



## Meeting Summary November 28, 2018

### Attendance

#### Panel Members:

Don Taylor, Chair  
Bob Gorman, Vice Chair  
Ethan Marchant  
Larry Quarrick  
Fred Marino (recused for review of plan #18-17)

#### DPZ Staff:

Valdis Lazdins, Nick Haines, Jeff DelMonico, Lisa O'Brien, Lisa Kenny,  
Kaitlyn Clifford

1. **Call to Order** – DAP Chair Don Taylor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Review of Plan No. 18-16: Jordan Overlook** – Columbia, MD

Owner/Developer: Sherrie Jordan / Land Design & Development  
Engineer: Fisher Collins & Carter Inc.

### Background

The 5.45-acre Jordan Overlook site, comprised of four residential lots and Parcel 309, is located at 9219 Jordan River Drive in Columbia; adjacent to the Village of Oakland Mills. The property is zoned R-20 (Residential: Single District), which can accommodate age-restricted housing as a conditional use. Plat (F-11-041), Jordan Overlook Lots 1-4 was recorded December 12, 2014, and it subdivided the parcel into four lots.

### Applicant Presentation

The applicant's team gave a multimedia overview and described the project as an age-restricted community consisting of 20 homes. The design includes 12 villas and eight single family detached dwellings along the proposed Jordan River Road. The villas will have two floors, a two-car garage and drive way parking spaces. The two styles of residences will have first floor master bedrooms, basements, and garages.

The project includes a 500-square foot community center, with amenities for the residents to hold meetings or group activities. The proposed community will have access to many amenities in the Columbia area due to its location and a proposed walking path. The dwellings and amenities will create areas for living, relaxation, play, and civic gatherings for the residents.

## **Staff Presentation**

Staff requested the DAP evaluate the concept plan and provide recommendations on site layout, architecture, landscaping, and connections to and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. 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 asked about potential flooding risks and stated that stormwater management was not shown on the plan. DAP was concerned with stormwater discharging toward the open space and with the possibility of more flooding. The applicant responded that stormwater management would be addressed at the next plan stage. The DAP then discussed the dead-end street and T turnaround. They said that a cul-de-sac would be more appropriate and better for residents and truck and delivery van access.

The DAP also believed that the plan did not consider existing topography and that significant grades would have to be accommodated by the townhouses. This could require a substantial retaining wall, but without a grading plan it is not possible to know if one would be needed.

### Architecture

The DAP then commented that the single-family homes fit well with the surrounding neighborhood, but took issue with the townhouses and the design of the community center. DAP stated the character of the townhouses was out of place and asked if other age restricted residential units could be used instead, such as more single-family detached homes or duplexes? The applicant responded that requirements for age restricted communities mandate at least 20 residential units and that cannot be achieved without the proposed mix of housing types.

DAP stated that the community center appeared insignificant and that it was not centrally located. They recommended moving it to the end of the street and making it appear more substantial.

### Landscape

The DAP was also concerned with landscaping and that forested areas would be removed due to a proposed drainage swale along a property line. The DAP commented that only two types of trees, Red Maples and Nellie Stevens Holly are proposed and that more variety is needed and that more evergreen trees are needed to provide screening.

## **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

DAP Chair Don Taylor made the following motion:

The applicant should revise the site plan in accordance with DAP comments and return for a second review. Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman.

Vote: 5-0 to approve

### **3. Review of Project No. 18-17: Columbia Lake Front Neighborhood Design Guidelines – Columbia, MD**

Owner/Developer: Howard Research and Development Corporation  
Landscape Architect/Engineer: Design Collective/Gutschick, Little & Weber

#### **Background**

The Lakefront Neighborhood is in Downtown Columbia, along the western edge of Lake Kittamaqundi and the eastern edge of Little Patuxent Parkway. It includes commercial land uses and public amenities. The zoning code requires DAP review of Neighborhood Specific Design Guidelines, which are subject to Downtown Revitalization requirements. The DAP must base its review and recommendations on the *Downtown-Wide Design Guidelines*.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

The applicant's team gave a multimedia overview of the guidelines and described them as an effort to revitalize the Downtown Lakefront Neighborhood. The guidelines update the neighborhood boundary and establish east-west connections to enhance visibility and access. The Block Plan allows active retail along the parkway and links amenity areas. Building heights range from nine stories (not to exceed 120') to a maximum 20 stories (not to exceed 250'). The Street Framework Plan extends north and south of Wincopin Circle and the guidelines integrate bicycle and pedestrian access in coordination with the existing the Little Patuxent Parkway bridge. They also address amenity spaces and update street design and landscaping.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Staff requested the DAP evaluate the guidelines and provide recommendations. Written comments from the public were received in advance of the meeting and provided to the panel and applicant.

#### **DAP Questions and Comments**

##### Guidelines

The DAP asked whether the shared use path could be affected by the guidelines. The applicant explained that light fixtures may be updated to match those near the Metropolitan and that surface treatments would potentially include concrete. Their hope is to save mature trees where possible.

The DAP then discussed the signage section of the guidelines and the applicant explained their intent. The applicant stated that directional signage for vehicles would be provided.

The DAP also discussed the importance of the bike share program. The applicant responded that they agree and specified that bicycle parking was being provided, as shown in the guidelines.

The DAP also asked about the Exxon station, since a new street is being shown. The applicant explained that the new street avoids the station since they are not aware of any plans to close it.

The DAP then discussed pedestrian and activity zone designations with the applicant's team.

The DAP asked that tree pits be properly designed to help guarantee tree survival and growth. The applicant stated that the plan will be executed as designed and as specified in the guidelines.

The DAP asked about the southern amenity space and potential impacts due to a future interchange. The applicant responded that this will be reviewed and considered as part of a traffic study and analysis, which will occur later.

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

DAP Chair Don Taylor made the motion to approve the guidelines and the vote in favor was unanimous.

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

There will be a meeting on December 5, 2018

#### **5. Call to Adjourn**

DAP Acting Chair Bob Gorman adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.