing on the corners. Framing will be done in clear anodized aluminum. Both black and ivory stone granite will be used along the base and on the stair towers.

Two existing buildings on Irving Place will be demolished to allow for parking expansion. A special hearing may be required to allow this parking expansion into the RO zone. The applicant later clarified that a parking-use permit has been requested. The property is also currently involved in the CZMP process (Issues 2-011 & 2-012) and a request to change the zoning of the site to BM-CT has been made to allow the parking by right.

Landscaping on the site will be re-done, with street trees along Reisterstown Road, Irving Place & Slade Avenue. The existing streetscape will be replaced with enlarged tree pits and new paving and paver patterns. Shrubs are also proposed to screen the parking areas and Holly trees are proposed to screen the existing utilities. Planters are also proposed at the street level, in front of the building.

Lighting on the building will be hidden behind the parapets. Signage on the building will be freestanding pin lettering made out of metal. The existing free-standing sign at the front entrance of the building is under review.

SPEAKERS COMMENTS:

Mr. Alan Zuckerberg, on behalf of the Pikesville Communities Corporation and himself, commented on the newly constructed freestanding sign. He noted that the sign is not in conformance and that it clearly violates the Pikesville Design Guidelines. Mr. Monk stated that if the sign is deemed to be in violation, they will be asked to remove it. Mr. Zuckerberg urged the panel to look at the building with regards to the Guidelines as well.

Mr. Mark Sapp, on behalf of the Colonial Village Improvement Association and himself, commented on the project and stated that he was glad to see improvements in the area. He did not feel that the freestanding sign is in conformance and that it does not work with the busy Reisterstown Road corridor. Mr. Sapp stressed that the Panel look at the project as a whole, including the freestanding sign, building architecture, and pending CZMP issues.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Repsher stressed the importance that the applicant coordinate the site and landscape plans. This would include incorporating and clearly defining the ingress/egress locations, the pedestrian and vehicular circulation, curbing along green spaces, and the ramp details. He questioned the architect on the location of the existing mechanical equipment. It was noted that the equipment on the roof will be completely screened by the parapets. Also in question, was the location of a dumpster on the site and dumpster enclosure details. Mr. Repsher also asked the applicant to show storm water management plans for the site. He also suggested providing fencing or screening along the residential properties. Mr. Repsher noted that he did not like the current free-standing sign on the site. It was also requested that the applicant look at improving the existing parking lot wall and hand rails.

Mr. DiMenna also suggested that the applicant look at SWM. He also commented on the parking and current postings for parking use permits. Mr. DiMenna stated that the overall cladding of the building is a great improvement to the existing deteriorating conditions. His only concern was the detailing at the top of the stair towers, which appeared too busy.

Mr. Parts commented on the stairs in the garage. Currently the pedestrians come up the stair well and exit right into the driveline. He suggested that this be addressed for pedestrian safety. Mr. Parts stated that he would like to see the pedestrian circulation for the entire site more clearly defined.

Mr. Monk discussed the two points of ingress/egress onto Milford Mill Road. He stated that the proposed location for the dumpster will not work, in terms of space and visibility. He suggested that the applicant consider consolidating the two entrances, which will leave a larger area for the dumpster and its enclosure. Mr. Monk also questioned the Irving Place entrances. He also commented on the open space comments made by the staff in the staff report, which is filed as Appendix C. These comments suggested that the applicant provide more buffers along the parking as well as the street and address the coordination of the site and landscape plans.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Monk commented on the significant upgrades to the building as a positive improvement to the Reisterstown Road corridor. A motion was made to have the project revised and resubmitted at a later date, with the following conditions.

1. Provide conceptual plans for a new free-standing sign – existing sign is not consistent with Pikesville Design Guidelines
2. Revise and coordinate site and landscape plans
3. Clearly define ingress/egress points – Milford Mill Road, Irving Place
4. Provide screening along residences to the West
5. Provide dumpster location & enclosure details
6. Provide details of pedestrian & site circulation

7. Consider use of materials at street level to create Pikesville Village style (lower the height of the base).
8. Provide consistent way of identifying tenant graphics – no tenant graphics on building banners
9. Provide details of how the project is proceeding through County review at this time.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Repsher and approved by acclamation at 7:42 p.m. The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 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 March 14, 2012