

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
May 14, 2014

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the April 9, 2014 Meeting**

**Items for Introduction:**

1. Baltimore County Fire Department – Station No. 1, Towson
2. 2 Acorn Hill Lane (Addition) – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
3. 620 Meadowridge Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

---

*Appendices*

<b>Appendix A</b>	Agenda
<b>Appendix B</b>	Minutes – April 9, 2014 Meeting, as approved
<b>Appendix C</b>	Staff Report – Towson Fire Station

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
May 14, 2014

**Call to order**

Acting Chair, David Martin, 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. David Martin  
Ms. Julie Kirsch  
Mr. Ed Hord  
Mr. Mitch Kellman  
Mr. Bill Monk  
Mr. Fran Anderson (RRLR)

**Not Present**

Mr. John DiMenna  
Ms. Shannon Comer Dodge  
Mr. Richard Jones  
Ms. Melanie Moser

County staff present included:

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

**Minutes of the April 9, 2014 Meeting**

Ms. Kirsch moved the acceptance of the April 9, 2014 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1****PROJECT NAME:** Baltimore County Fire Department – Station No. 1, Towson**DRP PROJECT #:** 547**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

George Klunk, of the Baltimore County Office of Budget & Finance, along with other members of the project team including Dave Recchia of Rubeling & Associates, Steve Jerrick of A. Morton Thomas and Associates, and Assistant Chief, Kyrle Preis III of the Baltimore County Fire Department presented the project to the Panel.

Baltimore County is proposing to build a new five-bay, seven-vehicle fire station on county owned property bounded on the west by Bosley Avenue, on the south by the existing fuel station, on the east by Courtland Avenue, and on the north by the Towson Police Precinct. The proposed building will be constructed of brick masonry with a green roof and other elements that will certify the building as LEED Silver.

The fire station will be a pull-through design with fire department egress onto Bosley Avenue. The existing grades on the site will be matched at both Bosley Avenue and Courtland Avenue. There will be median adjustments made on Bosley Avenue to allow for access and use of the Fire Department vehicles as well as new signals and signal control of the Towsontown Boulevard/Bosley Avenue intersection.

A staff report was prepared by the Department of Planning and is filed as Appendix C.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Steve Nolan, representing Courthouse Commons, expressed concerns to the Panel regarding the traffic on Bosley Avenue and the need for pedestrian safety enhancements. He was also concerned with the noise from the sirens and the close proximity to offices and residences. It was also stated that this location is a gateway to Towson and the County should spare no expense with the design.

Richard Reinhardt, representing 220 Bosley Avenue, questioned the number of parking spots on the site and where the employees would be parking. It was noted that the employees will park in the County parking garages. He also expressed concern with the new traffic patterns that the project will create.

Mike Ertel, representing the GTCCA and WTNA, commented on the existing Towson Fire Station and stated that they would like to have a new fire station built on that site. He stated that the new location affects too many residences. It was stated that the design proposed needs more detailing and should have a “sense of community.” Mr. Ertel also suggested more screening on the site.

Josh Glikin, representing West Towson, was in agreement with Mike Ertel. He stated that this site is a gateway site and is close to Towson University as well as many other communities and it should have a more residential feel with detailing representative of the Towson area. Mr. Glikin suggested that the panel make design comments to enhance the site.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Ms. Kirsch commented on the materials used for detailing. It was noted that pre-cast stone detailing will be used in some areas while in other areas EIFS and steel beams will be used in a color matching the pre-cast stone material.

Mr. Monk questioned the applicants on the location of handicapped parking spots as well as ADA accessibility. It was noted that one of the three spots at the main entrance will be dedicated. Mr. Monk also suggested that the applicants provide an enclosure on the dumpster and consider additional landscaping to screen the gas pumps to the south.

Mr. Hord stated that he liked the design of the building and the way it fit on the site.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Hord made a motion to approve the project as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kellman and approved by acclamation at 6:47 p.m.

