

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
January 11, 2023  
**Approved**

*Contents*

**Call to order and announcements**

**Review of today's agenda**

**Minutes of the October 12, 2022 meeting**

**Items for initial or continued discussion**

1. 35 Walker Avenue, Pikesville Commercial Review
2. 4100 Maple Avenue, Forge Overlook, Bill 61-21 Purpose Built Student Housing-Resubmittal

**Adjournment of the Board meeting**

-----

*Appendices*

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

Agenda  
Minutes – October 12, 2022 meeting, as approved

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
January 11, 2023  
**Approved**

**Call to order**

Design Review Panel (DRP) Chair 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. James Stevens  
Ms. Julie Soss  
Mr. Joseph Ucciferro  
Mr. Raj Sharma  
Mr. Matt Renauld  
Mr. Donald Kann

**Not Present**

Ms. Hyon Rah  
Ms. Kelly Ennis

County staff present: Jenifer G. Nugent, Marta Kulchytska and Brett M. Williams.

**Minutes of the October 12, 2022 Meeting**

Mr. Donald Kann moved the acceptance of the October 12, 2022 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr.  
Matt Renauld and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

## **ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 35 Walker Avenue

**DRP PROJECT #:** 656

**PROJECT TYPE:** Pikesville Commercial Review

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by, Mr. Stuart Macklin, who is the Architect and Project Manager for 35 Walker Avenue.

A new activity center is proposed to be built on 35 Walker Avenue. This new activity center will be a three-story 3,600 sf addition to the existing Jewels Inclusive School, which is currently located in the building on the adjacent property at 31 Walker Avenue. The existing building located at 35 Walker Avenue is to be razed while the existing two-story building located at 31 Walker Avenue will remain. The exterior materials and fenestration used for the addition will match the existing adjacent two-story building.

### **SPEAKERS:**

There were no registered speakers from the public.

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

Ms. Marta Kulchytska read the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated January 11, 2023.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell opened the floor to panel members for discussion.

Mr. Donald Kann concurred with the comments in the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated January 11, 2023. He asked the applicants to confirm whether the site will meet parking requirements or whether appropriate relief will be requested. Mr. Kann stated that the elevations need to clearly indicate how the masonry will match the existing building materials and that landscaping across the entire frontage of the property should be provided.

Mr. Matt Renauld also agreed with the comments of the Staff Report. Mr. Renauld emphasized on the preservation of existing trees and addressing sidewalk transitions.

Mr. Raj Sharma agreed with the Department of Planning's Staff Report. He had no additional comments.

Ms. Julie Soss concurred with the comments outlined in the Staff Report. She asked for clarification on how existing trees will be preserved. She inquired about the implementation of ADA compliance and sidewalk improvements.

Mr. James Stevens stated that the vertical glazing on the new entry should match the existing stair tower. He inquired if there was a roofing plan and if the roof will be for pedestrian use.

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro stated that there is an existing significant storm drain that the applicants are proposing to build over, which would require coordination with the proper County Agency. He indicated that the applicants are building over a lot line, which may require relief. Mr. Ucciferro stated that the plan showed planting units and should also indicate proposed planting species.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell concurred with the Department of Planning's Staff Report. She stated that the applicant should address sidewalk improvements and transition. Ms. Bedwell inquired if the new roof will be bronze to match the existing one, or if will it be the green color shown in the presentation.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. James Stevens made a motion to approve the project with conditions. The conditions are to be reviewed administratively and are as follows:

1. Address all comments and conditions within the Department of Planning’s Staff Report dated January 11, 2023.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Joseph Ucciferro and approved with conditions by acclamation at 6:32 pm.

At this time in the proceeding of the meeting, Mr. Joseph Ucciferro of the Design Review Panel was required to recuse himself from the review and vote of agenda item two, 4100 Maple Avenue/Forge Overlook, due to conflict of interest pertaining to his involvement with the applicant as a client.

**ITEM 2**

**PROJECT NAME:** 4100 Maple Avenue/ Forge Overlook-Resubmittal

**DRP PROJECT #:** 654

**PROJECT TYPE:** Bill 61-21 Purpose Built Student Housing

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Jason Vettori, of Smith Gildea and Schmidt LLC, Mr. Brandon Rowe, of Bohler Engineering, Mr. Eric McWilliams, of Bohler Engineering, and Mr. Jeff Henneman, of Henneman Architects.

The request for this project is for Purpose Built Student Housing. The project will include different building types, including four (4), four-story apartment buildings comprised of one, two and three-bedroom units. The four-story apartment buildings will have center corridors and will be served by elevators with access to surface parking lots. There will be eleven (11), three-story townhomes at the south end and an additional thirty-one (31) townhomes in the adjacent parcel to the north east with both rear and front-loaded garages.

The proposed development will be accessed from Route 1 onto Avalon Ridge Road. Amenity spaces include a lounge area, a co-working space with a conference room, a pet spa for student residents, a package room, a fitness center, and restrooms. Outdoor amenity spaces will include pathway connections for pedestrians, recreational spaces, seating areas, grills for cookouts, a water wall, and an outdoor trellis to provide shaded seating areas.

The proposed elevations of the buildings will have a mix of stone veneer, brick and vinyl siding. The proposed project is to be certified through a national “green” rating system, NGBS or LEED.

Bill No. 61-21, adopted by the County Council on June 7, 2021, defined purpose built student housing and its requirements. The Bill mandates that each building or development shall be reviewed by the Design Review Panel (DRP) for context within the community in which it is proposed.

