



## Meeting Summary September 26, 2018

### Attendance

Panel Members: Don Taylor, Chair  
Bob Gorman, Vice Chair  
Ethan Marchant  
Fred Marino  
Larry Quarrick

DPZ Staff: Valdis Lazdins, George Saliba, Nick Haines, Lisa Kenney

1. **Call to Order** – DAP chair Don Taylor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Review of Plan No. 18-13: Elkridge Crossing II – Elkridge, MD**

Owner/Developer: Chetan Mehta/Elkridge Development LLC  
Architect/Engineer: Fisher Collins & Carter Inc.

### Background

The 12.74 acre site is zoned CAC-CLI and located on multiple parcels at 6206, 6210, and 6218 Washington Blvd. The CAC (Corridor Activity Center) zone accommodates pedestrian oriented, urban activity centers, with a mix of uses. CAC encourages multi-story buildings along Route 1, with ground floor retail and parking to the side and rear.

The Elkridge Crossing I development received sketch plan approval in 2004 and phase I was completed in 2014. It includes 214 units, with a mix of apartments and townhomes on approximately 13.76 acres. The DAP is reviewing phase II of the development.

### Applicant Presentation

The project team gave a multimedia overview of the project. Elkridge Crossing phase II is a mixed-use development of 175 townhomes and two commercial buildings; one of which includes 18 condominium units on the upper floors. The commercial buildings are served by surface parking with primary access off Route 1, via the existing entry drive, and secondary access from Elkridge Crossing Way, off Montgomery Road.

Ryan Homes plans three townhome models that range in size from 16-20' wide, with a blend of front and rear loaded garages, including some tandem garages. Exterior materials provide a range of options, including brick and siding, with optional features such as covered entries and bump-out windows.

The 18,066-SF commercial building is two-stories with a day care facility, while the second has 7,481 SF of commercial space on the ground floor and 18 residential units above. The architecture for these buildings is less developed at this stage.

Amenity spaces include a central green space with a dog park and gazebos, a perimeter pathway, tot lot, and seating space around a stormwater management pond.

### **Staff Presentation**

Staff requested the DAP evaluate the concept plan and provide design recommendations on site design, layout and configuration, amenity spaces, landscaping, pedestrian connectivity, sustainability, and architecture.

Written comments from the public were received in advance of the meeting and provided to the panel and applicant.

### **DAP Questions and Comments**

#### **Site Design**

The DAP said that sidewalks should better connect the central amenity space with the rest of the community. DAP was concerned that a sidewalk was not provided along Dr. Patel Drive to the child daycare building. They also recommended additional crosswalks within the project, and one across the project entrance at Route 1.

DAP recommended a better buffer between Dr. Patel Drive and the parking lot serving Commercial Building "E". They also stated that parking should be thoroughly screened from Route 1.

DAP asked about parking ratios and the applicant responded that parking meets all development regulations. The applicant noted that all townhomes will have full length driveways to accommodate parked vehicles.

DAP commented that many concerns raised by phase 1 residents deal with the lack of visitor parking and parking in general. DAP stated that phase 2 parking locations and amounts should address such concerns. The applicant showed where on-street visitor parking was located and stated that 104 surface spaces were being provided.

DAP commented that the street layout should be revised to accommodate an interconnected grid. They noted where bottlenecks and congestion could be anticipated. DAP also discussed building orientation and commented that garage doors front most streets, not townhomes, which front internal walkways. They stated that the orientation of phase 1 townhomes fronting along Elkridge Crossing Way and Doctor Patel Drive was desirable, but that this plan does not do that. There is no hierarchy of streets and the most used building entrances will front alleys. Consequently, the architecture does not have a strong presence on key streets. DAP recommended a hierarchy of streets - primary streets, secondary streets, and alleys and courts in a grid layout. The applicant requested DAP to elaborate further and they responded that a grid system will create a streetscape where houses face each other and rear garages will be accessed by parallel alleys. The hierarchy of the road system would create a more desirable layout.

DAP commented that CAC zoning requires building facades to extend along 75% of the Route 1 frontage and the proposed plan does not do that. DAP further suggested switching out the two story commercial building and the four story buildings to increase parking for the larger building. The applicant responded that daycare parking was being met in the rear parking lot and that SWM was under that lot, which would allow for parking but not structures.

DAP commented that the townhome and garage layout would create a situation much like phase 1, with little area for landscaping. DAP asked which units will have single car garages and the applicant pointed those out. They stated that there would be greenspace behind them. DAP suggested alternating and ganging garage entrances to increase greenspace and landscaping along driveways.

The applicant stated that the elevation from Route 1 to the western property line was roughly 40 feet and that grade was being made up by using walkout units and retaining walls. The DAP did not believe it was appropriate to have a three level home adjacent to a two level unit.

The DAP commented that phase 1 lacked landscaping behind homes and that phase 2 had the same design flaw. The DAP commented that while the illustrative plan showed lush landscaping, it was not provided in phase I. The applicant responded that a landscape plan is being worked on and that it would mimic that of another CAC zoned development. The applicant also stated that street trees were provided and that planting areas will be within the traffic circle and islands.

#### Architecture

DAP commented that the architecture be checked against the CAC requirements and recommended that it be revised to better reflect the guidelines, especially along Route 1. DAP also recommended that the commercial buildings be extended to improve massing. The DAP stated that it would be more appropriate to have buildings of equal height along Route 1, rather than a two story and four story building, as shown. They also did not find vinyl siding, as shown in the illustrative, to be an appropriate material along Route 1.

#### **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

DAP chair Don Taylor made the following motion:

1. The applicant revise the site plan and architecture in accordance with direction given at the meeting and return for a second review of the project.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

#### **3. Other Business and Informational Items**

A) The vote to elect a new chair and vice chair was postponed.

B) There will be a meeting on October 10, 2018.

C) The DAP approved the 2019 meeting calendar.

#### **4. Call to Adjourn**

DAP chair Don Taylor adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.