

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel (DRP)
September 9, 2020
Approved

Contents

Call to order and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the July 8, 2020 meeting

Items for initial or continued discussion

1. 1861 Circle Road, RRLRAIA Residential Review.
2. 24 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Towson DT Commercial Review.
3. 29 Susquehanna Avenue/215 Washington Avenue Signage, Towson DT Commercial Review.
4. 4313 Ebenezer Road, Day Care at Perry Hall Square Shopping Center, Perry Hall Commercial Review.
5. 706 Washington Avenue, Student Housing Building, Towson DT Commercial Review.

Adjournment of the Board meeting

Appendices

Appendix A
Appendix B

Agenda
Minutes – July 8, 2020 meeting, as approved

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
September 9, 2020
Approved

Call to order

Design Review Panel (DRP) Chair, Mr. John DiMenna, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County DRP to order at 6:02 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present	Not Present
Mr. John DiMenna Ms. Cecily Bedwell Mr. Donald Kann Mr. Joseph Ucciferro Ms. Kelly Ennis Mr. Matt D'Amico	Mr. Matt Renauld

Residential reviewer present: Mr. Francis Anderson.

County staff present: Pete Gutwald, Jeff Mayhew, Jenifer Nugent, Marta Kulchytska, Te-Sheng Huang, and Chris R. Davis.

Minutes of the September 9, 2020 Meeting

Mr. Matt D'Amico moved the acceptance of the July 8, 2020 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Kann and passed by acclamation at 6:04 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 1861 Circle Road

DRP PROJECT #: 474

PROJECT TYPE: RRLRAIA Residential Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The developer of the subject property, Mr. Alan Klatsky, presented the project to the panel. The project proposes development of a single-family detached dwelling on a four-acre site located at 1861 Circle Road. The dwelling will contain approximately 7,500 square feet of living space on two floors. Materials for the proposed architecture include stucco and natural stone with accented features such as a stone turret with a cupola and bluestone hardscaping on the front porch, lead walk, and rear patio. Mr. Klatsky indicated that the subject property will be buffered from the adjacent 1857 Circle Road property (approved by the DRP on July 8, 2020) by an existing 4-foot tall stone retaining wall and vegetation. The dwelling will be visibly limited from Circle Road by planting in accordance with required forest conservation measures. The rear of the site is also buffered by existing vegetation.

SPEAKERS:

Ms. Janet McHugh, resident of the immediately adjacent property, stated that she supports the project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. John DiMenna, DRP Chairman, opened up the floor to the panel members for their comments.

Mr. Anderson asked if any meetings occurred with neighbors through the RRLRAIA Community Association. Mr. Klatsky responded that he had sent notification letters about the project to the surrounding neighborhood and had spoken to Ms. Peggy Squitieri, Executive Director of the RRLRAIA Community Association. Mr. Anderson further asked if there would be a fence on top of the existing privacy wall and if required to submit details of the fence to the panel. Mr. Anderson also inquired on the types of trees proposed to be planted on the property.

Ms. Ennis had no additional comments.

Mr. Ucciferro had no additional comments.

Ms. Bedwell inquired if there was a delineated water table sill proposed which continues around the stone portions of the elevations and also asked if the proposed veneer was real stone veneer or a composite. She also asked whether the elevation's materials and the finished stucco would employ an EIFS or parched stucco. Ms. Bedwell lastly commented that regarding the front elevation, there should be some minor modifications to the entablature above the columns, so that it does not extend over the columns, but is reduced in alignment with the neck of the columns.

Mr. D'Amico had no additional comments.

Mr. Kann had no additional comments.

Mr. DiMenna commented about the projected fireplace on the rear elevation, that in lieu of the lower “saddle bag” roof line shown on the projected fireplace, the stone of the fireplace should be carried up to the eaves of the soffit line to avoid a stacking of separate eaves. Mr. Klatsky indicated that he would raise the chimney four feet accordingly to match the eaves of the main roof.

