

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
January 13, 2021
Approved

Contents

Call to order and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the December 9, 2020 meeting

Items for initial or continued discussion

1. 1024 Rolandvue Road, The Maddux Residence, RRLRAIA Residential Review.
2. 600 Reisterstown Road, Pikesville Plaza, Pikesville Commercial Review.
3. 9925 Bird River Road, The Spiegel Property, Middle River Residential Review.

Adjournment of the Board meeting

Appendices

Appendix A
Appendix B

Agenda
Minutes – December 9, 2020 meeting, as approved

Minutes
Baltimore County Design Review Panel
January 13, 2021
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 6:01 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. John DiMenna
Ms. Cecily Bedwell
Ms. Hyon Rah
Mr. Joseph Ucciferro
Ms. Julie Soss
Ms. Kelly Ennis
Mr. Matt D'Amico
Mr. Fran Anderson
Mr. Purnell Glenn

Not Present

Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. Matt Renauld

County staff present: Jenifer Nugent, Marta Kulchytska, Bill Skibinski and Te-Sheng Huang.

Minutes of the December 9, 2020 Meeting

Mr. D'Amico moved the acceptance of the December 9, 2020 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ucciferro and passed by acclamation at 6:02 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 1024 Rolandvue Road, The Maddux Residence

DRP PROJECT #: 635

PROJECT TYPE: RRLRAIA Residential Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is located on a 1.91 acre lot. There is an existing house and garage on the lot that is planned to be demolished to build the new structure. The proposed 4,810 square foot single-family house is designed to integrate into the traditional architectural fabric of the Ruxton-Riderwood neighborhood. The design features include the following: gable roofs, shingle siding with traditional woven corner detailing, as well as a full stone water table. The following elements will be used on the new house: pvc trim, composite shingles, insulated garage doors, as well as clad wood windows with simulated divided tiles with spacer bars.

SPEAKERS:

There were no speakers from the public community for this project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

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

In response to the staff comments, Mr. Ratcliffe explained that the retaining stone wall located on the existing property line will remain unchanged. He also indicated that all the trees on the west side of the subject property would be preserved.

Mr. DiMenna, DRP Chair, opened up the floor to the panel members for discussion.

Mr. Anderson asked if the applicant had a meeting with the RRLRAIA Community Association.

Mr. Ratcliffe indicated that he had a telephone conversation with Ms. Hope Jordan of the RRLRAIA Community Association. Mr. Ratcliffe also stated that the property owner spoke with several neighbors about the project.

Mr. Anderson complimented the project and requested the applicant provide pictures and/or documentations to show the current screening between the proposed dwelling and the existing one.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Maddux, the property owner, explained that there is an existing screening of Leyland Cypress trees between the proposed dwelling and the existing one, and are planning to extend the screening of the same planting material to the north.

Mr. Ucciferro commented that the submittal is well done and that he has no comments.

Ms. Soss stated that she had no further comments.

Ms. Rah indicated that she had no comments by using the chat feature.

Ms. Ennis complimented the presentation and added that she had no additional comments.

Mr. D'Amico requested the applicant to add a note on the plan that all the trees onsite will be preserved.

Ms. Bedwell inquired about the materials used for the water table element and the cap stone. She also asked about the design detail for the breezeway in the garage that is below the shingle.

Mr. Ratcliffe stated that natural stone will be used for the water table element as well as the cap stone and the design detail for the breezeway will be flushed.

Mr. DiMenna did not have any additional comments.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the project with the conditions that the applicant confirm the intent not to remove any trees and provide some pictures of the neighbor's viewshed into the subject property. The motion was seconded by Mr. D'Amico.

Ms. Bedwell made a clarification to the motion to approve the project under the condition that the DRP comments be addressed and submitted to the Department of Planning for administrative review and follow up.

The amended motion was seconded by Mr. D'Amico and approved by acclamation at 6:43 p.m.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 600 Reisterstown Road, Pikesville Plaza

DRP PROJECT #: 529

PROJECT TYPE: Pikesville Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The presentation was given by Mr. Stuart Darley, Principal of Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, LLC., Ms. Rozi Kamhi, Architect of Macklin & Kamhi Architects, LLC., Mr. Jeff Kennelly, Senior Project Manager of Morabito Consultants, and Mr. Mordechai Snider, Developer and property owner.

