

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 8, 2023
Approved

Contents

Call to order and announcements

Review of today’s agenda

Minutes of the February 8, 2023 meeting

Items for initial or continued discussion

1. 8822 Belair Road, Perry Hall Commercial Review - Resubmission
2. 808 Reisterstown Road, Pikesville Commercial Review – Resubmission
3. 4100 Maple Avenue, Forge Overlook, Bill 61-21 Purpose Built Student Housing - Resubmission
4. Milford Mill Shopping Center, Liberty Road Commercial Review

Adjournment of the Board meeting

Appendices

Appendix A
Appendix B

Agenda
Minutes – February 8, 2023 meeting, as approved

Minutes
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**
March 8, 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 6:00 p.m. The following panel members were:

Present

Mr. Cecily Bedwell
Ms. Kelly Ennis
Mr. Matt Renauld
Mr. Raj Sharma
Mr. Donald Kann
Mr. James Stevens

Not Present

Ms. Hyon Rah
Mr. Joseph Ucciferro
Ms. Julie Soss

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

Minutes of the February 8, 2023 Meeting

Mr. Donald Kann moved the acceptance of the February 8, 2023 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly Ennis and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

ITEM 1

PROJECT NAME: 8822 Belair Road

DRP PROJECT #: 649

PROJECT TYPE: Perry Hall Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The presentation was given by Mr. Matt Bishop of Kimley-Horn and Mr. Brian Olsen, Architect of Skorpa Design Studio.

The 8822 Belair Rd property is owned by Service Master by Tropea, which is seeking to expand its business. The proposed plan of development is to raze two existing buildings and construct a new 18,600 square foot building containing the following uses: Cleaning and Restoration Business (10,000 sf); office space (5,000 sf); and retail space (3,600 sf).

This project was presented during the May 11, 2022 DRP meeting and again, during the September 14, 2022 DRP meeting. The DRP requested the applicant to address several conditions and to come back for another DRP review.

Since the previous Design Review Panel Meeting, an amendment has been adopted to the Perry Hall Community Plan (see attached Resolution No. 43-22), which affects one of the conditions of the Design Review Panel approval pertaining to the proposed parking for this project.

The following condition is no longer relevant:

- Per Resolution No. 103-20, if an existing building is being repurposed, parking bays should be located along the sides and rear of the lot, and parking should not be provided in the front. For new construction, any buildings shall be placed as close to the road as possible, with parking provided at the side or in the back.

However, based on the attached Resolution No. 43-22, there are new additional conditions that need to be addressed.

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 March 8, 2023.

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

Ms. Kelly Ennis had no comments.

Mr. Donald Kann asked that the plans clearly show the access doors on the elevations as well as the plans.

Mr. Matt Renauld concurred with the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated March 8, 2023. Mr. Renauld recommended examining the outdoor seating locations to ensure that it will be homogenous with the site and can coexist with the tree planters without disturbance.

Mr. Raj Sharma had no comments.

Mr. James Stevens indicated that the site and architecture were appropriate and had no further comments.

Ms. Bedwell concurred with Mr. Renauld's comments pertaining to the placement of seating l and trees.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Matt Renauld 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 March 8, 2023.

The motion was seconded by Mr. James Stevens and approved with conditions by acclamation at 6:27 pm.

ITEM 2

PROJECT NAME: 808 Reisterstown Road

DRP PROJECT #: 657

PROJECT TYPE: Pikesville Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The presentation was given by Mr. Donny Ankri, who is the Architect and Project Manager for 808 Reisterstown Road.

A new two-story commercial building is proposed to be built at 808 Reisterstown Road. The building will have ground floor retail and second floor offices for an architecture office, and an additional office suite proposed for a future tenant. The existing building will be razed and the existing parking lot will remain in the same location.

This project was presented during the February 8, 2023 DRP meeting. The DRP requested the applicant to address several conditions and to come back for another DRP review.