DISPOSITION:

Ms. Bedwell made the motion to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. The front entryway column entablature needs to be in alignment with the neck of the columns.
2. The fireplace on the rear façade, to the left side of the rear façade, be raised with the stone running up. Also, the eaves be coincidental with the eaves of the house proper that of the garage portion with the roof laying on top of the garage roof.

The motion was seconded by Matt D’Amico and approved by acclamation at 6:31 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 24 West Pennsylvania Avenue

DRP PROJECT #: 629

PROJECT TYPE: Towson DT Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Tom Hoff, a local registered landscape architect, presented the project. The subject property is a 9,000 square foot parcel with an existing two story building and a parking lot on the rear half of the property that is used for retail and office space. The proposed use is to raze the existing building and expand the surface parking facility throughout the entire property, towards Pennsylvania Avenue. The parking facility will be a pay lot for 30 cars. The parking lot is a short term plan for the property. Anticipated time frame for future development of the lot is three to five years. After that the property will be redeveloped with a new building, the existing landscaping abutting Pennsylvania Avenue is proposed to be retained and augmented by additional plantings.

SPEAKERS:

There were no speakers for this project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. DiMenna opened up the floor to the panel members for comments and requested to clarify the duration for the use of the proposed parking lot. Mr. Hoff confirmed that the parking lot would be used for three to five years.

Mr. Kann commented that given that the building abuts the property on either side, it is important to strongly identify the street edge, including the implementation and placement of lighting along the Pennsylvania Avenue’s portion of the site. He added that lighting, fencing, and signage needs to be further detailed.

Mr. Ucciferro commented that there were no dimensions of the parking lot labeled on the site plan. He also inquired about the type of material for the retaining walls. Mr. Hoff responded that the walls would be either reinforced concrete or block and emphasized that the walls' height ranged from four to one foot high. Mr. Ucciferro also inquired how stormwater management (SWM) would be addressed. Mr. Hoff responded that he proposes an inlet on the east side corner of the site towards Pennsylvania Avenue, which would then tie into the existing storm drain and added that he had not yet discussed the site with County officials and that such meetings would determine the outcome for SWM.

Ms. Ennis re-iterated staff's and Mr. Kann's comments regarding lighting and signage. Ms. Ennis also commented that it would also be important to understand what signage and how the pay machine would look like from Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Hoff mentioned that signage would be limited and that the pay machine would be similar in design to an existing pay machine located at the corner of Washington and Alleghany Avenues.

Mr. D'Amico inquired if the paid parking would be secured by a gate. Mr. Hoff indicated that no gate was proposed. Mr. D'Amico added that it should be noted on the plan how the development would meet the five percent open space requirement of the Downtown Towson District (DT District) Guidelines.

Ms. Bedwell indicated that typically the panel would like to see detailed components of the project such as the landscaping and the details of the sidewalk. She added that because such details were not provided, the project could be approved by the panel with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. DiMenna asked if the two trees outlined in green on the site plan were proposed as new trees. He also emphasized that details should be provided for the fencing proposed between the parking and landscape areas. Mr. Hoff responded that he was prepared to make revisions and resubmit plans accordingly to address the panel's and staff's comments.

Mr. D'Amico further added that he was comfortable with the conditions presented by staff and that the applicant needs to provide the requested materials to staff for review. He added that he was inclined to require the empty tree pit to be replaced with a large street tree, so that it will ultimately match the existing street trees in the future. He also commented that the other two proposed trees could be smaller ornamental trees, given that they will probably be temporary.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. D'Amico made the motion to approve the project with the following conditions based on the DT District Guidelines and all the conditions contained in the staff report. Once these conditions are addressed, the project should be re-submitted to the Department of Planning staff for review and approval.

