

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
September 14, 2016  
**APPROVED**

*Contents*

**Call to order, and announcements**

**Review of today's Agenda**

**Minutes of the May 11, 2016 Meeting**

**Items for Introduction:**

1. 904 Applewood Lane – Ruxton/Riderwood/Lake Roland Review Area
2. Introduction of Planning Staff for the Downtown Towson District

**Adjournment of the Panel Meeting**

---

*Appendices*

<b>Appendix A</b>	Agenda
<b>Appendix B</b>	Minutes – May 11, 2016 Meeting, as approved
<b>Appendix C</b>	Towson Urban Center Overlay District

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County **Design Review Panel**  
September 14, 2016  
**DRAFT**

**Call to order**

Chair, David Martin, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County **Design Review Panel** to order at 6:07 p.m. The following panel members were:

**Present**

Mr. David Martin  
Mr. Mitch Kellman  
Mr. Ed Hord  
Ms. Cecily Bedwell  
Mr. Matt D'Amico  
Ms. Nikki Brooks  
Ms. Melanie Moser  
Mr. Qutub Syed  
Mr. Fran Anderson – Residential Reviewer

**Not Present**

Mr. Richard Jones  
Ms. Julie Kirsch

County staff present included:

Jeff Mayhew, Jenifer Nugent, Jessie Bialek, Brett Williams, Laurie Hay

**Minutes of the May 11, 2016 Meeting**

Mr. Ed Hord moved the acceptance of the May 11, 2016 draft minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cecily Bedwell and passed by acclamation at 6:11 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

**ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 904 Applewood Lane

**DRP PROJECT #:** 575

**PROJECT TYPE:** Residential

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Mr. Delbert Adams, of the Delbert Adams Construction Group presented the project to the Panel. They are proposing to construct a 5,900 SF, 40 ft high home on an existing lot in Ruxton. The existing home on the site will be removed. The new home will be situated on the site in a different location as the existing house, to minimize the impacts on the neighborhood. The attached 3 car garage will be situated on the right facing south. In the rear there is a proposed walkout patio with a pergola and entry to the house. A portion of the existing driveway will also be used for ingress and egress to the property and a parking area will be added in front of the house and garage. The applicant also plans to remove some existing vegetation and add swales to the western side of the property to control and contain runoff of rainwater. Since there is a fair amount of grade change from the back to the front of the site, a retaining wall will be designed in the rear yard of the home.

The proposed dwelling will be constructed with high quality durable materials to include a 3-d grand manor roof and artisan hardi-plank siding on all sides; the corners will have fluted pilasters.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Ms. Alicia Haberman of 909 Applewood Lane, was pleased that Mr. Adam's company was going to build a new home on the site. Ms. Haberman also expressed two major concerns to the Panel. These concerns included the elevation of the home as well as runoff. Ms. Haberman was concerned that the proposed height of the home would invade on the privacy that she and her family currently enjoy and stressed the need to address runoff on the site, due to the fact that there are already existing problems. She stated that she would like a third party to look at the drainage and runoff issues. Ms. Haberman also expressed concerns regarding swales proposed along her property line, due to the location of her own gardens on the lot and she asked that the applicant be mindful of what is currently on site.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Ed Hord questioned the location of the swale and stated that there is a considerable grade change from the south to the north. Mr. Hord agreed with the issue of the height of the house and suggested lowering the roof line, with some adjustments to the window heads and gutters. He was surprised to see how the neighbor's house is so close to the property line. Mr. Hord also said that creating a swale should help with the storm water management issues and urged the applicant to pipe the water to the street.

Chairman David Martin stated that with regards to Ms. Haberman wanting a third party to look at the potential runoff issues, she would need to discuss that with the applicant.

Mr. Mitch Kellman said that with regards to potential runoff, if the limit of disturbance is over 5,000 SF the applicants will be required to adhere to the storm water management regulations. He also stated that the maximum height of a house in the DR 2 zone is 50 ft.

