

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
March 13, 2013

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

**Items for Introduction:**

1. 305 South Wind Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. McDonald's (Addition) 501 Frederick Road – Commercial, Catonsville

**Item for Resubmittal:**

3. Dulaney Valley Apartments – Residential, Towson

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

-----

*Appendices*

<b>Appendix A</b>	Agenda
<b>Appendix B</b>	Minutes – February 13, 2013 Meeting, as approved
<b>Appendix C</b>	Staff Report – McDonald's, 501 Frederick Road
<b>Appendix D</b>	Staff Report – Dulaney Valley Apartments

*Minutes*

Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
March 13, 2013

**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  
Ms. Shannon Comer Dodge  
Mr. William Monk  
Mr. Mitch Kellman  
Ms. Bliss McCord (RRLR – Resident Member)

County staff present included:

Lynn Lanham, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak, Jeff Mayhew, Andrea Van Arsdale

**Not Present**

Ms. Julie Kirsch  
Mr. Ed Hord  
Mr. Richard Jones  
Ms. Melanie Moser

**Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

Mr. Martin moved the acceptance of the February 13, 2013 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Monk and passed by acclamation at 6:00 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1****PROJECT NAME:** 305 South Wind Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 540**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Mr. Everett Schram, of J. Schram Architecture LLC, presented the project to the panel. The existing house on the property, located at 305 South Wind Road, will be razed. The Sinclairs propose to build a new 2,800 SF cottage-style home on the site. The plans resemble the 1994 Life Magazine "Dream House," by Robert A.M. Stern. The home will be constructed of cedar shingles and brick, with shuttered windows and dormers. There will be a porch along the rear of the home, and a 2-car side load garage. The proposed home sits on the same grade elevation as the existing home.

Jamie Walsh, of Walsh Landscape Architecture, presented the landscape plans to the panel. The home will have a circular driveway, with symmetrical plantings proposed at the street frontage, along with foundation plantings around the base of the home. Additional plantings are proposed for the rear yard, to be phased in the future.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Darrell Strobel, of 303 South Wind Road, expressed his concerns with drainage and runoff on the site. Mr. Walsh stated that the water will go in the same direction as it exists now, with a swale helping to direct the water towards the street.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Ms. Bliss McCord, resident member for the Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland area, stated that the Sinclair's met with the Community Association in December and the community had positive comments on the project. Ms. McCord, more recently spoke with most of the direct neighbors and they were enthusiastic about the project.

Mr. Martin questioned the location of the main entrance. It was noted that there is a porch entry on the street facing side of the home (front), but the main entry door is located on the side of the home.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Monk made a motion to approve the project as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin and approved by acclamation at 6:15 p.m.

**ITEM 2****PROJECT NAME:** McDonald's (Addition), 501 Frederick Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 539**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Catonsville**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Robert Goldman, of Chesapeake Design Group Architects Inc., presented the project to the panel. McDonald's is currently undertaking a nationwide re-branding. The location at 501 Frederick Road is proposed to be upgraded accordingly. The program requirements include a complete transformation of the exterior of the building, a remodel of the existing dining areas, including toilet rooms and front counter areas, an addition for extra seating as well as corrections and upgrade of ADA non-compliance.

This McDonald's was previously reviewed and approved by the DRP in 1998 for the construction of the currently existing building. At this time, the applicants are requesting a limited exemption from County Code Section 32-4-106 (a)(1)(vi). The Development Review Committee granted an (a)(1)(vi) exemption subject to DRP and zoning relief approval. The following changes are proposed for the property:

1. New building façade
2. Construction of a 872 SF building addition on the front of the existing building
3. Placement of an additional order speaker and menu boards, as well as a 20 SF order window addition to help with drive-thru congestion
4. Construction of a new patio area on the NE corner of the property to replace existing one being taken away in the front by the building addition
5. Construction of a new exit only driveway at the SW corner of the property to help with exit congestion at the light of Frederick Road and Delrey Avenue
6. Placement of new building signs. An application for sign variance will be submitted through the county (See variance plan).
7. A variance will be requested for the parking, as parking will be lost due to the exit driveway and additional spaces needed due to the building addition.

The materials for the project include masonry, with cultured stone details on the front façade and metal banding.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No members of the public signed in to speak on behalf of the project.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Monk suggested screening the pedestrian area at the front of the building, either by a wall or additional landscaping. He stated the need for a safe environment, due to the traffic conditions along Frederick Road. Mr. Monk also suggested that the applicants consider redesigning or relocating the existing free-standing sign at the front of the building to make it more of a monument style sign that fits with the front of the site.

Ms. Comer Dodge agreed with Mr. Monk, and stated that the applicants should pay special attention to the detailing for the pedestrian seating area, to make the area appealing to pedestrians.

Mr. Martin stated that the addition of a decorative railing to tie in the existing brick walls along the front of the site could work well. He also suggested larger trees along the front of the site to make it more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Kellman questioned the need for a variance on the new exit onto Delrey. It was noted that the variance was needed due to the loss of parking spaces.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Monk made a motion to approve the project as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Work with Planning Department to create a more pedestrian friendly front to the building (seating area, landscaping, screening walls)
2. Redesign/relocate existing sign – create monument style sign

All revised plans are to be resubmitted to the Planning Department for review and approval and incorporation into the Development Plan refinement approval. It was noted that the panel was in support of the variances requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and approved by acclamation at 6:37 p.m.

