

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
November 14, 2012

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the July 11, 2012 Meeting

Item for Introduction:

1. 911-919 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – July 11, 2012 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	Staff Report – 911-919 Reisterstown Road

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
November 14, 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	Not Present
Mr. John DiMenna	Mr. William Monk
Mr. David Martin	Mr. Mitch Kellman
Ms. Shannon Comer Dodge	Mr. Richard Jones
Ms. Julie Kirsch	Mr. Ed Hord
Ms. Melanie Moser	

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

Minutes of the July 11, 2012 Meeting

Mr. Martin moved the acceptance of the July 11, 2012 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kirsch and passed by acclamation at 6:01 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1**PROJECT NAME:** 911-919 Reisterstown Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 537**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Pikesville**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed project is located in Pikesville, at the former site of the Suburban House Restaurant, which burned down several years ago. A portion of the existing building remained undamaged by the fire and is currently vacant. The site is zoned BL and is approximately 0.6 acres in size.

The plan proposes renovating the existing building and constructing an addition in the approximate location of the portion of building that burned down and which fronts on Reisterstown Road. Two uses are proposed, +/- 4,066 square feet of retail and +/- 3,225 square feet of medical office space. On-site parking will continue to be provided to the side and rear of the building.

There are some grade and visibility issues on the site due to its location that is bordered by the Suburban Club of Baltimore County to the east and south, and the old Pikes Theater which currently operates as a restaurant to the north.

Mr. Gary Getz & Mr. Matt Bishop, both of Morris & Ritchie Associates, Inc. were on hand to explain and present the project. The proposed materials for the building include brick veneer and EIFS. The existing building exterior walls to remain will be painted to match the proposed brick. Metal canopies will be provided along Reisterstown Road over the storefronts. Due to the visibility issues on the site, the applicants have proposed a vertical sign element (parapet wall sign) which will give tenant sign visibility perpendicular to the road. The materials will be brick with pinned or channeled letters.

Regarding the site design, one-way vehicular access is provided to the site off of Reisterstown Road with angled parking provided along the side of the building and perpendicular parking in the rear. Cars will exit the site from the existing alley and onto Reisterstown Road where a traffic signal exists. Pedestrian entrances are proposed at the front and side of the building. Landscaping is proposed via planters around the building as well as two tree pits, which are proposed along Reisterstown Road.

The applicants will have to ask for variances on the proposed signs. Along Reisterstown Road, the applicants are proposing two enterprise signs. Due to the pedestrian entrance at the side/corner of the building, a variance will be needed to allow both signs along Reisterstown Road. On the SE elevation the joint identification sign is proposed (parapet wall sign). The applicants will be asking for relief to put the tenant signs on both sides of the wall as well as all of the lines of text that are needed, which exceed the maximum allowable square footage for signage of this category.

A staff reported was prepared by the Department of Planning. The main issues presented by staff included the parapet sign element, its design and building design as a whole, as well as lighting proposed for the site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Alan Zuckerberg of the Pikesville Communities Corporation expressed his concern with the sign wall. He feels that the proposed sign is totally against the Pikesville Design Guidelines. He referenced previous DRP projects that are currently in litigation due to sign issues. Mr. Zuckerberg also commented on the architecture, stating that it is also not in keeping with the village style proposed for that area of Pikesville, specifically the large windows and awnings. He suggested that the applicants meet with the surrounding community to address their concerns and review the Pikesville Design Guidelines.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Martin was concerned with the re-painting of the wall along the alley and its appearance with the new brick. He suggested possibly carrying the brick around the corner. The applicant responded that new brick must end at the corner due to structural issues with the existing wall. He also questioned the applicant on the colors of the tenant signage. The applicants stated that the colors proposed are generic and the actual colors will depend on the tenants. Mr. Martin also questioned the applicant on the storm water management plans for the site, due to the fact that the site is fully paved. He suggested that the applicants meet with the County to address these issues as soon as possible, concerned that lack of SWM design could alter the plans. Mr. Martin also stressed that this building is a gateway to Pikesville, therefore he thinks the building and site could make a stronger statement than proposed.

Ms. Comer Dodge questioned the height of the parapet wall sign. The applicant stated that the sign is in keeping with the height of the Pikes Theater building. She also suggested that the applicants consider more articulation on the façade of the building.

Ms. Kirsch questioned the placement of the tenant signage on both the front and side of building. The applicants stated that the signage is proposed that way to accommodate the pedestrian entrances from both Reisterstown Road as well as the parking lot.

Ms. Moser, referencing the Pikesville Design Guidelines, suggested that the applicants provide more trees on the site. She also suggested adding another island in the parking area, which will allow for more green space as well as another planter at the corner entry. Ms. Moser also noted that she would like to see the location of the parking lot lighting shown on the plans.

Mr. DiMenna suggested that the applicants consider pervious paving to help with SWM on the site. He also suggested that the aesthetics of the building be more unified, such as using accents from sign walls on piers dividing windows.

All Panel Members were in agreement that the project needed some more work.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Martin moved that the project be tabled to until the next DRP meeting to address the Panel's comments, specifically the following:

1. Reach out to the Pikesville Community
2. Revise landscape plan – Provide additional trees and green areas in the parking lot, provide location of lights on the site (specifically the parking lot lighting)
3. Revise site plan – Coordinate with landscape plan changes and SWM provisions (if any)
4. Revise façade – Provide additional detailing/articulation

5. Study parapet wall sign element:
 - height
 - location
 - detailing
 - relationship to architecture
6. Address storm water management
7. Consider location of pedestrian entrances – may appear confusing or create security issues

Staff Note (with regards to building entry): *Page 12 – Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines – If two or more entries exist, the main entry shall always be from Reisterstown Road.* The proposal consists of a main entrance on Reisterstown Road, with additional entrances on the side and rear.

Once the applicants address the concerns of the Panel they can return to the DRP for review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Moser. Mr. DiMenna voted against the motion, but the remaining four members approved it and the motion passed at 7:07 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 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 12/12/12