*This presentation before the DRP was being performed solely to provide notice as required by Section 32-4-116(b) of the Baltimore County Code (BCC). Baltimore County is exempt from complying with its land use and zoning regulations, Glasscock v. Baltimore County, Maryland, 321 Md. 118, 122 (1990), and the notice provided by this presentation shall not be construed as a waiver of this exemption. While the comments and recommendations of the Design Review Panel with respect to this project will be strongly considered by Baltimore County, they are advisory only and will not binding on the County.*

**ITEM 2****PROJECT NAME:** 2 Acorn Hill Lane (Addition)**DRP PROJECT #:** 553**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Randy Kuser, owner of the home, presented the project to the Panel. The existing 2 Acorn Hill Lane property contains three acres, zoned DR-2 with an existing 1959 vintage one story rancher with 2,351 SF of conditioned space. The applicants plan to add an addition to the home which will include adding to the footprint, converting the existing breezeway to a mud room, and building a new second floor for a new total condition space of 4,753 SF. A new two car garage will be connected to the home via a breezeway. Materials for the project include hardi plank siding.

The addition to the home exceeded 50% of the existing square footage, therefore DRP approval is needed.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Peggy Squitieri, of the Ruxton Riderwood Lake Roland Area Improvement Association stated that she met with the neighbors of the property and no concerns or issues were expressed.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Anderson, resident member for the RRLR area, suggested that the applicant provide some additional landscaping to the rear of the site to alleviate any potential run off issues downhill of the site.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Hord made a motion to approve the project as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Monk and approved by acclamation at 6:56 p.m.

**ITEM 3****PROJECT NAME:** 620 Meadowridge Road**DRP PROJECT #:** 552**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Richard Chavatel, of Chavatel Builders presented the project to the Panel. The applicant is building a 2-story home with an attached two car garage on the site. The site sits on a prominent corner of Joppa Road & Meadowridge Road, therefore it has high visibility.

Materials for the project include hardi plank siding with brick to grade along with hardi shingles and metal roof detailing. The driveway to the site will be off of Meadowridge Road. A stamped concrete patio is also proposed off of the rear of the home.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no members of the public in attendance to speak on behalf of the project.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Hord questioned the grading proposed for the site. It was not clear on the site plan. He was concerned with the grading and potential flooding problems. The extensive grading shown on the plan would kill the existing trees. Mr. Hord also suggested that the applicant revise the elevations to provide more detailing on the right elevation and the rear elevation, which are the most visible from the roads.

Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Hord's concerns. He also questioned the location of the existing hedge lining the property. Mr. Martin also suggested that the applicant reference Section 260 of the BCZR to address the detailing on the highly visible sides of the home.

Mr. Kellman noted that the height of the hedging at an intersection is restricted by zoning. He suggested that the applicant make note of this.

Mr. Monk was concerned with the site plan and inconsistencies with regards to the elevations and the site plan. He suggested that the applicant revise the plans to give more accurate details.

Mr. Anderson , resident member for the RRLR area, was concerned with the lack of proposed landscaping on the prominent site. He also wanted to see more detailing on the right elevation, facing Joppa Road. It was also noted that the elevations need to be revised to address the grades on the site.

Ms. Kirsch agreed with Mr. Anderson's comments. She also suggested that the applicant provide brick steps and porches on both the front and rear elevation so that they both are the same.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Hord made a motion to deny the project due to the high number of concerns as well as lack of information and inconsistent plans. The applicant was advised to return to the Panel at a later date to address the following conditions:

1. Revise the site plan to clearly and accurately indicate the proposed work. All plans (site, landscape and architectural) must coordinate with each other and fully portray all proposed work
2. The landscape plan shall show accurate topography complete with clearly labeled elevation grades. Proposed grade work shall also be shown complete with spot grades and top and bottom of wall elevations for any proposed retaining walls. The proposed walls shall be shown on both the site and landscape plans.
3. Show on the landscape plan the existing plant material that is to remain and to be removed. Clearly demonstrate the protective measures to retain the existing trees that could potentially be affected by the site grading. Show clearly and accurately the proposed plant material.
4. The architectural elevations shall be revised to clearly and accurately depict what will be built for this proposal. The elevations must coordinate with the floor plans.
5. The right side elevation and the rear elevation must have more detailing so that they address the high visibility of Joppa Road similar to the front elevation.

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning for review prior to scheduling a DRP meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kirsch and approved by acclamation at 7:33 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 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 6/11/14