1. Provide a detailed landscape plan with a list of all proposed plants. Native plants from the suggested tree list should be used.
2. Replace the tree in the empty tree pit with a major street tree, similar in species and form to the existing street trees.
3. Per DT District Guidelines, provide details for the street tree pits and the brick paving edge along the curbs, which is 16 inches in width.
4. Provide details for the proposed retaining walls and/or fencing, including the railing and fencing on top of the proposed retaining walls.
5. Label the pedestrian and vehicular entrances.
6. Show pedestrian connections from W. Pennsylvania Ave. to Watkins Way and to Alleghany Ave.

7. Include a detail, color and height of the light pole fixture being proposed.
8. Indicate that there will be adequate illumination for safety and convenience for private users.
9. Include a cut-off fixture so that there isn't glare and light going beyond what is intended to be lit.
10. Provide a detail of the proposed pay kiosk and label on the plan where it is to be located.
11. Include native species for Environmental Site Design (ESD) in the planting area along West Pennsylvania Avenue.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann at 7:05 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 3

PROJECT NAME: 29 Susquehanna Avenue/215 Washington Avenue Signage

DRP PROJECT #: 616

PROJECT TYPE: Towson DT Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Mr. David Karceski of Venable LLP and Mr. Bryce Turner of BCT Design Group presented the project. Mr. Arthur Adler of Caves Valley Partners participated in the meeting.

In May 2019, the owner of 215 Washington Avenue (formerly addressed as 29 West Susquehanna Avenue and branded as "The Susquehanna") presented to the DRP a project to renovate and rebrand a thirty-year old building. In addition to building updates, the owner also presented a comprehensive sign package. Since the project appeared before the DRP, the owner now has an interested tenant (a medical cannabis brand and health care provider) that wants to lease an entire floor within the building (11,000 square feet) for its corporate office headquarters. The tenant has requested wall-mounted signage along the south elevation of the building to identify its location. Along with this tenant's sign, the owner is proposing to add identification for the building address.

In his presentation to the panel, Mr. Karceski highlighted the applicant's requests, that if the proposed sign is approved, there not be a condition imposed that this be the only additional sign allowed on the building in the future. Mr. Karceski put forth that such a limitation could create a competitive disadvantage for the office market in Towson and that any additional signage proposed by the property owner be reviewed on its own merit in terms of its location and design. He added that in other office areas of the county such as Owings Mills and Hunt Valley, buildings of a certain size allow signs two times the length of the wall without variances and do not limit the amount of enterprise signs.

Mr. Turner gave a brief overview of the proposed signage located on the building's south facing façade emphasizing that the proposed sign was designed in such a way as to provide little contrast and employ a darker color palette that effectively integrates into the building's existing façade materials. In addition to the proposed sign, which is planned to be back illuminated, Mr. Turner detailed the proposed "215" identification sign comprised of non-illuminated pinned aluminum letters.

SPEAKERS:

There were no speakers for this project, however, there was a question submitted by Mr. John Weaver inquiring as to the height of the 215 Washington Avenue building. Mr. Turner responded that he was not sure on the specific height of the building, but recalled approximately 120 feet high.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Bedwell and Mr. Matt D’Amico recused themselves from commenting. It was indicated that both are involved in other projects with Greenbaum Enterprises, who are a part of this project team.

Ms. Kulchytska gave an overview of the staff report and presented to the panel the staff’s proposed conditions.

Ms. Ennis asked Mr. Karceski to further elaborate on the request for the panel to not prohibit the ability to add signs to the building in the future. Mr. Karceski indicated that request was made in the understanding that any future signage on the buildings would require review of the Panel and there are design regulations in place in the district that the panel would use to evaluate any proposed additional signs later in the future. Ms. Ennis commented that she had no opposition to the request on not limiting signage but that there should be design considerations and guidelines for further signage to the building and that there should be limits to the amount of tenant signage.

Mr. Kann commented that the location and scale of the proposed sign was appropriate. Mr. Kann indicated that adding additional signs to the building could be challenging. Mr. John DiMenna added that any future sign would be subject to the panel’s review.

Mr. Uccifero indicated that the “215” sign was tastefully done and indicated that the color of the “Curio” sign matching the color of the lower bands was also appropriate. He further inquired about whether there were any other signs on the building. Mr. Turner indicated that there was additional tenant signage on a trellis at the ground level but not attached on the building.

Mr. DiMenna indicated that he did agree with Ms. Ennis’ comments and assessment regarding the potential for future signage. Mr. DiMenna added that because future signage would require DRP review, a restriction on signage was not warranted at this time.

Ms. Nugent clarified for the panel regarding Mr. Karceski’s comments about signage. Ms. Nugent explained that the DT District does provide benefits for signage in the Towson core. Outside the DT District, any signage beyond what is allowed by the Zoning Regulations would require a zoning hearing, whereas in the DT District, all signage is approved by the panel.

DISPOSITION:

Ms. Ennis made the motion to approve the proposed signage as presented. Any additional future proposed signage will need to be reviewed by the DRP.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and approved by acclamation at 7:27 p.m.

*At this time in the proceedings of the meeting, Mr. Uccifero of the DRP was required to recuse himself from the review and on the vote of item 4, 4313 Ebenezer Road, Day Care at Perry Hall Square Shopping Center due to conflict of interest pertaining to his involvement with the applicant as a client.

ITEM 4

PROJECT NAME: 4313 Ebenezer Road, Day Care at Perry Hall Square Shopping Center

DRP PROJECT #: 628

PROJECT TYPE: Perry Hall Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The presentation was given by Mr. David Karceski of Venable LLP, Mr. Craig Bennett, Principal of CBA Architects and Mr. Joseph Ucciferro, Associate of Bohler Engineering.

This project was originally presented during the July 8 DRP meeting and approved with conditions. Mr. Karceski indicated that the project was being brought again before the panel given an amendment to the Perry Hall Community Plan which previously required a percentage of brick masonry on all new buildings in the area, but was recently amended by County Council. The amendment also required ornamental light poles to be installed that duplicate the look of light poles installed at Perry Hall Elementary School. Mr. Karceski opined that these new requirements apply to new developments and not to redevelopment of an existing center, where a fraction of the site's frontage is being affected and a fraction of square footage is being added to the center, and thus requested that the panel not apply the amendment to the subject development. He made a second request to the panel, that if the amendment were to be clarified, that the project not have to be submitted again to the panel.

Mr. Ucciferro indicated that condition 2, 3 and 4 from the July 8 DRP meeting had been addressed. Mr. Ucciferro continued that there would be lighting mounted on the building that would project to the adjacent sidewalk and front parking area. He added that if additional light poles were needed in the islands of the parking lot, they would be proposed to match the existing light poles within the center. Mr. Craig Bennett added that the exterior building materials proposed are designed to match those of the existing shopping center.

Ms. Kulchytska provided an overview of the staff report and presented to the panel the staff's proposed conditions.

SPEAKERS:

There were no speakers for this project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Mr. DiMenna inquired if the light poles are now required, for which the staff confirmed that they are. Ms. Jenifer Nugent indicated that this requirement applies to the entire DRP area, as the amendment does not constrain the new requirements to a specific geographic area.

Mr. D'Amico inquired whether the amendment to the community plan pertained specifically to new construction and Mr. DiMenna indicated that the amendment does not specify it applying only to new construction. Mr. D'Amico asked for Jeff Mayhew's interpretation of the amendment and if whether lighting is required along the frontage of the project. Mr. Mayhew responded affirmatively and that lighting is a requirement by the use of specific language such as, "shall." Mr. D'Amico added that the amendment should be clarified, and indicated that if the amendment was clarified, the project should not have to come back to the panel for review, consistent with Mr. Karceski's request.