On February 13, 2023 the project went through a zoning hearing. The applicant requested several variances and they were granted with conditions, see attached document titled "March 1, 2023 Opinion and Order, Case No. 2022-0296-A." The 808 Reisterstown project must be in compliance with the conditions outlined in the March 1, 2023 Opinion and Order, Case No. 2022-0296-A.

SPEAKERS:

There were no registered speakers from the public.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Marta Kulchyska read the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

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

Mr. James Stevens acknowledged and agreed with the resolution to accommodate the windows on the 2nd floor of the neighboring building. Mr. Stevens recommend that the one-story portion of the proposed building match the tan brick color of the two-story portion of the proposed building. He also stated that the door entry at the main entrance should have dark brick to create a strong focal point for the entry to the building. He indicated his concern with the right side elevation with the exposed exterior stair and recommended it be relocated.

Mr. Raj Sharma inquired about what will go in the proposed one-story building.

Mr. Matt Renauld stated that the bike rack and exterior stair location should be restudied, as it does not seem feasible. Mr. Renauld also recommended extending the sidewalk to the buildings front to engage the store.

Mr. Donald Kann reinforced Mr. Renauld's comments pertaining to the exterior stairs and indicated that the applicant review any code requirements.

Ms. Kelly Ennis indicated that the color of the bike rack and the exterior stair are not compatible. Ms. Ennis indicated that she does not oppose the dark grey color on the one story portion as it is articulated and recessed. She recommended relocating the bike rack and asked that dumpster details and landscaping/screening efforts be provided.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell stated that either the proposed dark grey brick color or the some of panelists' suggested tan brick color for the 1-story portion of the building are appropriate and should be left up to the applicant's aesthetic preference. Ms. Bedwell indicated that she initially liked the idea of the bike rack location being under that stair, as the stairs would cover/shelter the bikes and lighting could be provided, however placement and access should be studied. She also agreed that the stair location should be restudied and possibly moved to the rear of the building. She inquired if a detailed landscape plan was available and, if not, one should be provided. Ms. Bedwell recommended extending the hardscape at the front of the boutique to provide additional space for business activities

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 March 8, 2023.
2. The front façade design is to remain on the one-story portion of the building keeping the dark grey painted brick as proposed.
3. The main two-story façade design is to remain as proposed.
4. Restudy the exterior stair and bike rack locations.
5. Extend the hardscape at front of the boutique along the front building edge.
6. Provide a landscape plan detailing existing and proposed vegetation.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Kann and approved with conditions by acclamation at 7:02 pm.

ITEM 3

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, and again, on January 11, 2023. During both of these reviews, the DRP did not approve the project and requested that the applicant address several conditions and come back for additional DRP review.

SPEAKERS:

Michael McAuliffe, representative of the Halethorpe Community Association, stated that even though the open space areas increased in square footage, the topography of the areas, with its steep terrain and grading, does not provide much usable space. Mr. McAuliffe stated that only students should be allowed to live in the purposed built student housing units and that they should not be marketed to faculty and staff. He indicated that the housing is being built on Manufacturing Light zoned property, which would not be permitted through the normal process. He stated that the site was under-parked and there was no on-street parking.

Tiffany Wiseman, echoed Mr. McAuliffe’s comments pertaining to open space. Ms. Wiseman stated that sidewalk transitions should be addressed with the applicants providing plantings or grass between the sidewalk and parking spaces. She indicated the idea of bike lanes on Washington Boulevard would potentially be dangerous due to site distance and curves along the road.

Beth Lefebvre, concurred with Mr. McAuliffe and Ms. Wiseman’s comments but emphasized potential safety hazards of pedestrian and bicycle circulation as well as the lack of parking provided. She also stated that the plan should consider the specimen trees and vegetation, which is vital to wildlife and the neighborhoods character.

Shannon F. echoed the previous comments and concerns stated by Ms. McAuliffe, Ms. Wiseman, and Ms. Lefebvre. She indicated that an official development plan has not been submitted and the community would like to see these plans prior to approval per Bill 61-21. She stated that there should be a plan requirement that every student resident must be currently enrolled in the University full time. She also indicated that there are about 25 specimen trees on the property that are proposed to be removed, that should be protected and preserved or an EPS variance should be requested. Ms. Shannon F. stated that if the 42 townhouses on the plan were to be approved for faculty living, a School Impact Analysis should be required to account for the families of the staff. She reinforced Ms. Wisemans comment pertaining to sidewalk transitions. Lastly, she stated that UMBC should be more involved in the process and would like notification of their input.

Sara Harman stated that the community is not opposed to the project, but the scope of the project seems too big for the assets that the neighborhood can handle. She indicated that she would like to see fewer units, more parking, and more green space for the students and wildlife. She inquired how the student housing would be regulated and if students have to vacate after graduation.

Jack Lancaster indicated that the roads are too narrow for bypass and bicycle improvements. He expressed concerns about the existing trees and vegetation that the plan proposes to remove. Lastly, he echoed Ms. Harman’s comment pertaining to how the student housing will be regulated.

Ms. Sue indicated her support of the Halethorpe Improvement Association’s comments and concerns for this project.

Ms. Beverly Thomas concurred with all the stated concerns and comments from the previous community speakers. She inquired if UMBC later decided to make other arrangements for students, what would happen to this project. She expressed concern about safety and crime issues for the Halethorpe and Arbutus areas.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Marta Kulchytska read the Department of Planning’s Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

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

Mr. Donald Kann indicated that the specimen trees on the site should be located, identified and incorporated in the design to the fullest extent possible. He inquired how the management and upkeep of the open spaces will be facilitated. He also concurred with the Department of Planning’s Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

Mr. Matt Renuald recommended the applicant provide renderings or sight section of the open space to help the panel understand the relationships to the topography and existing elements. He also inquired about details for the proposed walls.

Ms. Kelly Ennis echoed Mr. Kann and Mr. Renuald’s comments. She found the applicants response to the Staff and Panel’s previous comments appropriately addressed.

Mr. Raj Sharma concurred with the comments in the Department of Planning’s Staff Report dated March 8, 2023. He stated that he would like to see the concerns made by the community that are under the purview of the Design Review Panel addressed.

Mr. James Stevens agreed with the Department of Planning’s Staff Report dated March 8, 2023. He stated that the building materials on buildings A, B, C, and D as well as the proposed open space areas have improved and are appropriate.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell indicated that some of her comments such as, access to the front of the townhouses have been addressed; although there are no sidewalk lead walks to every townhouse, the current proposed grouped configured works well for access and with grading. She made mention of the bus stop connections, with the applicant providing two sidewalks leading to the stops as well as crosswalks. She acknowledged the applicant’s for adding open space and addressing the connectivity comments to the extent possible. Ms. Bedwell retracted her comment from the previous meeting pertaining to the staggering of the townhouses stating that the townhouse designs are compatible with, not only Phase 1 of the project, but the context of the neighborhood. Ms. Bedwell stated that some process needs to be put in place to evaluate and monitor the requirement for the purpose-built housing to be for students, i.e., a mechanism put in place to manage and administer that requirement.

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Matt Renuald 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 March 8, 2023.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Kann and approved with conditions by acclamation at 8:10 pm.

ITEM 4

PROJECT NAME: 3600 Milford Mill Road, Milford Mill Shopping Center

DRP PROJECT #: 658

PROJECT TYPE: Liberty Road Commercial Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Project Description:

The project site is 5.01-acres+/- in net area and is located at 3600 Milford Mill Road, Windsor Mill, MD in the northwest corner of the intersection of Liberty Road and Milford Mill Road. A Development Plan is currently approved for a Royal Farms convenience store/carryout restaurant, rollover car wash, gasoline service, and two retail buildings.

The developer is now proposing a new plan, which would include a Grocery Outlet at this location in lieu of the currently approved two retail buildings.

Currently on the site is an urgent care building, a vacant grocery store, and a retail store. The proposed new development would include demolishing part of the existing grocery store building and remodeling a portion to remain for the Grocery Outlet user. Also, the new plan would redevelop the southern portion of the site with a proposed Royal Farms convenience store/carryout restaurant, rollover car wash, and gasoline canopy. The existing urgent care building on the northern part of the site is to remain.

SPEAKERS:

William Mcqueeney stated that the area is over supplied with fast food, convenient stores and gas stations and recommend the applicants subtracted the Royal Farms from the proposal. He expressed concerns with poor air quality and rodent infestation that this project would bring.

Kathleen Cheryl reinforced Mr. Mcqueeney's comment pertaining to the area being over supplied with gas stations, stating that there are currently four gas stations, with two on each side of Liberty Road. She stated that more grocery stores and other shopping options should be provide to make Liberty Road feel less like a highway.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:

Ms. Marta Kulchytska read the Department of Planning's Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

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

Ms. Kelly Ennis had no comments.

Mr. Donald Kann inquired how the west side of the truck loading area for the grocery store would function. He asked if there was a way to modify the island at the access point directly behind the Royal Farms. Lastly, he concurred with the Department of Planning's comments in the Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

Mr. Matt Renauld indicated that the parking in the Northwest corner is proposed to remain and there seems to be an opportunity to improve the circulation at that corner. He recommended the applicant show a grading plan, and a street view of the connection at the Urgent Care to see the steep points.

Mr. Raj Sharma recommended investigating the islands at the entrance to the Car Wash, which creates a bigger turning radius for vehicles and could potentially cause accidents. He indicated that there should be a median at the access point coming out of the car wash to turn on Liberty Road to promote right turn only as a safety precaution. He concurred with the Department of Planning's comments in the Staff Report dated March 8, 2023.

Mr. James Stevens indicated that this area of Liberty is a heavy auto centric area and with these additions could cause additional circulation problems in the area. He stated that this area should be restudied to provide alternative uses.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell inquired if the West and North walls and loading dock were to remain for the existing grocery store. She asked why the Milford Mill entry access point was so large and recommended widening the median to clarify site circulation as well as ingress/egress points. Ms. Bedwell recommended substituting the manufactured stone on the grocery store and Royal Farms store with a brick veneer material that can properly meet the ground plane. She acknowledged the applicant's efforts to work with MTA to provide bus shelter amenities. She inquired about details and locations for bike racks and benches. Ms. Bedwell recommended eliminating one portion of sidewalk, saving some of the impervious surface at the Milford Mill intersection. She indicated that she would like to see pedestrian circulation but less impervious surface and more planting area (two sidewalks adjacent to one another, as currently shown, are not needed).

DISPOSITION:

Mr. Donald Kann 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 March 8, 2023.
2. Provide a sidewalk and stairs as necessary from the Urgent Care Facility to Milford Mill Road.
3. Provide a median and narrow the existing entrance along Milford Mill Road.
4. On both the grocery store and Royal Farms Store, replace the manufactured stone material with brick.
5. Eliminate the second sidewalk loop at the corner of Liberty Road and Milford Mill Road and provide green space.
6. Provide details of the loading dock for the grocery store, indicating what screening and safety efforts are to be implemented.
7. Restudy the façade of the grocery store to clarify the height of the watertable as proposed.
8. Restudy the gray coloring of the facades of the grocery store elevation. Consider further articulating the façade with a horizontal band of some other color and not have the EIFS material below 10 feet height on the façade, measured off adjacent grade, as per the guidelines.

The motion was seconded by Mr. James Stevens and approved with conditions by acclamation at 9:36pm.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Matt Renauld and was seconded by Mr. James Stevens. The meeting adjourned at 9:36pm.