**ITEM 3****PROJECT NAME:** Dulaney Valley Apartments**DRP PROJECT #:** 541**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Towson**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Jonathan Mayers, of Chesapeake Realty Partners, presented the Development Team to the Panel as well as a history of the project. The Dulaney Valley Apartments (PAI # IX-773) project site consists of 12.95 acres located in Towson, MD northwest of the intersection of Dulaney Valley Road and Fairmount Avenue. In 2005 a development plan was approved which showed a plan to remove the existing garden apartment buildings and replace them with four new elevator apartment buildings containing 900 apartments and internal parking garages. The project was reviewed by the Design Review Panel in 2005. Buildings 1 and 2 have been constructed in accordance with DRP recommendations and are occupied.

The Development Team in attendance included Scott Zimmerly, of Wood Partners, Doug Cann of Chesapeake Realty, Ross Taylor, of Taylor Service Company, Daryl Carrington, of J Davis Architects, Steve Warfield of Matis Warfield, and Chris Mudd, of Venable LLP.

At this time, the current developers are proposing to build the final two buildings, buildings 3 and 4, of the development on the north side of Southerly Road. Buildings 1 and 2 will remain with existing ownership. The proposed buildings will be architecturally different from the first two buildings. Building 3 (175 units) is located along Locustvale Road and Building 4 (295 units) is located along Dulaney Valley Road. The total number of apartment units will be 900 when the project is completed, which is inclusive of buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The Development Review Committee (DRC) granted a development plan refinement on February 26, 2013 which will be processed by agencies. The refinement was supported due to the fact that the overall unit count (900 apartments) is not changing; only minor modifications and reconfigurations of buildings 3 and 4 in addition to changes in their architectural design are proposed. Each building is intended to serve as its own community, complete with amenity areas, parking and trash/maintenance facilities.

Building 4 will be the next building to be constructed by Dulaney Venture, LLC and will contain apartments and internal parking spaces along with amenities and services for the building and guests. The proposed building will be 4 stories along Dulaney Valley Road and for a portion of the Southerly Road frontage. Along the grade drop on Southerly Road, the building will transition to 5 stories. The proposed parking garage is located in the interior of the building footprint. The garage will be completely inside of the building, with apartments wrapping the building exterior.

Building 3 will be the last building constructed by Dulaney Apartments, LLC and will contain apartments and internal parking spaces along with amenities and services for the buildings and guests. The proposed building will be 4 stories along the northern half of Locustvale and the northern side facing existing residences; the rest of the building will be 5 stories, due to grade

changes. Again on this building, the parking garage will be completely inside of the building. Interior amenities proposed include courtyards, yoga rooms, cafés, spa, bike rooms, etc.

The goals for the development include contributing to the walkability in Towson, internalizing the parking, creating interior open space, and achieving Green Building Certification.

Architectural materials include brick, hardi siding and hardi cladding along with glazing details. Additional detail was given to the corner elements and vertical divisions of each building to reduce the massing of the project as a whole. The color of the materials will differ on the two proposed buildings to give each one individuality.

Mr. Mayers noted that he had letters of support for the project from the Greater Towson Committee as well as the Towson Chamber of Commerce. The Development Team is willing to continue working with the community on the project.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Michelle Ekarius, of 908 Locustvale Road, was involved with the project in the past as a resident of the community. She stated that the community wanted the project to be completed and finished like the existing buildings. Her main concern at this time is privacy. She suggested removing the balconies on the units facing the single family homes. Ms. Ekarius stressed the importance of the Panel taking the time to review the project and its effects on the neighboring single family homes.

Mr. Paul Hartman, President of the Greater Towson Council of Community Associations, commented on the design of the proposed buildings. He liked the attention to detail as well as the pedestrian and bicycle amenities. Mr. Hartman asked that the Panel support the project and give attention to the buffer between the proposed project and the neighboring homes.

Joanna Hargess, of 907 Locustvale Road brought up the issue of the Jazz building, which is currently falling apart. She wanted to know who would be responsible if this building does the same. Ms. Hargess also commented on the issue of the units being apartments versus condos. Apartments were not preferred. Traffic was also a concern.

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Martin praised the Development Team on the project as a whole. The massing and detailing are a vast improvement to the existing buildings. He commented on the issue of removing the balconies and stated that if done, it could possibly make the building appear to be even larger. Mr. Martin also questioned the power lines along the rear buffer area and whether they will be removed. The applicants will be working with BGE before finalizing the buffer plans.

Mr. Kellman questioned the applicants on variances requested. It was noted that no additional variances were needed from the original plan approval.

Ms. Comer Dodge commented on the edge of the property facing the residential homes. She suggested that additional detail and attention be paid to that area. The applicant stated that they intend to keep the mature trees and existing fencing and will create more intense landscape plans as well as an 8ft. walkway. Ms. Dodge also questioned the applicants on the color palettes for each building, and color choices were shown accordingly. Mr. Carrington stated that they are trying to get a range of colors to mix with the surroundings of the site.

Mr. DiMenna commented on the ground faced block proposed for the base of building 4 and stated that the color tends to stain over time. He also commented on the amount of brick used on the buildings, and the architect explained the reasoning for using the brick detailing in different locations around the elevations.

Mr. Monk commented on the significant improvements to the buildings and the level of detail that was put into this phase of the project. He suggested that more detail be given to the buffer on Locustvale, and that the landscaping should be above and beyond the minimum requirements of the county. It was also suggested that the applicants work with the community to come up with an agreeable buffer. Mr. Monk also questioned the signage proposed. It was noted that signage has not yet been finalized but will be reviewed at the Planning Department when plans are made final. He also commented on the Dulaney Valley street edge, and the need for additional landscaping.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the project as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Revise landscape plan – provide additional details of buffer along Locustvale (exceed the minimal landscape required by Baltimore County), work in conjunction with the Department of Planning, the County Landscape Architect, BGE and the Locustvale residents.

All revised plans are to be resubmitted to the Planning Department for review and final approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and approved by acclamation at 7:59 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 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 May 8, 2013