

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
June 11, 2014

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the May 14, 2014 Meeting**

**Item for Continued Discussion:**

1. 620 Meadowridge Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

---

*Appendices*

**Appendix A**

Agenda

**Appendix B**

Minutes – May 14, 2014 Meeting, as approved

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
June 11, 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 May 14, 2014 Meeting**

Mr. Hord moved the acceptance of the May 14, 2014 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and passed by acclamation at 6:01 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1****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, having high visibility at the side and rear of the proposed home. 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

The project was previously reviewed at the May 14, 2014 DRP meeting and denied with 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.

At this time the applicant has had a field survey completed on the site and a site plan was presented that accurately depicts the existing and proposed grading as well as the dripline of the existing trees on the site. The landscape plan was also revised to show all existing and proposed landscaping. The rear and side elevations were all revised to add more architectural detailing, including shutters on the windows. Exposed foundation is proposed to be brick on all sides.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

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

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Anderson questioned the applicant on the floor plan options for a 4<sup>th</sup> bedroom and the possible removal of a window on the side elevation. It was noted by the applicant that all windows shown will remain no matter what option is shown. Mr. Anderson also suggested that the applicant apply shutters to the windows on all sides of the home.

Mr. Hord questioned the applicant on the use of brick on the exposed foundation. He suggested that the applicant study how this will be done to ensure that there are no flooding issues in the house.

Mr. Monk commented on correspondence that was emailed to him regarding the existing hedge row on the property that rounds the corner and goes up West Joppa Road. Concerns were expressed from a community member regarding maintaining the hedge height and its location at the corner causing visibility issues for drivers. Mr. Monk suggested pulling the hedge row back on the property at the corner.

Mr. Kellman questioned the applicant on the height of the existing hedge row. He suggested that the applicant view the zoning regulations for the hedge height restrictions (Section 102.5, BCZR).

Ms. Kirsch questioned the applicant again regarding the inconsistent materials for the stairs on the house. The rear is proposed as brick while the front steps are concrete. Mr. Chavatel stated that he does this frequently to match the front sidewalks.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Hord made a motion to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Revise architectural elevations – Add shutters to left elevation; provide details at grade
2. Provide picture of hedge row and revise landscape plan to show adjustment of row; Either relocate or complete necessary pruning to conform to the 3’ height requirement (Section 102.5, BCZR)

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning for review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and approved by acclamation at 6:28 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 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 7/9/14