The Pikesville Plaza is located at 600 Reisterstown Road. There is an existing seven-story office building with restaurants on the first floor and offices above. The existing building will undergo both interior and exterior façade renovations and a new, one-story addition built in the rear of the building. Currently, there is an underground parking garage and a surface parking lot on the site. A new parking garage will be built on the site's rear portion of the property to replace the existing underground parking under the existing building. The façade improvements were reviewed and approved by the DRP in 2012. The proposed façade plans remain largely unchanged since the 2012 approval.

SPEAKERS:

Mr. Alan Zuckerberg, President of Pikesville Communities Corporation, expressed appreciation that the proposed project will remove the monument sign on Reisterstown Road. He questioned if the proposed façade materials for the building comply with the design guidelines. Because Reisterstown Road is a major artery, heavy traffic is anticipated around the building. The community had spoken with the owner and the engineer regarding this issue and expressed their concerns about left turns from Irving Place. Mr. Alan Zuckerberg also indicated that the presentation renderings do not show the multiple antennas on the rooftop's building. He stated that there should be restrictions to prevent these antennas from being seen from the street level. Finally, he advised the DRP to regulate the growth of plants to avoid using immature ones.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

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

Before opening up the floor for discussion, Mr. DiMenna, DRP Chair, confirmed with staff that the prior DRP approvals do not have a time limitation and that in the absence of major changes, prior approvals are still applicable.

Ms. Nugent confirmed that this is correct.

Mr. DiMenna indicated that the project focuses on the minor changes proposed on the main building and includes the proposed addition and structured parking garage.

Ms. Bedwell mentioned that the original renovations of the building intended to articulate the building. Some of the details that helped tie the building together included the fin elements and some of the tower elements. Materials that were used on the ground floor had a cohesiveness with the design intent. However, the new elevations had stripped some of the details. Ms. Bedwell further inquired if vestibules are provided at the front entry doors.

Mr. D'Amico inquired if the sidewalk along the building on Irving Place is made of concrete. He also asked if the design approach on Irving Place will be applied to the side on Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road.

Mr. Darley stated that the area between the parking garage and Irving Place will include landscaping and a 5' wide sidewalk. He also mentioned that the paving area will be of concrete. He indicated that the same design approach will be implemented in the area along Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road but that there is less area available for landscaping because of the transformers and the access/exit point of the garage.

Mr. D'Amico further asked if the existing entry to the underground parking area will be demolished and what will replace it. He also inquired which tree pits will remain or be removed. Mr. D'Amico reiterated from the staff report the comment regarding the transformers' screening on Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road.

Mr. Darley indicated that the entry will be demolished and replaced with landscaping. He also explained that the two tree pits at the corner of Reisterstown Road and Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road will remain. However, the Reisterstown Road and Irving Place tree pits will be reconfigured to enlarge the growth area.

Mr. D'Amico asked if there are walls on the ground level and the parking garage's upper level to prevent car headlights casting light into the dwellings across Irving Place. Based on the presented photometric plan, he asked if there will be spillover light. He asked about the accuracy of the planters that were shown on the renderings but not labeled on the landscape plan.

Mr. Darley explained that there are 27" height walls that act like guardrails and that block car headlights. He also mentioned that they will consider planters.

Ms. Ennis concurred with Ms. Bedwell's comments on the loss of architectural details from the 2012 approval. She suggested utilizing lighting and for the lettering of the tenant signage to enhance the entry experience. She also recommended that the signage font should be consistent.

Ms. Rah expressed her concern that the project lacks pedestrian connection. She inquired if the purpose of the recommended 42" height of the garden wall from the staff report is to address the potential disruption from the parking garage to the street. Ms. Rah suggested using vegetation to enhance the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Soss noted that the streetscape around the entire building should be uniform and pedestrian-friendly; the tree pits should have sufficient space for growing and being well-irrigated.

Mr. Ucciferro commented that the package is difficult to read because the parking garage rendering was in black and white, and colors were not used.

