

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
September 8, 2021  
**Approved**

*Contents*

**Call to order and announcements**

**Review of today's agenda**

**Minutes of the July 14, 2021 meeting**

**Items for initial or continued discussion**

1. 1726 Reisterstown Road, Office Building Renovation, Pikesville Commercial Review
2. 1726 Reisterstown Road, Pad Site B, Longhorn Steakhouse, Pikesville Commercial Review
3. Eastland Road Lots, Hakim Amat Residence, RRLRAIA Residential Review
4. 329 South Wind Road, RRLRAIA Residential Review

**Adjournment of the Board meeting**

---

*Appendices*

**Appendix A**  
**Appendix B**

Agenda  
Minutes – July 14, 2021 meeting, as approved

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
September 8, 2021  
**Approved**

**Call to order**

Design Review Panel (DRP) Acting Chair, Ms. Cecily Bedwell, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County DRP to order at 6:01 p.m. The following panel members were:

**Present**

Ms. Cecily Bedwell  
Mr. Donald Kann  
Ms. Hyon Rah  
Mr. Matt Renauld  
Mr. Raj Sharma  
Mr. Joseph Ucciferro

**Not Present**

Mr. John DiMenna  
Ms. Kelly Ennis  
Mr. Matt Renauld  
Ms. Julie Soss

Residential Reviewer: Mr. Francis D. Anderson

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

**Minutes of the May 12, 2021 Meeting**

Mr. Donald Kann moved the acceptance of the July 14, 2021 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hyon Rah and passed by acclamation at 6:04 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

## **ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 1726 Reisterstown Road, Office Building Renovation,

**DRP PROJECT #:** 621c

**PROJECT TYPE:** Pikesville Commercial Review

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Stu Darley, Principal at Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Mr. Michael Blake, Vice President at Moseley Architects, Mr. Sandy Marenberg, Director at Blue Ocean Realty, LLC and Mr. Timothy Kotroco, Esq., Partner at Kotroco & Associates, LLC.

This project was originally presented during the November and December 2019 DRP meetings and was approved in January 2020. In August 2021, the applicant resubmitted a new proposal for DRP review.

The new proposal consists of the demolition of approximately 22,000 GSF of the existing 39,500 GSF, two-story office building, providing a new design for the east facing façade. Separately, the applicant proposes to renovate the existing façades. The portion of the building to remain will serve as an interim phase of the owner's overall redevelopment plan and will allow existing tenants to remain in their current leases, for approximately five years.

### **SPEAKERS:**

No members of the community signed up to speak.

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

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

Ms. Bedwell opened the floor for discussion amongst the panel members.

Mr. Kann commented that the proposed signage was not in an ideal location that would be beneficial to the tenants.

Ms. Rah asked if after the five-year tenant lease was over, would the structure be demolished. She inquired if the applicants had a construction waste management plan and if there was an energy standard that they were working towards. Ms. Rah also encouraged the applicants to use recycled materials.

Mr. Renauld echoed the staff report comment for the need to provide site amenities for the tenants.

Mr. Sharma stated that he was pleased with the proposal and had no additional comments.

Mr. Ucciferro asked if the applicants had any signage or lighting details proposed with the new building work that could be discussed at the current meeting.

Mr. Marenberg indicated that the directory board will be updated and that there are no additional signage or lighting details.

Ms. Bedwell asked what was the clear distance between the inside column face to the building face.

Mr. Blake replied that the distance is 14 feet.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Ucciferro made a motion to approve the plan as presented with the condition to address the Department of Planning's staff report recommendations, dated September 8, 2021, with the exception of the Department's comments pertaining to signage and lighting. The approval of the resubmittal should be reviewed administratively by the Planning staff. The recommended conditions are as follows:

1. Provide a legible site plan. Identify materials and show dimensions for the proposed sidewalk on the plan.
2. Indicate on the plan the location of the dumpster. Provide details of dumpster enclosure and its materials. The dumpster shall be adequately screened from public view complying with the Baltimore County Landscape Manual, Section III, H.
3. On all the perspective view renderings, show the existing DoubleTree by Hilton hotel.
4. Label the location of the proposed rooftop equipment for the office building and show how it will be screened.
5. On the west elevation, show the proposed new exterior exit staircase.
6. Provide seating areas for employees and patrons and label them on the plan.
7. Indicate if any landscaping will be proposed and show on the plan.
8. Provide calculations for the required parking for the office uses and show on the plan.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and approved by acclamation at 6:47 p.m.

