

*Minutes*

Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
June 13, 2012

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the May 9, 2012 Meeting**

**Items for Introduction:**

1. 7343 Brightside Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. Patient First, 950 York Road – Commercial, Towson

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

---

*Appendices*

<b>Appendix A</b>	Agenda
<b>Appendix B</b>	Minutes – May 9, 2012 Meeting, as approved
<b>Appendix C</b>	Staff Report – Patient First

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
June 13, 2012

**Call to order**

Chair, John DiMenna, 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. David Martin  
Mr. Mitch Kellman  
Ms. Julie Kirsch  
Mr. Fran Anderson – Resident Member, RRLR

**Not Present**

Ms. Shannon Comer Dodge  
Mr. William Monk

County staff present included:  
Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak

**Minutes of the May 9, 2012 Meeting**

Mr. DiMenna moved the acceptance of the May 9, 2012 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kellman and passed by acclamation at 6:01 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1****PROJECT NAME:** 7343 Brightside Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 535**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Steve Appler, of Goodier Builders, presented the project to the Panel. The project consists of a 6,000 SF single family dwelling with a 3-car garage, constructed of all natural materials. The site is presently vacant and the applicant proposes to maintain as many existing trees as possible. Access to the site will be provided via a shared driveway. Due to the grade on the site, an all brick retaining wall is also proposed at the rear of the site.

Materials for the project include natural stone and brick along with Hardi Plank shingle accents on the dormers over the garage. The applicant met with the Ruxton Riderwood Community Association prior to the DRP meeting. Neighbors had concerns with the mix of materials on the front elevation as well as storm water issues and parking along the shared driveway. To address their concerns the applicants presented a revised front elevation that included a re-work of the brick and stone placement. They also made plans for parking during construction and assured the neighbors that they would not block the shared driveway.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

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

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Kellman questioned the applicant on the number of homes, which are serviced by the shared driveway. Mr. Appler stated that there is a legal easement for the shared driveway and it serves 2 other homes.

Mr. Anderson, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland area, was concerned with storm water and runoff on the site. Mr. Martin, engineer for the project, stated that architecture was used to minimize the disturbance on the site. He suggested using a rain barrel or dry sumps at the corners of the home to absorb some of the runoff. Mr. Anderson also brought up a neighbors concern, regarding the safety of children on the shared driveway. He suggested proposing smaller plantings at the entrance to the driveway to help aide in the sight line of cars existing their driveway.

Ms. Kirsch praised the applicant on the architectural changes at the front elevation.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Anderson, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland area moved that the project be approved as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Revise landscape plan – provide smaller plant type at driveway entrance
2. Provide rain barrels/well to address storm water issues

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning for review and approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kirsch and approved by acclamation at 6:22 p.m. Mr. Martin was recused from the vote on this project.

**ITEM 2****PROJECT NAME:** Patient First, 950 York Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 528**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Towson**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Dick Matz, of Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Inc., presented the project to the panel. Patient First is proposing to construct a 7,000 SF building with 45 parking spaces on 0.77 acres of land zoned BR & DR 5.5. The building floor plan, orientation and prototypical look are critical to the success of the business, which is positioned to serve the communities of Towson, Timonium, and northern Baltimore City. Patient First is proposing to position the building in the middle of the parcel to allow convenient access for the patients, with employee parking in the rear. Access to the site will be provided at both Gerard Avenue and Carver School Road, via easements provided by the Baltimore County Board of Education. Enhancements will be made to the intersection at York Road and Carver School Road, in the form of an added turn lane for vehicles to turn north on York Road. Patient First also plans to incorporate landscape treatments, setback lines and sidewalk enhancements in keeping with recent improvements to other commercial properties within the immediate area.

Materials for the building include grey and white concrete masonry split block with a green standing seam metal roof, to fit with the Patient First prototype. Two freestanding signs are proposed along York Road along with building mounted signage typical to Patient First. It was also noted that a request was made by the Councilman to look at possibly incorporating a Towson Gateway sign on the site. The applicants stated that they will look into this and would like to work with Planning staff regarding the sign.

Patient First will be seeking zoning relief for variances on setbacks and signage to include the following:

1. Variance for a side yard of 15' in lieu of the 30' required under Section 238.2 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations (BCZR)
2. Variance from Section 450.4. Table of Sign Regulations, to permit two freestanding enterprise signs on York Road, in lieu of the one sign per street frontage permitted and to permit a freestanding directional sign including a company name and logo greater than 30% of the sign face.
3. Variance from the Landscape Manual for a buffer of 0' in lieu of the required 10' under Section 409.8.A.1 of the BCZR and the Baltimore County Landscape Manual
4. Special hearing to permit business parking in a residential zone and to access the business parking through a residential zone, pursuant to Section 409.8.B of the BCZR.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

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

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Martin questioned the applicant on the Gerard Avenue Access, and whether or not State Highways has reviewed it. He suggested that it be right-in and right-out only. Mr. Matz stated

that they have not heard anything from SHA, but are expecting that most will use the light at Carver School Road to exit the site. Mr. Martin also commented on the landscaping proposed along York Road, due to the bio-retention area. Ms. Sally Malena, landscape architect for the project, stated that they will use Itea and Ilex Glabra in and around the bio-retention area, with Crepe Myrtles in front of it.

Mr. Kellman questioned the applicant on the previous special exceptions on the site. It was noted that the previous cases have been vacated. Mr. Kellman also requested the heights for the two signs, which were noted to be approximately 11' and 5'.

Mr. DiMenna addressed the staff report, which was prepared by the Department of Planning, and is filed as Appendix C. He specifically commented on the issue of amenity open space being provided on the site. Mr. Matz stated that they are providing a lounge area inside the building, but they do not feel a need for outside open space, due to the fact that they are adjacent to the school and most customers will not be coming and going.

#### **DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Kellman made a motion to approve the project as submitted, with the incorporation of the staff comments. It was noted that the Towson Gateway sign will be studied and discussed with staff. The Panel stated that this location may not be appropriate for a gateway feature. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin then amended the motion to include support for the variances requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kellman and all was approved by acclamation at 6:53 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54 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 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 7/11/12