Mr. DiMenna agreed with Mr. Ucciferro's comment that the package is not self-explanatory. He inquired if the garage's cast-in-place concrete will be painted to match the stone veneer's color for the building facades. He also asked what kind of color coding will be used, the details between the slab edges, the screen wall above the upper level, and the actual condition of the top of the wall. Additionally, Mr. DiMenna questioned if the slab, the wall, and the columns on the garage elevations are in the same plane.

Mr. Darley explained that the color coding for the cast concrete has not yet been decided. In terms of the garage's details, he responded that there are different reveals in the exposed concrete and that those details are not yet clear.

DISPOSITION:

The panel agreed with the recommendations in the staff report dated 01/13/2021. Ms. Bedwell made a motion for the project to come back to the DRP for another review. All the conditions listed in the staff report should be addressed:

1. Provide details for the proposed sidewalk pavement and tree pits around the office building and clearly indicate the existing tree pits around the area that are to be removed.
2. Provide seating, bike racks, and trash receptacles along Reisterstown Road.
3. Provide enclosure details for the proposed dumpster and the existing transformer on Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road.
4. Provide a detailed landscape plan with a list of all proposed plants that meet Condition D (Parking Structures) of the Baltimore County Landscape Manual, page 27. Consider native and adaptive plants.

5. Based on the Pikesville Commercial Revitalization Guidelines, page 5, a 42" garden wall in combination with shrubbery should be included to screen a bay of parking space that is located outside the parking garage from Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road and Irving Place.
6. Ensure connection of the proposed concrete walkway (5.5' in width) in front of the proposed addition to Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road and Irving Place.
7. Improve the existing sidewalks on Slade Avenue/Milford Mill Road and Irving Place to enhance pedestrian connectivity.
8. Provide crosswalks that have contrasting colors to adjacent paving at the access/exit points of the parking garage.
9. Provide signage details for the proposed addition, including material, size, color, and illumination.
10. Label location and provide details for any signage and direction signs that are included in the parking garage.
11. Clearly label the lighting location for parking fixtures and parking deck fixtures in the proposed parking garage.
12. Clearly label building wall sconces on the elevations of the office building and link the codenames to the images of the wall sconce types on page 21 of the presentation.
13. Provide street lamps along Reisterstown Road and their details.
14. Link the codenames of the proposed materials for building facades to the provided material images on page 13 of the presentation.
15. Show how the equipment on the rooftop of the addition will be screened.

Based on the panel's discussions, additional recommendations were added for the applicant to address:

1. Provide a rendering of the parking garage.
2. Address paint on the garage and provide adequate responses regarding the type of paint on the garage and the concern of wearing over time if it is of concrete.
3. Provide a rendering of streetscape and landscape plan to clearly show the planting area, size of the sidewalk, and label which planting pits will be removed.
4. Add some canopy and fin elements at the main entrance and on the upper portions of the stair towers to articulate the building.

Before the motion was carried, Mr. Snider expressed that the intent for renovating the building is not to make it an art deco building but to make it a clean, beautiful, and nice building. He indicated that the proposed parking garage's facades will be finished with concrete and that those concrete surfaces will be weatherproofed and painted with sealants.

Ms. Bedwell explained that the DRP members review projects based on the design guidelines. She indicated that the request for the type of paint on the garage is from the standpoint of weather ability.

Based on the current economic situation, Mr. DiMenna expressed his opinion that the building on Reisterstown Road can be approved as submitted in the presentation. However, he stated that the presentation of the proposed garage was incomplete.

Mr. D'Amico asked Mr. DiMenna if the review of the garage's paint colors can be reviewed through the administrative review process.

Mr. DiMenna stated that the review of the paint colors could be managed at the staff level if the applicant could submit a wall section of the garage. He also added that if the panel agrees, the landscape plan can also be reviewed administratively.

Mr. D'Amico indicated that the recommendations regarding streetscape and landscaping plans could be handled by staff. However, architectural details and elements cannot.

Mr. Ucciferro stated that the plan to build a garage needs to come back to the DRP for another review.

Ms. Ennis concurred with Mr. Ucciferro's statement.

Ms. Rah expressed no problem approving the building itself except for its relationship to the pedestrian level. She indicated that it would be helpful to have additional annotations and clarifications visually on what is actually being proposed for the garage and its relationship to the residence on Irving Place.