Ms. Bedwell commented that since a limit of disturbance has been delineated on the plan, the applicant should not be required to install lighting in the remainder of the site which had been previously developed. Ms. Bedwell added that she was unaware of another law which required installing lighting for an entire site for which only a portion was being redeveloped. Mr. DiMenna agreed with Ms. Bedwell and

indicated that such a requirement was unusual. Ms. Bedwell indicated that beyond the comments relating to lighting, the applicant had successfully addressed the panel's previous comments.

Mr. Mayhew commented that if the panel was inclined to follow Mr. Karceski's argument, the panel's motion should include some explanation as to how the panel is interpreting the amended legislation.

Mr. Kann inquired about the status of the pylon sign located at the entrance. Mr. Ucciferro explained that it is an existing joint identification sign which was previously approved.

DISPOSITION:

Ms. Bedwell made the motion that the DRP approves the resubmission with the interpretation of the street lighting to be limited to the area of disturbance along Ebenezer Road. If the law regarding the amended Perry Hall Community Plan in Resolution 73-20 is further amended, the applicant will not be required to resubmit the subject project to the DRP for review.

The motion was seconded by Mr. D'Amico and approved unanimously at 7:54 p.m.

ITEM 5

PROJECT NAME: 706 Washington Ave, Student Housing Building

DRP PROJECT #: 626

PROJECT TYPE: Towson DT Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project was originally presented during the July 8 DRP meeting and is now re-submitted as a revised project for another DRP review. The revised project proposes a 16-story mixed-used building, outdoor spaces with seating and landscaping along the sidewalk on the ground floor, the terrace on level three, and on the rooftop. The building will also accommodate a café and provide retail leasing space.

The presentation was given by Mr. Mark Manzo, the property owner, Mr. Nick Hill, the Sr. Project Manager from Niles Bolton, and Mr. Richard Matz, Engineering Consultant from Colbert Matz Rosenfelt.

Mr. Manzo provided the opening comments and Mr. Hill continued the presentation with specific revisions to the project and addressed the previous comments from the panel. Some of the changes presented included: reorienting the entrance to Joppa Road with an active green wall; the activation of the street on Joppa Road, Washington Avenue, and Ware Avenue through large entryways; and the expanded window treatments on building levels one through three. Additionally, Mr. Hill mentioned that the soffits were raised in order to mitigate their impact on the pedestrian realm and the active landscaped deck was rotated to the south to get more user activation. Additional community open space was provided on level three via an outdoor terrace that wraps around the building on all sides. At street level, standard Towson light fixtures will be provided while at higher levels, uplit led lighting of various colors are proposed to provide an interesting skyline. Proposed façade materials have been updated to include cementitious paneling and ironspot brick with exposed concrete at the pedestrian levels. Exterior building mounted signage will be composed of aluminum materials and will be backlit.

SPEAKERS:

Ms. Kulchytska read a question from Mr. John Weaver, on whether any of the rooftop lighting would emit to the west. Mr. Manzo indicated that per an agreement with the West Towson community, light shades will be provided so that there would be no lighting that would be emitted to the west.

Ms. Beth Miller, representing the Green Town Alliance (GTA), presented numerous comments on the project. She began with a comment about the two rows of windows shown on the west elevation. She mentioned that such windows located in a wall that's proposed to be built on the property line and construction of an adjacent building to the west could impact the light available to the interior rooms of those units. The GTA opined that the location of the building is in the public right-of-way and disregards the setbacks that define the public realm established by the adjacent buildings and commented that is a "fatal flaw." GTA further provided a diagram which depicted the building's encroachment into the public realm. Ms. Miller added that the GTA found that the open space calculation is not in line with the design guidelines. She also explained that the building was too "top-heavy," and that a setback to the upper levels is more in keeping with the urban design principles for creating a walkable street. She noted that there are no other buildings of this height so close to the street in Towson. The GTA concluded that the DRP should not approve this project unless the rights-of-way and setback are respected. The GTA commented that the design is too aggressive for the site and is not in keeping with the spirit and intent of the DT District design guidelines. Mr. Manzo responded that at the Concept Plan Conference, DPW did not have issues with the right-of-way encroachment. He also noted that the recommendations are not binding to the Administrative Law Judge.