**ITEM 2**

**PROJECT NAME:** 1726 Reisterstown Road, Pad Site B, Longhorn Steakhouse

**DRP PROJECT #:** 621e

**PROJECT TYPE:** Pikesville Commercial Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Stu Darley, Principal at Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Ms. Carla Ryon, Planner at Colbert Matz Rosenfelt, Mr. Sandy Marenberg, Director at Blue Ocean Realty, LLC, Ms. Jennifer Nelson, Longhorn Steakhouse architect, Mr. Mark Naylor, Longhorn Steakhouse engineer, and Ms. Michelle Wright, Longhorn Steakhouse representative.

The site is located at the intersection of I-695 and Reisterstown Road in Pikesville, MD. Currently, on the site there is a DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel, a Coppermine Racquetball and Fitness facility, a WesBanco bank, and an office building.

This property was reviewed by the Design Review Panel (DRP) in 2019 and 2020 and received approval for the design of Pad sites A1/A2 and C, and for the renovation of the office building.

This current review is specifically for the development of Pad Site B for a Longhorn Steakhouse Restaurant.

**SPEAKERS:**

Mr. Alan Zukerberg, President of Pikesville Communities Corporation inquired whether the applicant attended the Design Review Committee (DRC) and what was the outcome. He asked if the existing monument sign will be razed. Mr. Zukerberg questioned if the plan proposal met the requirements of a Pad Site and expressed concerns of the internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS**

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

Ms. Bedwell opened up the floor to Panel members for discussion.

Mr. Ucciferro inquired about the location of the loading and dumpster area. He also asked for more details about the site condition of the 13 parking spaces that the Department of Planning recommend to be removed.

Mr. Darley explained that due to the grade change of the site there was a retaining wall between the 13 parking spaces and Reisterstown Road.

Mr. Ucciferro asked about the material of the proposed retaining wall. He asked if outdoor seating was typical with Longhorn Steak house developments, and recommended that some sort of outdoor seating or service be provided. He also recommended that the 13 parking spaces remain to accommodate the parking demand for the three retail establishments. Mr. Ucciferro stated that the proposed joint identification signage was in good taste. He acknowledged that there are already three existing signs on the site. In addition, he mentioned that the joint identification signage would have to be reviewed and approved by an Administrative Law Judge due to the amount of signs allowed on a site. Mr. Ucciferro was in favor of allowing the two proposed joint identification signs.

Mr. Sharma had no additional comments.

Mr. Renauld commented that the proposed site plan lacks a cohesiveness, which makes it difficult to envision its final condition. He recommended providing trees and such elements as brick crosswalks to unify the entire site and enhance the connection between the buildings. He concurred with the Department of Planning's staff report for the need of a consistent landscaping along Reisterstown Road to strengthen the frontage of the property. He also agreed that there is a need for outdoor dining.

Ms. Rah asked if the windows of the proposed restaurant are operable. She suggested for the windows to be operable to provide ventilation. She also expressed concern that some areas of the site might be too dark based on the photometric plan presented. For safety issues, she suggested at least a 0.5-foot candle is needed for suburban parking.

Mr. Kann recommended that the applicants investigate a less conspicuous location for the dumpster. He also asked the applicants to indicate the location of a decorative fence along Reisterstown Road and to provide details of the proposed materials.