Because the motion made by Ms. Bedwell was not seconded. Mr. DiMenna followed Roberts Rules of Order and modified the motion to accept the recommendations as proposed by staff and approve the seven-story building on Reisterstown Road as submitted by the applicant. For the garage and the landscape plan, the applicant is required to come back to the DRP and address the following issues in addition to those recommended in the staff report:

1. Provide a rendered landscape plan that addresses the connectivity issue on Reisterstown Road, Irving Place, and Slade Avenue.
2. Provide rendered elevations for the parking garage that includes a wall section to accurately describe the details on the garage elevations.

The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Ucciferro and approved by a vote of six for and one against at 8:06 p.m.

At this time in the proceedings of the meeting, Ms. Bedwell and Mr. D'Amico of the Design Review Panel were required to recuse themselves from the review and vote on Item Three, 9925 Bird River Road, The Spiegel Property due to conflict of interest pertaining to their involvement with the applicant as a client.

ITEM 3

PROJECT NAME: 9925 Bird River Road, The Spiegel Property

DRP PROJECT #: 634

PROJECT TYPE: Middle River Residential Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Before the presentation, Mr. DiMenna inquired if the DRP is reviewing the project based on the presentation for site development and/or from the pattern book submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Nugent confirmed that the panel is to review the project based on the information from both the presentation and from the pattern book.

The presentation was given by Mr. Neil Greenberg, Chief Operating Officer of Somerset Construction Company, Mr. Jason Vettori, of Smith, Gildea & Schmidt, LLC, Ms. Cecily Bedwell, Principal of Design

Collective, Mr. Aaron Kensinger, Sr. Project Manager of Century Engineering, and Mr. Devin Leary, Landscape Architect of Human and Rhode.

The Spiegel Property is approximately 55.7 acres of land that stretches from Bird River Road to the northwest and to Windlass Run to the southeast. The subdivision proposes eighty-nine single-family detached lots and associated infrastructure. The project offers front-loaded and rear-loaded garage options. The Spiegel Property proposes various lot types, including SFD Rear-Loaded Mid-Block Lot, SFD Rear-Loaded Corner Lot, SFD Front-loaded Mid-Block Lot, and SFD Front-Loaded Corner Lot. The existing site conditions consist of varied topography, with evidence of prior mining and agricultural activity. The majority of the site is currently forested, with significant environmental constraints of steep slopes, stream buffers, wetlands, and forest buffer areas.

After the presentation, Ms. Nugent stated that the Middle River Design Review Panel Area was established in 2008 through the comprehensive zoning map process. As required by law, this major subdivision needs to be reviewed by the DRP. Ms. Nugent also indicated that a residential reviewer from the community assigned by the County Council is a member of the panel.

SPEAKERS:

There were no speakers from the public community for this project.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

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

Mr. Glenn, the Residential Reviewer, indicated that the project was well presented and had addressed all the suggestions from the community. He did not have any further questions.

Mr. Ucciferro complimented the detailed presentation and the quality of the proposed project. He had no further comments.

Ms. Soss commented on the well-communicated presentation and the efforts that go beyond just meeting the required standards. She had no further questions.

Ms. Rah concurred with the comments from other panel members for the high-quality presentation. She expressed her concern about the stormwater management because the project is located in a flood prone area. She inquired if the flood risks have been considered for some units and the various parts of the site. Ms. Rah also asked if issues related to the generation of electricity and its supply were discussed because the project is located in an area where the sea level rise is expected to be six feet in the next 30 years.

Mr. Kensinger responded to Ms. Rah's comments and stated that the site runs from the low side at 60 feet to the high side at 120 feet and that all the stormwater management criteria at the state and county level have been addressed.

Mr. DiMenna had no further comments.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Ucciferro made a motion to approve the project with the conditions stated in the staff report:

1. Clearly label on the plan and in the pattern book the proposed path that is intended to provide a connection from the adjacent residences to the public park;
2. Indicate if the proposed signage will be illuminated; and
3. Provide window features in all garage doors. This should be illustrated and labeled in the pattern book.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Ennis and was approved by acclamation at 8:54 p.m.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Ucciferro and was seconded by Mr. DiMenna. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.