Ms. Kulchytska read a question from Mr. Scott Hall, who inquired on how the development did not encroach on the right-of-way of levels three to 16 of the building and if they would overhang over the sidewalk. Mr. DiMenna responded that the building does not go beyond the property line and that the DT District allows the developer to build up to the property line. Ms. Nugent confirmed Mr. DiMenna's response and added that the issue with the overhang is something that is addressed through the county's multi-agency review. Mr. Hall also inquired what is the total distance between Washington Ave.'s curb edge to the eastern edge of the proposed building on Washington Avenue. Mr. Hill responded that the distance varied between 16.6 and 12 feet.

Ms. Kulchytska gave an overview of the staff report and presented to the panel the staff's proposed conditions.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Matt D'Amico indicated the project design was improved from the previous panel review and inquired whether the project would attempt LEED certification. Mr. Manzo indicated that LEED certification was still a goal. Mr. D'Amico asked if the project is not encroaching into the right-of-way and Mr. Manzo responded that it is not. Mr. D'Amico continued that the building entrances and the second and third floors have been improved. He commented that the proposed parking space on Ware Avenue caused a reduction in the width of the proposed sidewalk to 4 feet and indicated that such parking space should be removed to provide a wider sidewalk. Mr. D'Amico also questioned why the design for the overhead door facing Joppa Road had changed. Mr. Hill responded that the previous overhang had been eliminated to provide further ventilation and airflow, but added that the design would have to be further investigated. Mr. D'Amico suggested the dimensions of the steps along the Washington Avenue side of the building be altered to look more sculptural rather than functional as stairs to interact more with the streetscape. Mr. D'Amico mentioned that bicycle racks should be added. He questioned what the proposed soffit material was and requested that the material be labeled on the submission. He also suggested that labels be added

to the drawing to indicate colors of the proposed lighting and to add note that lighting will not shine to the west or be projected into the night sky.

Mr. Uccifero indicated that the project had been significantly improved.

Ms. Ennis emphasized that the exterior materials should relate to the interior materials when they pass through the glass along the facades on levels 1 through 3 and on the fitness center area and that such materials should not be drastically different. She asked what the lighting material would be under the soffit to which Mr. Hill responded that simple, “can” lighting would be provided. He agreed that the internal and external materials should be complementary.

Mr. Kann asked whether the building face at the third floor or higher extends over the property line. Mr. Hill indicated that on all sides the building ranges from 6 inches to 5 feet from the property line. Mr. Kann added that the opening up of the lower floors was successful in improving the streetscape. Mr. Kann indicated that he was not comfortable with the precedent that this building would set for future developments in regards to its size and impact on the streetscape in Towson. Mr. Richard Matz indicated that per discussions with the County, the area of the building that overhangs will be located in a County sidewalk easement area and that the building will not cross over into the right-of-way. Mr. D’Amico clarified that it was his understanding that the building does not project beyond the existing property line and does go into an area designated as, “highway widening.” Mr. D’Amico added that it was his understanding that such widening will not be required. He stated that he was comfortable with the building not extending beyond the property line, and felt that issues with the right-of-way should be handled by DPW and not DRP.