This project was presented to the DRP on October 12, 2022. The DRP did not approve the project and requested that the applicant address several conditions and come back for another DRP review. The project was resubmitted for full process review at the January 11, 2023 DRP meeting.

**SPEAKERS:**

Michael McAuliffe, representative of the Halethorpe Community Association, stated that the proposal’s open space was deficient and that more centralized open space should be provided. He stated that the site was under- parked

with 527 beds proposed and only 489 parking spaces. He said there is no on-street parking at the north of the site near the townhomes. Mr. McAuliffe stated that only students should be allowed to live in the proposed built student housing units and that they should not be marketed to faculty and staff.

Ms. Tiffany Wiseman stated that the units went from four stories to five stories. She stated that the open space was deficient and should be reworked. Ms. Wiseman expressed that the townhome units look like they are designed for a family of four instead of targeting student population. Lastly, Ms. Wiseman stated that sidewalk transitions should be addressed.

Mr. William Carter addressed open space requirements breaking down how much is required and what is proposed to be provided. He indicated that a fee and lieu for open space should not be approved because the site could accommodate what is required and providing it is feasible. He stated that the site is 121,500 short of meeting open space requirements.

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

Ms. Marta Kulchytska read the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated January 11, 2023.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell opened the floor to panel members for discussion.

Mr. James Stevens stated that the architectural materials were appropriate. He stated that the gable area in Building B is a thin brick and the other buildings, consisting of vinyl siding, should match Building B. He stated that the balance of exterior brick indicated in key notes 22, 23 and 24 shall be brick veneer. He said the courtyard space between Buildings A and B should be increased. Mr. Stevens indicated that the amenity open space between Buildings C and D is deficient and the 2,500 sf open space next to the dumpster should be relocated to provide appropriate centralized space. He stated that the retaining walls in the North East should indicate top and bottom wall heights and an enlarged plan should be provided for clarity.

Ms. Julie Soss concurred with Mr. Stevens' comments and the Department of Planning's Staff Report. She indicated that there should be more amenities for students provided in the open space and that more centralized open space should be provided. She said to address safety concerns, more lighting should be provided. She inquired if there were wetland buffer encroachments and asked for clarity on how access and landscape buffering of the water tower will be implemented.

Mr. Raj Sharma also agreed with the comments within the Department of Planning's Staff Report. He stated that the applicant needs to address open space and site lighting deficiencies. Mr. Sharma inquired how the implementation of security and surveillance management would be addressed.

Mr. Matt Renauld mentioned that there was very little information on the open spaces and that the applicant should provide perspectives and other supporting materials to help clarify the function and the amenities of these spaces. He stated the open space had no ADA capacity and that the linear open space adjacent to Building D is poorly located. Mr. Renauld indicated that many of the grades accessing the building around Buildings A and B are not clear and it appears stairs, ramps, or both may be required. He recommended having the townhomes along Avalon Ridge Road connect to the street, which would provide a physical and visual connection. Mr. Renauld stated that the bike rack location was not accommodating to the bus stop shelters and the sidewalks did not connect to the crosswalks.

Mr. Donald Kann concurred with previous panel members' comments and added that the amenity open space is too small and not fully developed. He also agreed with the Department of Planning's Staff Report comments.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell stated that the proposed open space areas are insufficient and lacked recreational amenities targeted toward the student population. She asked that the connectivity of the shared paths and trails to surrounding neighborhoods and campus be clarified and indicate how they transition through the site and connect off-site to student destinations. Ms. Bedwell also questioned if the bike lanes along the road frontage will be on both sides of the street and if there will be any protective measures implemented, such as a buffer or striping for safety. She noted that the minimum 4' or 5' feet is too narrow for two-way bike traffic, particularly due to use by the student

population. Ms. Bedwell asked the applicant to confirm, on record, if the purpose built student housing will be marketed to faculty and staff in addition to students. Ms. Bedwell indicated that the townhouse units should not be staggered with the frontage/facades stepping back and forth. She recommended that the units step back in groups as seen in traditional neighborhoods, rather than the staggered approach in suburban development with every other unit individually stepping back.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. James Stevens made a motion to **NOT** approve the project and to return to the DRP for another review. The conditions to be addressed are as follows:

1. Comply with all of the recommended conditions outlined within the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated January 11, 2023.
2. Restudy the public amenity open space, to include retaining walls, ramps and steps, in the northeast corner between Buildings A and B and also the public amenity space between Buildings C and D.
3. The 2,500 sf of open space between Buildings C and D located near the dumpsters should be centrally relocated.
4. The gable entry on Buildings A, B, C, and D should be thin brick not vinyl. The balance of exterior brick indicated in key notes 22, 23, and 24 shall be brick veneer.
5. Provide increased site lighting to promote safety measures.
6. Provide more centralized greenspaces throughout the site.
7. Provide grading information related to the building entries of Buildings A and B to clearly show stairs, walls and ramps for accessibility.
8. Provide the necessary ramps between Buildings A and B and to access the open space between Buildings C and D.
9. Lead walkways and stairs should be provided between each townhouse unit and street ( to the street sidewalk).
10. Bike racks should be located properly on the site and shown clearly on the plans. There should be adequate bike rack spaces to accommodate the users.
11. The proposed plan should be updated to ensure that sidewalks are connected to the proposed crosswalks.
12. Provide connectivity for pedestrian and bicycle activity offsite to accommodate the students and community.
13. Provide recreational amenities in the proposed open space.
14. Restudy the staggering of the townhome elevations. The elevations should be stepped in groups rather than staggered one by one.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Kann and passed by acclamation at 8:06 pm.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Matt Renauld and was seconded by Mr. James Stevens. The meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm.