

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
January 13, 2016  
**APPROVED**

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the December 9, 2015 Meeting**

**Items for Introduction:**

1. 1707 Thornton Ridge Road – Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland
2. 4 Old Court Road – Commercial, Pikesville

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

-----

*Appendices*

<b>Appendix A</b>	Agenda
<b>Appendix B</b>	Minutes – December 9, 2015 Meeting, as approved
<b>Appendix C</b>	Staff Report – 4 Old Court Road
<b>Appendix D</b>	Letters of Support – 4 Old Court Road

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
January 13, 2016  
**APPROVED**

**Call to order**

Chair, David Martin, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:02 p.m. The following panel members were:

**Present**

Mr. David Martin  
Ms. Melanie Moser  
Mr. Ed Hord  
Mr. Francis Anderson – Resident Member, RRLR

**Not Present**

Mr. Richard Jones  
Ms. Julie Kirsch  
Mr. Mitch Kellman

County staff present included:

Andrea Van Arsdale, Jenifer Nugent, Krystle Patchak

**Minutes of the December 9, 2015 Meeting**

Mr. Hord moved the acceptance of the December 9, 2015 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Moser and passed by acclamation at 6:35 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 1707 Thornton Ridge Road

**DRP PROJECT #:** 573

**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential, Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Walter Daniels of Daniels & Associates Architects, presented the project to the Panel along with Landscape Architect, Lloyd Martin. Approximately 10 years ago a foundation was built on the site by a previous owner and then construction stopped. The new owner, Matt Blair, is proposing a 2 story 4500 +/- sf single family residence using the existing foundation with minor modifications.

The proposed dwelling will be constructed in a French country style with natural stone veneer and hardi shake siding along with brick accents, wood shutters, and asphalt shingles. The site will be fully landscaped along with low stone entry walls and paving elements to accent the driveway. The existing grade slopes up from front to back, therefore a stone faced retaining wall will be installed in the rear to control soil erosion.

The applicants met with the neighbors on January 4, 2016 and overall they were complimentary on the completion of the lot. The main concern was runoff, which the applicant will address.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Mr. James MacDonald, of 1709 Thornton Ridge Road, praised the applicant on completing the project. His main concern was runoff after construction. It was stated that the landscape architect agreed to meet with him to discuss and address concerns.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Anderson referenced an email he received from Peggy Squitieri, of the Ruxton Riderwood Lake Roland Area Improvement Association regarding the community meeting. He stated that overall neighbors were in support of the project after the property sat unfinished for 10 years. She also stated that it would be important to address storm water runoff. Mr. Anderson questioned the applicant on the fence at the retaining wall and requested additional details. He also commented on the discrepancy of the window placement on the elevations versus the floor plans. Additionally, he commented on the roof massing and wanted the applicant to look at this issue as well as the mix of materials on the elevations.

Mr. Hord praised the applicant on the design of the home. He also commented on the mix of materials but stated that it would give the project a unique look. Mr. Hord suggested that the applicant look at accessibility at the front of the home and consider a possible ramp element.

Ms. Moser praised the applicant on the complete package of materials that was submitted for review. With regards to the landscape plan, Ms. Moser suggested that the applicant focus on the silver maples located in the restrictive easement, specifically while grading the site to ensure protection of the trees.

Mr. Martin had no additional comments.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the plan pending the following conditions:

1. Revise elevations and floor plans – Ensure accurate window placement, study roofline
2. Provide detail of retaining wall fence

Plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning for final review and approval by the Design Review Panel. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hord and approved unanimously at 6:35 p.m.

**ITEM 2**

**PROJECT NAME:** 4 Old Court Road

**DRP PROJECT #:** 574

**PROJECT TYPE:** Commercial, Pikesville

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Virendra Patel, Architect, presented the Vineyards Elite project to the Panel. Mr. Patel, along with his wife, currently own Vineyards Elite in Pikesville. Approximately 2 years ago, they purchased the property at 4 Old Court Road. The existing building on the site was formerly owned by BGE and is a brick building constructed in 1912. The building also has 2 brick firewalls in the rear that had 2 transformers between them. The owners, along with engineer Rick Richardson, are working to redevelop the site for the new location of Vineyards Elite. They plan to rehab the existing building as well as provide landscaping for the overall revitalization of the site. New materials for the building include black brick as well as metal awnings and metal LED lighting fixtures to give it an industrial look along with black anodized windows and doors. An entry will also be provided at the rear of the building and the applicant will use the two existing brick fire walls to enclose the rear of the building.

Parking for Vineyards Elite will be provided at the rear of the building, and a handicap parking spot will be located at the front of the building. The applicants are currently requesting variances for the site including the width of the driveway, parking counts, and distance of the handicap parking spot from the street right of way.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no members of the public in attendance to speak at the meeting. Letters of support for the project were submitted to the Panel prior to the meeting and are filed as Appendix D.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Martin praised the applicant on the project. He stressed to all in attendance that this is a high priority project that will enhance the redevelopment in Pikesville.

Ms. Moser questioned the applicant on how deliveries would be made to the site, with the narrow drive aisle. It was stated that they have small deliveries with smaller trucks and they will enter via the front entrance. This should not be an issue. Ms. Moser also suggested that the applicants hire a professional landscape architect to enhance the plans presented and ensure a great look year round. She also suggested enhancing the width of the landscape aisle at the front, but it was noted that this cannot be done due to the Old Court Road access aisle as well as the parking space at the front.

Mr. Hord praised the project overall. He suggested that the applicant study the materials to be used on the side. He liked the black brick as well as the wood and metal and suggested recessing it to give it depth and a better overall look.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Hord made a motion to approve the project as presented with the following conditions:

1. Revise elevations – Provide detailing of masonry and specify materials to be used on rear and side elevations (recess)

Plans are to be submitted to the Department of Planning for final review and approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Moser and approved unanimously at 7:05 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 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 (1), (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.*