

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
November 13, 2024  
**Approved**

*Contents*

**Call to order and announcements**

**Review of today's agenda**

**Minutes of the October 9, 2024 Meeting**

**Items for initial or continued discussion**

1. 1303 Maywood Avenue, RRLRAIA Residential Review
2. 121 Back River Neck Road, Giggle Box Learn N Play, Essex Commercial Review (Resubmittal)

**Adjournment of the Board meeting**

-----

*Appendices*

**Appendix A**  
**Appendix B**

Agenda  
Minutes – October 09, 2024 meeting, as approved

*Minutes*  
Baltimore County Design Review Panel  
October 9, 2024  
**Approved**

**Call to order**

Design Review Panel (DRP) Chair Joe Ucciferro, called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Baltimore County DRP to order at 6:01 p.m.

The following panel members were:

**Present**

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro  
Mr. Donald Kann  
Ms. Julie Soss  
Mr. Tarek Saleh  
Mr. Om Khurjekar  
Mr. Raj Sharma  
Mr. Scott Walters

**Not Present**

Ms. Kelly Ennis  
Mr. James Stevens

Residential Reviewer present: Mr. Fran Anderson

County Staff present: Marta Kulchytska, Shawn Frankton, Brett M. Williams, Sydnie Cooper.

**Minutes of the October 09, 2024 Meeting**

Mr. Tarek Saleh moved to the acceptance of the October 09, 2024 draft minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Julie Soss and passed by acclamation at 6:03 p.m.

The approved minutes are filed as Appendix B.

## **ITEM 1**

**PROJECT NAME:** 1303 Maywood Avenue

**DRP PROJECT #:** 671

**PROJECT TYPE:** RRLRAIA Residential Review

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Bin Liu, Managing Member of Integral Property Group LLC. and Property Owner, Mr. Mike Razavi - Civil Engineer for Raztech, Mrs. Tania L Bruno – Architect and Mr. Stuart Ortel – Behrens Home Design.

The proposal is to construct a three-story single-family home with six bedrooms, six and a half baths, and a two-car garage. In addition, a retaining wall is proposed along the east side and southeast corner of the building envelope in order to offset the downward slopping grade of the parcel.

### **SPEAKERS:**

Community Member Mr. Mike Riehl had the following questions:

1. We reviewed a drawing of the new home at the Ruxton Riderwood Office. This home was on a flat lot but the Maywood lot is not flat; is this drawing reflective of the final product?

Mr. Bin Liu stated that their initial exterior rendering did not fit the topography of the land, but has recently been revised. He believed the community members may have received an outdated version of that exterior rendering showcasing the lot size and the topography of the land.

2. There were no drawings of the proposed retaining wall; do you have any more details on how this will look?

Mr. Bin Liu stated that the initial design proposed a concrete wall. However, they intended to use designs similar to the stacked stones used for the front of the home.

3. Where will the storm water drain or run-off to?

Mr. Mike Razavi, stated there are three dry wells designed for stormwater management to attenuate any runoff from the roof area. The remaining runoff from the site will drain to the southeast side, the same direction as it does today.

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro then opened the floor to panel members for discussion.

Mr. Fran Anderson inquired about the proposed materials for the retaining wall and if they would be the same as the decorative stone on the foundation of the house. He was also concerned about the lack of foundational planting around the sides of the house which leaves the foundation exposed to the neighbor's view. He recommended adding foundation plantings around the sides of the house and showing them on the proposed landscaping plan.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the window placements shown on the left side of the house were inaccurately reflected. Specifically, the window spacing, number of different sizes, and uneven elevations. He stated the window elevations should be aligned and the window sizing should be comparable. Mr. Anderson commented on the decorative stone on the foundation shown on the front of the house and recommended it be continued around the entire foundation of the home.

Mr. Donald Kann recommended removing all shutters from the windows as the application and sizes were inconsistent. He also recommended that the proposed materials for the retaining wall and foundation should match to help merge the different elevations. Mr. Kann concurred with Mr. Anderson's earlier comments concerning the window placement and sizing shown on the left side of the house and agreed that the windows should be placed at even elevations and matching sizes. Mr. Kann commented that it is important for the detailing of the retaining wall material to match the foundation and that special attention should be given to the detail of the railing proposed on top of the wall.

