

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
September 10, 2014

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the July 9, 2014 Meeting**

**Item for Introduction:**

1. 6402 Pratt Avenue (Addition) – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

---

*Appendices*

**Appendix A**

Agenda

**Appendix B**

Minutes – July 9, 2014 Meeting, as approved

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
September 10, 2014

**Call to order**

Chair, John DiMenna, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:01 p.m. The following panel members were:

<b>Present</b>	<b>Not Present</b>
Mr. John DiMenna	Mr. Bill Monk
Mr. Mitch Kellman	Mr. Richard Jones
Ms. Melanie Moser	Mr. Ed Hord
Mr. Joe Coale (RRLR)	Mr. David Martin
	Ms. Julie Kirsch

County staff present included:  
Lynn Lanham, Krystle Patchak, Jenifer Nugent

**Minutes of the July 9, 2014 Meeting**

Ms. Moser moved the acceptance of the July 9, 2014 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kellman and passed by acclamation at 6:02 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1****PROJECT NAME:** 6402 Pratt Avenue (Addition)**DRP PROJECT #:** 559**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Nitin Agarwal, owner of the property presented the project to the Panel along with Phil Gugliuzza from Creative Outlook, LLC. Mr. Agarwal recently purchased the property located at 6402 Pratt Avenue as well as the neighboring vacant property at 6400 Pratt Avenue from Market Pro Homes. Both properties were recently in for a zoning variance to allow another home on 6400 Pratt Avenue, Mr. Agarwal purchased both properties and is intending to renovate the existing home at 6402 Pratt Avenue and keep the vacant lot at 6400 Pratt Avenue open, therefore the zoning relief associated with the house originally proposed for 6400 Pratt is no longer required. The applicant will be withdrawing that request, if not already done by the previous owner.

The existing home on the .29 acre lot was built in 1945. Existing materials include a stone front with vinyl/aluminum siding. The applicant plans to renovate the home and add a 2-story addition with basement on the rear and a 2 car garage on the side. The addition will be greater than 50% of the existing square footage, therefore DRP approval is needed. The proposed materials will match the existing. The applicant met with the Ruxton Riderwood Lake Roland Area Improvement Association and neighbors to go over the plans and the elevations were revised to accommodate some of their concerns. Revisions to the elevations included the addition of stone on the garage (left elevation) as well as an upgraded double garage door, additional bay window, and rectangular window detailing. The roof alignment was also adjusted. The left elevation of the home faces Bellona Avenue, which is a prominent road in the neighborhood therefore the community was concerned with that specific elevation due to its high visibility.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no members of the public signed up to speak on behalf of the project.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Ms. Moser questioned the applicant on the grade change at the rear of the property. It was unclear how much foundation would actually be exposed. Ms. Moser also suggested that the applicant provide landscaping details to address screening the garage and rear of house from Bellona Avenue.

Mr. Coale was concerned specifically with the rear elevation, which he felt was not in context with Ruxton. He also was concerned with the materials on the exposed foundation. It was noted that currently concrete is proposed. The overall massing was too large and it would be highly visible from the public road.

Mr. DiMenna requested that the applicant provide a grading plan to see if the proposed addition will even work at the rear of the property. The grading details will help to show exactly how much foundation will actually be exposed at the rear as well as the actual overall massing. Mr. DiMenna was concerned with the massing and the lack of stone detailing on the rear. The rear elevation needs more articulation and possible changes to root the massing.

Mr. Kellman suggested that the applicant follow up with the zoning office to confirm that the previous zoning case was withdrawn as well as original required side setback relief for the existing house.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. DiMenna made a motion continue review of the project subject to the following conditions:

1. Provide grading plan
2. Revise rear elevation – show accurate grade details, modify massing to be more in keeping with the Ruxton neighborhood as well as provide additional architectural detailing (exposed foundation)
3. Provide landscape plan – show proposed landscaping materials, specifically the buffer materials to screen the garage form Bellona Avenue
4. Revise elevations – provide mix of materials on all sides

The motion was seconded by Mr. Coale and passed by acclamation at 6:44 p.m. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

**Code Statement:** Section 32 – 4 – 203 (i) (2) of the Baltimore County Code states, *The Panel's recommendation is binding on the Hearing Officer, and on the agencies under subsection (l), (Directors of the Department of Planning, the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections and the Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability), unless the Hearing Officer or agencies find that the Panel's actions constitute an abuse of its discretion or are unsupported by the documentation and evidence presented.*

Approved as of October 8, 2014