Ms. Bedwell commented that there should be some pedestrian connections across different parking bays to create more continuity across the parking lot. She concurred with the staff report's recommendation to increase planting between Reisterstown Road and proposed parking to soften the view and increase rainwater penetration. Ms. Bedwell also echoed Mr. Ucciferro's comment and advocated to keep the additional 13 parking spaces. She asked what is the lowest point of EIFS relative to the grade of the sidewalk. Ms. Bedwell inquired if the wood used for the entry canopy was real wood or faux. She also inquired about the height of the stonewall above the grade and the treatment of the surface of the exposed foundation. Ms. Bedwell concurred with Mr. Ucciferro's comment to approve the two proposed joint identification signs.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Renauld made a motion to approve the plan as presented contingent on the comments from the staff's report, dated September 8, 2021, excepting the comments about removing the 13 parking spaces along Reisterstown Road and removing one of the two proposed joint ID signs. The additional recommended conditions in addition to the Department recommendations are as follows:

1. Provide safe pedestrian connectivity among the office building, Longhorn Steakhouse, Starbucks and the bank.
2. Provide enhanced landscaping along Reisterstown Road with a decorative fence extending along the 13 parking spaces, which are to remain as supported by the DRP.
3. DRP is in support of two joint identification signs. Details of their location and design should be included in the submittal.
4. Ensure that the photometric plan for the entire site has a minimum of 0.5-foot candle of lighting.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Rah and approved by acclamation at 8:05 p.m.

**ITEM 3**

**PROJECT NAME:** Hakim Amat Residence

**DRP PROJECT #:** 639

**PROJECT TYPE:** RRLRAIA Residential Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Ms. Consuelo Amat, PhD, property owner, Mr. Devin Leary, Landscape Architect, and Mr. Fred Scheckell, builder.

The property is currently entirely wooded. An 11' driveway will be installed off Eastland Road. several specimen trees are proposed to be removed for the installation of the driveway and home. Public water and private septic will serve the property.

In total, the home contains 5,432 square feet of finished space. It will feature such elements as gable roofs, brick and hardie board siding over wood framing, and clad wood windows with simulated divided lites. The lower level will incorporate French doors and a 12' dual sliding door to make the connection to outdoor covered and uncovered patios.

## **SPEAKERS:**

Mr. Michael McCann, a representative for several neighbors, explained the context of the surrounding area. He spoke about the streams to the east and the west and the required forest buffers for the streams and about the steep slopes on the site. All of this was to describe the potential environmental constraints for the proposed site. He also pointed out that the zoning regulations require a 50-foot setback from the northern property line.

Ms. Kathleen Lane, owner of the neighboring property to the north (1901 Eastland Road) indicated that the proposed dwelling is not compatible to the wooded setting of the neighborhood nor is its architectural form, size, massing and height.

Ms. Linda Owen, owner of the neighboring property on 1900 Eastland Road Eastland Road, provided some context of Eastland Road showing the size, massing and height of the houses on Eastland Road. She also pointed out that the size of the proposed dwelling is nearly double the size of most of the existing houses in the area.

Ms. Cynthia Daignault, owner of the 2019 Skyline Road property, commented that the proposed project might impact the view profile from Lake Roland Park and its design does not fit into the surrounding wooded character.

Ms. Margaret Millard and Mr. Jack Millard, owners of the 1906 Indian Head Road an immediate adjacent property, expressed concern about the lack of landscaping along the proposed driveway. They asked for the details of the guardrail and expressed concern about the potential damage that will be caused when the specimen trees will be removed.

## **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS**

Ms. Bedwell opened up the floor for discussion to the Panel members.

Mr. Anderson asked if the schematic drawings presented would be the final version submitted to the county for a permit. He agreed with the landscaping comments made by Mrs. and Mr. Millard and suggested that there should be vegetative plantings along the driveway for screening. He inquired about how many specimen trees would be removed and if any of these trees are located in the Lake Roland Park view shed, which is in the rear of the property.

Mr. Leary explained that the removal of specimen trees would only be for the purpose of accessing the site and the intent is to preserve as many trees as possible. He also indicated that the existing forest between the proposed dwelling and the park property line will remain.