Mr. Tarek Saleh agreed with earlier concerns regarding the different sizing and misalignment of the window elevations shown on the left side of the home. He also concurred with Mr. Kann that the shutters should be removed from the front of the house. He recommended extending the stone detail all the way around the foundation. Mr. Saleh indicated that the proposed black color of the vertical siding to the front of the house was incompatible with the overall color scheme of the neighborhood. He recommended that a color that is more compatible with the existing homes in the neighborhood be considered. He also indicated that the vertical siding should be replaced with horizontal siding to match the siding on the right which would blend the various architectural elevations.

Mr. Raj Sharma commented that he agreed with his fellow panelist's comments, and in particular, the concern over the window placement shown on the left side of the home.

Ms. Julie Soss stated that the plans show a stockpile area in the same area as an existing Elm Tree that is to be retained. She wanted to verify its inconsistency with other plans that show the same area as undisturbed with a protective fence around the Elm Tree and its root system. She was able to confirm that the stockpile area would not be in this area and that the Elm Tree would be undisturbed.

Mr. Om Khurjekar agreed with earlier comments presented by Mr. Anderson concerning the retaining wall detail. He also concurred with the overall design and importance of the retaining wall to stabilize the existing slope.

Mr. Scott Walters commented that the elevation of the foundation detail should match at each intersection and cover all of the concrete foundation walls. Also, the detail for the proposed railing on top of the retaining wall should be provided for review.

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro had no additional comments.

#### **DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Fran Anderson made a motion to approve the project with the following conditions for an Administrative Review by the Panel Chair:

1. Revise and resubmit all drawings presented during the DRP meeting to the Department of Planning for an Administrative Review by Planning and the DRP Panel Chair. All landscaping and civil drawings should be consistent and accurately depicted.
2. The landscape drawing should be revised to accurately show the stockpile area location.
3. Add foundation plantings, including right side foundation landscaping and left side stabilization, show and label them on the landscape plan.
4. Confirm and provide details for the retaining wall finish and railing.
5. Undergo a window study of the left side elevation to clean up the window placement sizing and to study the shutters of the front elevation.
6. Extend the front foundation stacked stone to both sides of the house.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Tarek Saleh and approved at 7:10 pm.

## **ITEM 2**

**PROJECT NAME:** 121 Back River Neck Road, Giggle Box Learn N Play

**DRP PROJECT #:** 669

**PROJECT TYPE:** Essex Commercial Review

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The presentation was given by Mr. Chris Burns of Richardson Engineering.

The request for this project is to construct a daycare facility, an associated parking lot, and a play area on the site. The building is to be constructed in the center of the lot along Back River Neck Rd. The building is to be a modular construction with stucco finish with a matching dumpster enclosure located at the rear of the parking lot. The site will be served by a single entry/exit point off of Howard Avenue. Parking will be located inside the site off of Howard Ave.

### **SPEAKERS:**

Community member, Mr. Thomas Johns had the following questions:

1. Will there be some form of visual screen? For example, shrubbery or privacy fence between the parking lot and the property at 1605 Harvard Avenue.

Mr. Chris Burns replied that currently there is no privacy fence shown between the parking and the neighboring property but that one could be added if necessary. He stated that there is proposed landscaping which would work as screening including three large trees and one medium sized tree to screen the dumpster area.

2. Should there be a separate entrance and exit to make for a better flow of traffic? The nearby businesses that are on Back River Neck Road that also share a residential street similar to Howard Avenue have an access point on both public streets. I'm also concerned how this project will affect traffic and our home's property value.

Mr. Chris Burns replied that the site design cannot facilitate the second entrance and that, unfortunately, it is not feasible.

3. Is there a possibility of 75 vehicles arriving to pick up or drop off their children?

Mr. Chris Burns replied that the proposed daycare would be atypical. There would be multiple drop-offs and pick-ups times to minimize traffic.

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro asked Ms. Marta Kulchytska to read the Department of Planning's Staff Report.

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro then opened the floor to panel members for discussion.

Mr. Scott Walters acknowledged that the applicant had addressed the previous comments and had no additional comments.

Ms. Julie Soss concurred that the previous comments had been addressed and she had no additional comments.

Mr. Joseph Ucciferro concurred and had no additional comments.

Mr. Raj Sharma had no additional comments.

Mr. Tarek Saleh had no additional comments.

Mr. Donald Kann had no additional comments.

**DISPOSITION:**

Mr. Tarek Saleh made a motion to approve the project as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Kann and approved at 7:26 pm.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Donald Kann and seconded by Ms. Julie Soss.

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.