



Meeting Summary
September 9, 2009

Attendance:

Panel Members: Phillips S. Engelke, Chair
Henry Alinger, Vice Chair
Phyllis Cook
Rob Hollis
Mohammad Saleem

Office of Law: Lisa O'Brien

DPZ Staff: Dace Blaumanis, Randy Clay, Bill Mackey, Mary Smith

Applicant: Route 1 Contractors Group, LLC
Richard Talkin, Attorney
James Lloyd, Architect
Frank Manalansan, Engineer

Public: Rob Vogel, Jeff Hayes

1. Call to Order

Chair Phil Engelke opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

2. Review of Plans #09-02. Morris Place

The DAP reviewed and discussed the proposed development (Sketch plan) by Route 1 Contractors Group, LLC for the 17.25 acre site located at 7521 Cemetery Lane, Elkridge, Howard County, Maryland. The proposal by Route 1 Contractors Group, LLC (the Applicant) is to enter the subdivision process with a plan that has the ability to be processed independently of surrounding properties but allows various possibilities for integrating the project into a broader development of the area. The Applicant expects it will be five years before the project will proceed.

The conceptual plans (Sketch Plan) for the project were presented by Richard Talkin, representing the Applicant. The architect did not address the panel. The Design Advisory Panel and Mr. Talkin exchanged information and ideas on site design and layout, building design, architectural features, open space, exterior lighting and the articulation and addition of site entrance features. The DAP members provided and suggested ideas for improvements.

By unanimous consent pursuant to each motion duly made and seconded, the DAP adopted the following recommendations with respect to the project. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning.

DAP member Rob Hollis offered the following motions:

1. "I move to consider a non-townhouse model, the possibility of increasing density with an atypical housing type that will allow for more opportunities to create public spaces, more opportunity for access roads, setting up a hierarchy of roads for entry into the property."
2. "Also to reconsider the road at the western edge of the site [to realign] along the eastern edge of the site and how that may allow for some possibilities to incorporate the future development along US Route 1 as well as access into the Bluestream development."

Mohammad Saleem seconded (both motions as a group). Vote: 5-0

DAP Vice Chair Henry Alinger offered the following motions:

3. "I make the motion to recommend the Applicant to consider rethinking the entrance, to consider coming into a public street. The idea of trying to create a street in at least some portion of the site but particularly the entrance would be important as a place to sort of set the tone. You may come into rear-loaded units; but in fact you have an entry street that has parallel parking on it. Even consider the notion that the Cemetery Lane cul-de-sac maybe doesn't even go to the end of the property but may become a midpoint that brings you into a street that leads you to the pond as an entrance sequence. Also consider, of course, changing the name of Cemetery Lane, if possible, to something a little more palatable."
4. "For the commercial area, the possibility of shifting the parking to the west and south, possibly parking between the units and try to bring all the units together, maybe upfront, so they feel a little bit more cohesive. Even though the parking distribution is not quite as good, I think it will feel like a better part of the plan. Then again, just try and consider mixing up the units a little bit. Figure out if there are any other places that introduce public streets so it is not all alley-loaded. Also, to consider some breaks maybe at the end of streets. I would like to see views into the pond. Right now, there are these units at the end of all the roads. It would be nice actually, if the green spaces were at the end of the road, so that you had a view to the pond rather than units. It is a matter of shifting some of the units around to create some views to the pond and the amenity area. Consider on Road I whether or not the parking really is going to work for those thirty units, whether or not you introduce more visitor parking or whether or not you break that street up with a couple of different kinds of units. Again, I am concerned; it is a long straight street with thirty units. It may not come off looking as good as you like. Also, consider whether there is any option of visitor parking at the end of all the mews. I realize that is needed, but also anything that you can do to make the mews bigger. Again, I realize everything is tight, but to get those as big as possible would have more impact. I would like to see Road A connect to Cemetery Lane, if it is going stay in that configuration, because I am not sure why it does and all other roads connect. I am also concerned about the stubs, and I realize they are stubs for future connection, but if they are designed as shown like on Road I, there is a right-hand turn shown again it's not designed at the end there is a stub; anyplace we leave something like that people are just going to park cars there. It turns out being kind of a negative."

Mohammad Saleem seconded (both motions as a group). Vote: 5-0

DAP member Mohammad Saleem offered the following motions:

5. "I make the motion to revisit the design approach, to [be] more in line with old towns, old cities and try to come up with a scheme and design that has more diversity of spaces and architecture and

urban design, and try to create some communal bigger recreation spaces and some smaller semi-private spaces. Also utilize sustainability approach in lighting, in landscape, in using porous materials and solar technology.”

6. “Also, in terms of character for the retail commercial properties to be clearly more urban, different than the predominant other residential character of the site and parking also done in a way that does not look [like] standard office blocks. Also utilize lighting to emphasize residential smaller spaces and larger communal spaces with private and semi-private and public, and consider safety.”

Henry Alinger seconded (both motions as a group). Vote: 5-0

DAP member Phyllis Cook offered the following motions:

7. “I would like to make recommendations that the streetscape be investigated further for the townhouse units to have more relationship to the streets and not all back-alley entrances and views of the units.”
8. “I would like there to be some investigation also for the green space amenity areas, to maybe look at different types of areas, different size areas that could be planned for various different types of functions, as well as form individual units within the development for the housing to relate to.”
9. “Also, that the lake amenity be developed and provide access for the whole community.”

Phillips S. Engelke seconded (all three motions as a group). Vote: 5-0

DAP Chair Phillips S. Engelke offered the following motion:

10. “I would like to see variations in paving and lighting depending on the hierarchy of the spaces and also texture and color in those spaces.”

Rod Hollis seconded. Vote: 5-0

3. Questions and Comments

Mohammad Saleem questioned the 65 decibel noise line, asking how this will affect the development. Mr. Talkin noted it would be under consideration in the next stage of the development process.

Bill Mackey presented adopted Council Bill 29-2009 and proposed CB 42-2009, related to the village center redevelopment process and the role of the DAP. Bill noted that as part of this newly proposed redevelopment process, the applicants will be required to come before this Panel.

The Panel discussed the current requirement in the adopted Rules of Procedure for a presentation of projects by the Architect. Staff will draft some alternate language choices for the Panel to review and consider. Staff will schedule further discussion as an agenda item at a future meeting.

4. Adjournment

Chair Engelke adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.