

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
May 8, 2013

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the March 13, 2013 Meeting

Items for Introduction:

1. Brown, Edward Property, 25 Woodbrook Lane - Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. The Greene Turtle, 408 York Road – Commercial, Towson

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Minutes – March 13, 2013 Meeting, as approved
Appendix C	25 Woodbrook Lane Correspondence – Concept Plan Comments, CIM Minutes
Appendix D	Staff Report – The Greene Turtle

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
May 8, 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	Not Present
Mr. John DiMenna	Mr. William Monk
Mr. David Martin	Mr. Ed Hord
Ms. Shannon Comer Dodge	Mr. Richard Jones
Ms. Julie Kirsch	Ms. Melanie Moser
Mr. Mitch Kellman (For Review of Item 2)	
Mr. Fran Anderson – Resident Member, RRLR	

County staff present included:

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

Minutes of the March 13, 2013 Meeting

Mr. Martin moved the acceptance of the March 13, 2013 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and passed by acclamation at 6:01 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1**PROJECT NAME:** Brown, Edward Property, 25 Woodbrook Lane**DRP PROJECT #:** 543**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Steve Smith, of Gaylord Brooks Realty Group, and Kristy Bischoff of Daft McCune Walker Inc. presented the project to the panel. The applicant is proposing to subdivide 11.32 +/- acres of land zoned DR 1. The proposal calls for subdividing the lot to create seven residential dwelling units (2 existing and 5 proposed). The majority of the site is open landscaped lawn and several large specimen trees scattered throughout. Three and a half acres of the site are in a no build zone to preserve the viewshed of the existing home as well as preserve the existing forested vegetation. The property will be served by public water and sewer and storm water management is proposed in the form of rain gardens and a dry pond.

The sizes of the proposed lots are similar to those in the Ruxton neighborhood. One panhandle driveway is proposed on the site, and it will follow most of the existing driveway configuration.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Scott Helm, of 201 Woodbrook Lane, submitted a complaint letter to the panel. He feels that this project will not fit with the historic nature of Woodbrook Lane, which has a variety of architectural styles. He was concerned that the proposed homes would be repetitious of a suburban subdivision and too similar to each other.

Vanessa Ford, of 120 Woodbrook Lane, asked about the setback of the first house located along Woodbrook Lane and why it was pushed back from the plan presented at the community input meeting. She also asked about the proposed rain gardens and whether they would be sufficient enough to control the potential runoff from the new impervious surfaces.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Martin questioned the setbacks of certain lots. He was specifically concerned with the use of rain gardens. Ms. Bischoff stated that they are still working out the engineering details on the site but emphasized that storm water flows cannot exceed the existing flows that are currently present going off the site.

Mr. Anderson, resident member for RRLR, questioned what will happen to the existing lots 5 and 7. It was noted that lot 7 will go to the current tenant. He hopes that the Victorian house on the site will be saved. Mr. Anderson also commented on the architectural guidelines presented in the pattern book and how they will work in connection with the DRP reviews. Mr. Smith noted that they are guidelines, but all houses will go before the DRP for official review and approval. He stated that architectural variety is desirable. Mr. Anderson specifically noted the statement in the pattern book regarding the homes to be "homogenous". He feels that this is in conflict with the DRP. Mr. Smith stated that Gaylord Brooks would be setting up an architectural committee to review the homes proposed and a community member volunteered to be on the committee.

Mr. DiMenna would like to see a variety of architecture and materials as well and he felt that not enough styles were presented in the submitted pattern book.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the site development plan subject to the note the Department of Planning recommended in their prior Concept Plan Comments to be put on the Development Plan. The note was read into the hearing and is as follows:

The proposed development plan is within the Ruxton-Riderwood-Lake Roland Community Plan area. As per Bill 56-04 the subdivision of this property is subject to the review, comments, and approval of the Design Review Panel. Contact the Department of Planning (410-887-3480) to discuss DRP scheduling, requirements, process and submissions. Proposed house plans, elevations and materials shall be reviewed and approved by the DRP prior to the issuance of a building permit.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and approved by acclamation at 6:50 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: The Greene Turtle

DRP PROJECT #: 542

PROJECT TYPE: Commercial, Towson

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Nestor Zabala, of Curry Architects, presented the project to the Panel. The Greene Turtle is proposing to extend their existing restaurant establishment by building an enclosed rooftop area on the existing two-story building. The ground floor footprint remains unchanged. The front portion of the rooftop area (towards York Road) will be open while the back half will be under roof. The front area is intended for outdoor dining and seating and the rear area will include dining tables as well as a bar area and kitchen.

Interior renovations are proposed for the existing first and second floors. Exterior renovations of the front façade are also proposed, which include an operable window/wall assembly along the first floor (at street level) as well as signage, lighting, and material upgrades. The top deck will be constructed of cementitious siding, with eifs panels proposed for the second floor. Overhead doors on the rooftop deck will be open most of the time, weather permitting, and the kitchen will be totally enclosed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Paul Hartman, of the GTCCA, stated that they are in support of the rooftop deck. They would also like to see landscape improvements along York Road. Andrea Van Arsdale, Director of the Department of Planning, stated that the County is evaluating improvements for the York Road streetscape and specifically asked the applicant to hold off on proposing anything until the County study was completed.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Kirsch questioned the applicants on potential roof runoff. It was stated that gutters and downspouts will be used to alleviate any issues.

Ms. Comer Dodge commented on the rooftop deck elevations. She suggested using hardi panel instead of hardi siding to give it more detail and help to correspond more with the detailing on the second floor.

Mr. Martin suggested adding window grids to the sliding glass doors and glass window wall to give it a more traditional feel.

Mr. Kellman was concerned with the rooftop railing that was proposed and whether or not it was a safe enough height, considering the location so close to the street and York Road below.

Mr. DiMenna questioned the applicant on the surface of the deck. It was noted that a weatherboard independent structure would be used. It was also suggested that the railing be setback from the front wall approximately 3-4' so that the railing can be lower and less visible for safety and visual reasons. Mr. DiMenna also expressed concern over the mix of materials being proposed as well as the first floor railing that was proposed. He feels that it appears too bulky. A comment was also made by Mr. DiMenna about the location of the fireplace on the deck and the number/location of emergency exits.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Martin made a motion to conditionally approve the project based on the applicant addressing the following items:

1. Revise the elevations – accurately show how the new rooftop will be constructed with relation to the height of the existing parapet wall.
2. Redesign the railings both at ground floor and along the rooftop to appear less bulky. (Possibly use a wider space picket or different design altogether)
3. Coordinate the use of materials and elements of the façade so that the overall design is more cohesive.
4. Consider using hardi panel material on roof top instead of siding so it relates more to the proposed second floor materials, in appearance and design.
5. Add window grids to upper and lower level glass doors/window wall
6. Revise location of roof deck railing (possibly move back 3-4' for safety and/or visual reasons).
7. Look into moving fireplace on rooftop front corner away from front of building or lower its height.
8. Show gutters and downspouts on the elevations

All plans are to be revised and resubmitted to the Planning Department for review and approval in consultation with the DRP members in attendance. The motion was seconded by Ms. Comer Dodge and approved by acclamation at 7:31 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 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 June 12, 2013