Ms. Bedwell commented that the proposed sidewalk width of 4.4 feet on Ware Avenue is inadequate for pedestrian passage. She advocated for removing the parking space and increasing the sidewalk dimension to be a minimum of six feet clear on all sides of the building to allow for adequate pedestrian passage. She added that it was necessary for some exterior publicly accessible bicycle parking to be added and should not impede a six feet minimum clear zone for pedestrian passage. Ms. Bedwell continued that in regards to the roof elements, there should be a more subtle treatment and she suggested in terms of lighting, to use a single color with a fade transition and a limited color palette. She added that dynamic lighting programs are more compatible with civic buildings and a precedent for such lighting should not be set with this residential project. Ms. Bedwell continued that in addition to shielding to the west, there should not be uplighting that affects the night sky. She also added that stairs along Washington Ave. should be revised into more of an amphitheater style. Ms. Bedwell indicated that the project had been improved. She inquired on the meaning of one of the proposed building materials labeled as, “textured concrete.” Mr. Hill responded and clarified that the textured concrete would be a form lined product which has a textured sheen as opposed to a smooth metal finish. Ms. Bedwell also inquired about how the project would address SWM requirements. Mr. Manzo indicated that the planters on third level were being provided to address SWM and Mr. Matz added that the street trees would also be a part of SWM. Mr. Manzo indicated that the project had received a conceptual SWM plan approval from the County. Ms. Nugent clarified that the project would require both conceptual and development stage approvals for SWM for the proposed development. Lastly, Ms. Bedwell inquired about the proposed “starburst” above the Studios sign and whether it would be backlit and whether it was a feature that would remain. Mr. Hill responded that the “starburst” sign will be backlit and Mr. Manzo responded that it was added to provide interest but could be removed if requested by the panel.

Mr. DiMenna indicated that he did not have any additional comments on the project.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. D'Amico made the motion and requested the project team to revise the project based on the DT District Guidelines, the conditions contained in the staff report and the following conditions below augmented thereto. All the conditions contained in the staff report and listed hereafter should be addressed and re-submitted to the Department of Planning staff for review and approval.

BCZR 259.16.A.6.b – BLOCK CONFIGURATION/SITE DESIGN

1. Increase the sidewalk width to a minimum of six feet wide clear along Ware Avenue.
2. Dimension the overhangs.
3. Include planting in front of the generator louvers or a similar approach that minimizes the presence of the louvers.

BCZR 259.16.A.6.d – DOWNTOWN OPEN SPACE

1. Label on the plan how the five percent open space requirement is accommodated.
2. Provide street trees at 30 to 50 feet on center per the DT District Guidelines and the Towson Amenity Open Space Standards.
3. Label and provide details for the tree planters, brick banding, and 16 inch banding along the curb.
4. Provide a detailed plant list to indicate trees from the Towson tree list and all plan materials including walls, terraces, and the streetscape. Use native plants.
5. Provide a detail for the green walls.
6. Vary the height and tread of the grand steps to widen the sidewalk and allow for trees, and to create a more artistic expression.
7. Label the plaza hardscape materials at both intersections as brick or unit paver.
8. Include bike racks in the sidewalk in some designated location while maintaining 6 feet minimum pedestrian clear widths in these locations.

BCZR 259.16.A.6.e – BUILDING PRINCIPLES/ARCHITECTURE and BCZR 259.16.A.6.f – BUILDING MATERIALS

1. Label the soffit materials and colors.
2. Label the concrete finish.
3. Clarify that interior colors will complement exterior materials and colors by bringing some of the same colors and warmth inside the building.
4. Provide photos of materials and textures that accurately reflect the building materials.

BCZR 259.16.A.6.g – LIGHTING

1. Clarify the street light type, color, height, 60 foot spacing, and fixture in accordance with the Towson standards.
2. Pull the street lights back from the curb.
3. Label and clarify the intended lighting at the rooftop, terraces, and all lighting to: a) not project into the night sky; b) not project west; c) not project into the neighborhood; and d) to focus on the architectural elements. No multiple colors of lighting should be involved; keep color scheme simple.
4. Clarify the lighting intent in the soffit.

BCZR 259.16.A.6.h – SIGNS

1. Remove the shooting star sign.

The motions were seconded by Ms. Bedwell. All present panel members voted in favor of the motion, with the exception of Mr. Kann who voted against the motion. The motion was carried and the project was approved by the panel at 9:25 p.m.

The motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Ms. Bedwell and seconded by Mr. Ucciferro. The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.