Mr. Anderson asked about the height of the proposed dwelling in context to the existing neighboring dwellings. He recommended lowering the roofline to make the proposed dwelling less prominent. He also commented that the building color should reflect the tone of the natural environment.

Ms. Rah concurred with all the comments made by Mr. Anderson. She asked if there is a drainage or soil study being done for the site.

Mr. Leary stated that there is a drainage study and explained that the alternation of the grade enables the water from the north to be diverted around the house to the storm-water management facility located in

the south. He also indicated that there are prominent swales on the east and west sides that drain water to Lake Roland.

Mr. Sharma had no additional comments.

Mr. Renauld asked if it was possible to flip the location of the garage to reduce the impervious area onsite as well as to increase the amount of buffer between the house and the adjacent property to the north.

Mr. Kahn expressed his concern of the height of the proposed house.

Mr. Ucciferro had no comments.

Ms. Bedwell echoed Mr. Anderson's comments about lowering the roofline and the need to add an additional landscape buffer, especially along the property line to the north and along the driveway. She suggested the house color be more of a white linen in contrast to the proposed stark white. She asked about the width of the driveway and the details of the proposed guardrail. She also commented on the boxed rake return of the roofing.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Anderson made a motion to conditionally approve the project and recommended the resubmittal be reviewed administratively by the Department of Planning Staff. The conditions were as follows:

1. Conduct a study with an intent to lower the roof height and fix the roof details on the proposed drawings that will be submitted for approval.
2. Coordinate with the neighbors to the north to provide additional landscape screening along the northwest property and along the driveway.
3. Alter the color of the house to be more of a white linen in contrast to stark white.
4. Provide details and confirm the proposed material of the guardrail.
5. Reduce the width of the driveway from 12 feet to 10 feet and provide additional landscaping.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kann and approved by acclamation at 9:06 p.m.

**ITEM 4**

**PROJECT NAME:** 329 South Wind Road

**DRP PROJECT #:** 640

**PROJECT TYPE:** RRLRAIA Residential Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Chris Knight and Ms. Gina Knight who are the owners to the property, and Mr. Steve Schneidereith, builder.

The existing site is currently developed with an existing single-family dwelling. The proposed dwelling will face South Wind Road and the driveway will be accessed from North Wind Road. The garage will be located on the right side of the dwelling. Architectural elements that will be included on the proposed house will be Marvin Ultimate series windows, white hardie cement board cedar plank wood grain siding,



a stained Alder wood front door, black Marvin 1/3 light side door, charcoal colored architectural style shingles, standing seam black metal roof and thin cut real building stones. Landscaping efforts will include the removal of pine and cherry trees for design and safety reasons but will be replaced with adequate and enhanced screening on the proposed site.

**SPEAKERS:**

No members of the community signed up to speak.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS**

Ms. Bedwell opened up the floor to Panel members for discussion.

Mr. Anderson stated that he did not get any feedback from the community prior to the meeting. He asked if a meeting was scheduled with the neighbors in the area.

Mr. Knight explained that they did notify all the neighbors of the project by mail as well as the Ruxton-Riderwood-Lake Roland Area Improvement Association. However, they did not schedule a meeting with them.

Mr. Ucciferro had no comments.

Mr. Sharma had no comments.

Mr. Renauld had no comments.

Ms. Rah had no additional comments.

Mr. Kahn had no comments.

Ms. Bedwell commented that the natural stone veneer for the house as well as the roof return and the trim around the windows are appropriate and well detailed. She asked about the materials for the columns and their color.

**DISPOSITION:**

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

1. The homeowner should reach out to the community association again and request a meeting with the neighbors. The meeting should take place before the final approval of the plan. Any results and concerns from the meeting should be brought back to the Department of Planning staff to be addressed.
2. The drawings of the proposed dwelling should be corrected so that the architectural drawings are coordinated with the site plan.
3. The column trim color and material should be white PVC or fly ash composite trim.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kahn and was approved by acclamation at 9:30pm.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Ucciferro and was seconded by Ms. Rah. The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m.