# Minutes Baltimore County Design Review Panel February 10, 2021 Approved

#### **Contents**

# Call to order and announcements

Review of today's agenda

Minutes of the January 13, 2021 meeting

Items for initial or continued discussion

1. 904 Applewood Lane, The Mest Residence, RRLRAIA Residential Review

Adjournment of the Board meeting

.....

**Appendices** 

**Appendix A** Agenda

**Appendix B** Minutes – January 13, 2021 meeting, as approved

#### Minutes

# Baltimore County **D**esign **R**eview **P**anel February 10, 2021

# **Approved**

# Call to order

Present

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:

Not Present

Tresent	Not I resent
Mr. John DiMenna	Mr. Joseph Ucciferro
Ms. Cecily Bedwell	Ms. Kelly Ennis
Mr. Donald Kann	Mr. Matt D'Amico
Ms. Hyon Rah	Mr. Matt Renauld
Ms. Julie Soss	

Mr. Francis D. Anderson, the RRLRAIA residential review panel member was present.

County staff present: Steve Lafferty, Jenifer Nugent, Marta Kulchytska, Te-Sheng Huang and Brett M. Williams.

# Minutes of the January 13, 2021 Meeting

Ms. Bedwell moved the acceptance of the January 13, 2021 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

# ITEM 1

**PROJECT NAME:** 904 Applewood Lane, The Mest Residence

**DRP PROJECT #:** 608

**PROJECT TYPE:** RRLRAIA Residential Review

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Peter Ratcliffe, Principal of Ratcliffe Architects, presented the project. Mr. Andy Mest, the property owner, was present at the meeting.

The project proposes to construct a new residential two-story 5,987 square feet home that will blend traditional architectural elements with American colonial-style design. The house will feature gable roofs, real stone over the wood frame at the main house mass, wings on each side with horizontal siding, and corner boards. The design will also include PVC trim, composite siding, insulated garage doors, clad wood windows with simulated divided lights, and spacer bars.

### **SPEAKERS:**

There was no one from the public signed up to speak.

# **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

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

Mr. Anderson stated that the house's mass and height is not consistent with the neighboring homes. He mentioned that having additional pictures of the adjacent neighbors' homes would have helped to provide more context about the site. He asked if any of the immediate adjacent neighbors had any comments about the height of the proposed building and if they had seen the landscape plan.

Mr. Ratcliffe explained that the positioning of the house was intended to preserve the lot's yard area and higher grade lift. He stated that he wanted the front setback of the house to be at a similar distance as the adjacent houses. He pointed out that the house to the west is also a two-story home. Mr. Ratcliffe indicated that he has met several times with neighbors and stated that they are in support of the proposed development. Mr. Ratcliffe also mentioned that Mr. Mest had long conversations with the neighbors to the east and west about landscaping and indicated that the removal of trees will be limited to what is necessary for development.

Ms. Bedwell complimented the chosen materials and asked if there was a stone capstone above the water table. She also inquired if the applicant was proposing white clapboard siding along with white shutters and, if so, what was the rationale behind the monochromatic choice.

Mr. Kann asked was there a tradeoff between the closeness to the houses to the east and west and whether flipping the driveway and garage to the other side was considered.

Mr. Ratcliffe replied that flipping the location of the driveway and garage to the west side would impact the neighbor because the lot slopes to the west.

Mr. Kann also asked for the details for the windows and headers.

Mr. Ratcliffe indicated that the windows would have divided and insulated glass. The header would be 6 inches deep with a 3 inch floating sill.

Ms. Bedwell inquired about the siding sills.

Mr. Ratcliffe replied that the siding sills are a solid wood sill with an apron.

Mr. Kann encouraged the applicant to make sure that the width of the shutters is proportionate to the windows.

Ms. Rah agreed with Mr. Anderson that the height, mass, and proportion of the home seemed a little bigger than the other houses in the neighborhood. She also expressed concern about the amount of trees proposed for removal. Ms. Rah stated that the amount of impervious space, along with the tree removal, would affect the quality of space.

Mr. Ratcliffe reiterated that he spent significant time with the neighbors and that they requested that more trees be removed. Mr. Alexander, who owns 902 Applewood Lane, asked them to remove all of the trees along the eastern property line to mitigate the potential of them falling on his house.

Ms. Rah asked if the material of the pavement for the driveway is concrete.

Mr. Ratcliffe indicated that the driveway would be macadam.

Ms. Soss mentioned that there should be more screening in between the houses along the property lines to reduce visual and spatial impacts and asked if there were any specimen trees on the property or was it mostly hollies and white pines.

Mr. Ratcliffe stated that he spent three hours at the property with an arborist who conducted an extensive survey and determined there were no specimen trees.

Mr. DiMenna stated that all his questions were addressed by the panel members. He noted that the project was well done.

#### **DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Fran Anderson made a motion to approve the project and noted that the elevation renderings should be adjusted to accurately reflect the true color of the siding and should be submitted to the Planning staff for review.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Bedwell and approved by acclamation at 6:49 p.m.

Mr. DiMenna adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.