

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
December 12, 2012

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the November 14, 2012 Meeting

Item for Continued Discussion:

1. 911-919 Reisterstown Road – Commercial, Pikesville

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A

Agenda

Appendix B

Minutes – November 14, 2012 Meeting, as approved

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
December 12, 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:
Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak

Minutes of the November 14, 2012 Meeting

Ms. Moser moved the acceptance of the November 14, 2012 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin 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. On-site parking will continue to be provided to the side and rear of the building. The project was initially reviewed at the November 14, 2012 meeting. The project was tabled at that time with the following conditions:

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

At this time the applicants have made revisions and those revisions were presented to the panel. Mark Renbaum of Schwaber Holdings outlined the history of the project as well as the meeting with the Pikesville Community. He noted that after meeting with the community they have made some changes to address their concerns and that a better project is now proposed overall.

Gary Getz of Morris & Ritchie Associates, Inc. outlined the revisions to the building. The façade has been revised to add more detailing in the masonry as well as the brick piers. Adjustments were also made to the knee wall and parapet heights to create more individuality along the storefronts. The parapet wall sign was also removed. The applicants did not want to delay the project any further with the variance process that would be needed for the sign.

Matt Bishop, also of Morris & Ritchie, explained the revisions to the site plan. The landscape plan was revised to add 3 additional trees (with 5 total) within the parking lot areas. An additional planter was also added at the corner to help soften the pedestrian entrance. Existing light poles on the site were located and noted on all plans and all are proposed to remain. With regard to stormwater management, the applicants have met with the Department of Environmental Projection and Sustainability to go over the possible scenarios for SWM that are needed. It was noted that any SWM requirements will not substantially change the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark Sapp, of the Pikesville Communities Corporation, commented on the Developer meeting with the community. He spoke positively of the developer and praised them on their ability to work together and make changes to address community concerns. He looks forward to seeing the project developed.

Mr. Mike Pierce, also of the Pikesville Communities Corporation, also praised the project changes. He noted to the Panel his concerns regarding the accessibility of the meeting minutes. He suggested that the Chairman work to get the draft minutes available to the public. Mr. DiMenna, Chair of the Panel, noted that he will review the procedures accordingly and suggested that Mr. Pierce discuss his concerns with the County Attorney.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Moser questioned the applicants on the types of existing light poles on the site. Mr. Bishop noted that the lights were on existing BGE poles and were the traditional cobra head lights. He stated that the lights are not visible from the public realm.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the revised plans as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and approved by acclamation at 6:15 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15p.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 2/13/13