

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
January 14, 2015

Contents

Call to order, and announcements

Review of today's Agenda

Minutes of the October 8, 2014 Meeting

Item for Introduction:

1. 7823 Ellenham Avenue – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

Adjournment of the Panel Meeting

Appendices

Appendix A

Agenda

Appendix B

Minutes – October 8, 2014 Meeting, as approved

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
January 14, 2015

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. Mitch Kellman
Mr. Ed Hord
Mr. David Martin
Mr. Fran Anderson (RRLR)

Not Present

Mr. Bill Monk
Mr. Richard Jones
Ms. Melanie Moser
Ms. Julie Kirsch

County staff present included:
Lynn Lanham, Krystle Patchak, Jenifer Nugent

Minutes of the October 8, 2014 Meeting

Mr. Kellman moved the acceptance of the October 8, 2014 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: 7823 Ellenham Avenue

DRP PROJECT #: 563

PROJECT TYPE: Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Steve Appler, of Goodier Baker, presented the project to the Panel. The applicants, Kevin & Laura Willie, are proposing to construct a 4600 SF home on an existing lot in Ruxton. The existing home on the site was removed and a detached garage and swimming pool remain at the rear of the site. The new home is situated on the site in a similar location as the former house, to minimize the impacts on the neighborhood. The attached garage is situated to the rear of the home so as to not be a dominant feature along Ellenham Avenue. A portion of the existing driveway will also be used for ingress and egress to the property.

The proposed dwelling will be constructed with high quality durable materials to include hardi shake style siding as well as a natural stone foundation on all side and a fiberglass roof. A sport court is also proposed for the site, with frontage on Roland Avenue. The plans for the sport court have not yet been finalized but it will be fully screened.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Nancy Horst, of 7819 Ellenham Avenue, expressed two major concerns to the Panel. These concerns included the elevation with the garage which is directly facing her property, as well as runoff. Mrs. Horst stressed the need to address runoff on the site, due to the fact that there are already existing problems. She stated that she would be willing to work with the applicants to come up with a solution and possibly share in the costs of something that would work for both of them. Mrs. Horst also mentioned limiting the construction hours as well as installing a silt fence and being mindful of the mature trees on the site. It was also noted that the HVAC equipment locations should be noted on the plan and screened properly from the neighbors.

Dan Fesperman, of 7827 Ellenham Avenue, praised the applicants on the location of the house to the rear of the site. He expressed concerns regarding the plantings proposed along his property line, due to the location of their own gardens on the lot. He stated that they have been working with the landscape architect and would like to continue conversations. Mr. Fesperman also expressed concerns with runoff as well as the location of the HVAC equipment.

It was noted by Mr. Appler, that although not finalized, the HVAC equipment would be located towards the back of the house.

Hubert Clay, of 1812 Roland Avenue, had comments regarding the proposed sport court. He wants to be sure that it does not take away from the character and quality of the neighborhood. He also questioned if it would be lighted and the applicants agreed that it would not be lighted.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. Hord was concerned with the drainage issues on the site. He suggested that the applicants work with their engineer to come up with a solution that will help both them and their neighbors. Mr. Hord also commented on the sport court. He suggested that the landscape architect look closely at the plans to assure that plantings could be used along the property lines at this location, so as to not be in the right of way. Mr. Hord praised the applicants on the design of the home.

Mr. Martin stated that with regards to runoff, if the limit of disturbance is over 5,000 SF the applicants will be required to adhere to the storm water management regulations. He suggested that the applicants have the engineer address the issue and work through it with the County. Mr. Martin also noted that the location and/or size of the sport court on the landscape and site plans did not match.

Mr. Kellman suggested that the applicants meet with the Zoning Office to address the sport court. Due to the location as well as what is proposed, the applicants should be sure that no variances are needed.

Mr. Anderson also praised the applicants on the design of the house. He stated that he would like to see more specificity in the landscape plan, specifically in regards to the sport court plantings as well as along the neighboring property lines. He suggested that the applicants continue to work with the neighbors to come up with an agreeable solution. With regards to runoff, Mr. Anderson stated that the permit process for the County will address this issue. Mr. Anderson also suggested that the applicants show the location of the HVAC on the plans and properly screen them.

Mr. DiMenna suggested that the applicants look at the fencing proposed for the sport court with regards to the County regulations in case a variance may be needed.

DISPOSITION:

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

1. Provide detailed landscape plan – address screening along property lines that is agreeable with neighbors, sport court plantings
2. Show details of sport court
3. Show location of HVAC equipment on plans and provide screening details
4. Provide coordinated landscape plan and site plan
5. Address drainage issues with engineer

All revised plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning. Plans will then be distributed to the Panel members for final DRP review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hord and approved by acclamation at 6:54 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 2/11/15