Ms. Cecily Bedwell stated that there was no third floor, occupiable space; it is roof space with false dormers. This fact should help alleviate Ms. Haberman's privacy concerns. She also wanted to know

from the applicant if there was going to be replanting after the installation of the swale, as it seemed to her that there was some conflict with the location of the swale shown on the plans and the statement that the evergreens would be maintained/undisturbed. [Mr. Adams responded that he could not ensure that the existing evergreens would remain, but agreed to replace if required.] Ms. Bedwell added that a swale should be added to the east side of the property as well. She also mentioned that the proposed pilasters on the house had no base trim and that no skirt/board board was shown on the proposed elevations; these details should be added.

Mr. Fran Anderson said that he had concerns about the size of the proposed home since it will be significantly larger than the other homes in the area and that there isn't another home in the surrounding community that has a full third floor.

Ms. Melanie Moser stated that she liked the look of the house but was concerned with all of the proposed pavement in the front of the house to access the three-car side-facing garage. She stated that it appears from the site plan that the paving was going to be over 40 FT wide and that it is excessive and having all the paving in the front yard detracts from the house.

Ms. Nikki Brooks thought that the proposed copper elements are overpowering that she would like to see the window cornices be larger and/or taller.

Mr. Matt D'Amico agreed with Ms. Moser's comments about the large amount of asphalt and that the applicant should try and reduce it and added that less paving and impervious surface would help with the drainage and runoff issues and concerns. Mr. D'Amico also stated that if there is damage to the existing trees when the swale is installed that they should be replaced with the same type of tree.

### **DISPOSITION:**

Ms. Bedwell made a motion to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Swales be added to both the eastern and western sides of the property
2. Evergreen trees be replanted along the eastern side of the property
3. Reduce the driveway to a maximum to 40 ft from the face of the garage
4. Pilaster bases and a skirt/board board be added to the proposed house
5. Drainage from the roof should be piped out to the road
6. The roof eave dimension should be raised to accommodate more cornice trim detailing

The motion was seconded by Ms. Moser and approved by acclamation at 6:52 p.m.

### **ITEM 2**

**PROJECT NAME:** Downtown Towson Overlay District

### **OVERVIEW**

Ms. Laurie Hay gave a presentation to the Panel of the newly adopted Downtown Towson Overlay District, Bill Number 49-16.

Ms. Hay began her presentation by stating that this new legislation was adopted due to a variety of factors and that the theme of the legislation is design. This new legislation replaces the old CT district of Towson with a DT district. The purpose was to create a comprehensive set of guidelines. The areas not included are the “Towson triangle” as well as the area around the courthouses, a Portion of the Towson Park community, the Prospect Park cemetery, and the East Towson residential community. All development in the areas included in the new district will be flagged through either the development process (DRC, etc.) or via a building permit. Ms. Hay presented the recommended process for full administrative reviews. Examples of what the Planning Department has suggested should go through the full DRP process are limited exemptions, PUDs, roof top signs, parking and landscape plans. Administrative review would include exterior painting, wall or awning signs, and projects that have come through the county architect on call program. The DRP will evaluate projects based on 5 criteria as outlined in the legislation. The DRP’s recommendations will not be binding, but will be recommendations to the ALJ.

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS**

Chairman Martin began by giving credit to the Department of Planning for completing the legislation in such a short amount of time and for the comprehensive and quick presentation to the Panel.

Ms. Moser stated that she thought that the separation of what should be handled administratively and what should go through the full process was sufficient and succinct. She was concerned however that the DRP’s recommendations are no longer binding on the ALJ. (Note: In Towson, DRP recommendations have been advisory for over 5 years)

Mr. Hord said that for signs a value judgement might be made on a case by case basis. He also stated that he thought the Panel should conduct a review at the time of concept plan to provide feedback for developers before they get too far in the process. Mr. Hord also pointed out that Baltimore City’s DRP is advisory as is Howard County’s.

Ms. Bedwell asked if the bulk regulations and setbacks still applied. She also inquired about the time frame and suggested that the Panel start early in the process with the developer to make sure that the criteria is being met on the front end of the project.

Mr. D’Amico suggested that the developer could have a pre-meeting with the Panel and wanted to know when the first project would be coming under these new regulations.

Mr. Kellman commented on the unlimited residential density in the new district along with the new parking requirements and how the Panel could make recommendations on the parking.

Mr. D’Amico made a motion for approval of the breakdown of full vs administrative process as per the presentation (attached to these minutes as Appendix C).

The motion was seconded by Ms. Bedwell and passed by acclimation at 7:43 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.