



## Meeting Summary November 4, 2020

### Attendance

Panel Members: Fred Marino, Chair – recused for 20-10  
Bob Gorman, Vice Chair  
Ethan Marchant  
Sujit Mishra – absent for 20-11  
Larry Quarrick  
Vivian Stone

DPZ Staff: Anthony Cataldo, Nick Haines and Kaitlyn Harvey

1. **Call to Order** – DAP Chair Fred Marino opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Review of Plan No. 20-10:** Paddock Pointe Phase III, Laurel, MD

Owner/Developer: Stronach Group  
Architect/Engineer: Design Collective  
Presenters: Mark Thompson, Brian Reetz, Rob Vogel, Kaitlyn O'Hara, Nick Aello

### Background

The 63.43 acre site is zoned TOD (Transit Oriented Development) and is on buildable parcels A, B, C, and E; with potential access to North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and in the long term, Davis Avenue. TOD accommodates development and redevelopment within 3,500 feet of a MARC Station and encourages multi-use centers that combine office and high-density residential uses. TOD further encourages safe and convenient pedestrian access for commuters using MARC and other transit.

### Applicant Presentation

The applicant presented the Phase III plan for Paddock Pointe which proposes the construction of 76 Elevator Condominiums and 76 Townhouse Condominiums on the northern side of the property. The project also includes the construction of Family Fit Park.

Exterior materials include glass, metal accents and covers, stacked stone, and cement and metal paneling. The design aesthetic is in keeping with the overall design philosophy of the district.

### Staff Presentation

Staff requested the DAP evaluate the following: site design and architecture focusing on parking and pedestrian circulation, hardscape, landscaping and screening, edge treatments and transitions along the front of the building and site perimeter; building scale, materials, and colors; and site lighting. There were no public comments submitted for this project prior to this meeting.

## **DAP Questions and Comments**

### Site Design

DAP expressed their appreciation for the project as it overall was very thorough and thought out. DAP suggested connecting the walking trail around the family fit park to the larger overall network of the sidewalks to allow users to have a longer walk if they desire. Additionally, DAP recommended widening and expanding the walking trails for adequate space to allow for multiple uses of the trail at the same time.

DAP encouraged the applicants to include a play area for younger children in the family fitness park such as the play structure at Watkins regional park as an example. It was suggested that an equestrian or western theme could be subtly incorporated into the design that would tie in with the adjacent race track.

DAP asked about the applicants' stormwater management facilities that would be incorporated into this phase of the project. The applicants responded that the property is redevelopment and so they will be using the stormwater management that has already been in place which have been placed throughout the entirety of the development to address the SWM requirements.

DAP inquired about the Davis Avenue connection to act as a second access point and to tie the project into the natural areas. The applicant responded that the development team was working on solidifying the connection and incorporating aspects of the trails as the project progresses.

### Landscape

DAP suggested adding mulch paths through the forest conservation area to allow for walkability in a more natural setting.

## **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman made the following motion:

That the applicant considers adding a soft pathway system into the forest conservation easement area North of the family fitness park.

DAP member Larry Quarrick seconded.

Vote: 5-0

DAP member Larry Quarrick made the following motion:

That the applicants study the family fitness park to include the inclusion of play equipment for the 2-6yo childrens' age group and enlarge the widths of the pathways if possible.

DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman seconded.

Vote: 5-0

## **3. Review of Plan No. 20-11: Route 40 Acute Care, Ellicott City, MD**

Owner/Developer: First Call Medical Center LLC

Architect/Engineer: Brasher Design & Benchmark Engineering

Presenters: Ron Brasher, Chris Malagari, Victoria Planholdt, Heidi Thomas

### **Background**

The acute facility will be constructed on the 1.09-acre lot and the property is Zoned B-2. There is an existing single-story restaurant on site with access onto Bethany Lane. The B-2 (Business: General)

zoning accommodates Ambulatory health care facilities and services that include health maintenance organizations, out-patient clinics, diagnostic centers, ambulatory surgical facilities, physician offices, public health clinics, or community mental health centers serve the general public.

### **Applicant Presentation**

The Route 40 Ambulatory project consists the removal of the existing structure and construction of a new 2 story clinic facility. The proposal also includes updating the vehicular circulation, parking areas and the inclusion of addition greenspace and vegetated areas.

### **Staff Presentation**

The project is located within the Route 40 corridor and is subject to the requirements of the *Route 40 Design Manual*. Staff requested the DAP evaluate the following: site design and architecture focusing on parking and pedestrian circulation, hardscape, landscaping and screening, as it relates to Route 40; edge treatments and transitions along the front of the building and site perimeter; building scale, materials, and colors; and site lighting. No public comments were received prior to the meeting.

### **DAP Questions and Comments**

#### Site Design

DAP suggested adding a sidewalk to come into the site off of the Route 40 side of the site like the sidewalk that comes in from Bethany Lane to add more walkability and ease of pedestrian access to the site.

DAP noted concern with pedestrian connection from Bethany Lane and asked the applicants to have the connection run from a landscaped area to landscaped area through islands instead of having the walkway run through a sea of asphalt. The applicant stated there were constraints on the property and the handicap spacing is the only part of the property that has a space flat enough to get 2% cross slope. The applicant was concerned about moving the pedestrian connection from its location as the applicants are trying to limit the amount of disturbance on the property. DAP suggested if the applicant was not able to move the Bethany Lane pathway anywhere else on the site to consider having the pedestrian connection come from Route 40 instead.

DAP asked the applicant to resurface as much of the asphalt on the property as possible.

DAP's biggest concern was vehicular circulation through the site. As traffic backs up on Bethany Lane due to the light at the intersection with 40 West, vehicles tend to cut through the parking lot to avoid sitting at the light. This is a concern as the site will be updated to be a health care facility site and could be dangerous to pedestrians and vehicles trying to access the site. The parking lot as it is currently set up goes against the natural tendencies to drive straight down a drive isle of a parking lot. DAP understands the applicant's constraints of the site with not wanting to update the footprint of the building but recommended the applicant look into making the vehicular circulation less dangerous due to oncoming traffic.

#### Architecture

DAP liked the materiality of the hardscape palate saying it looked elegant and slick but noted a disconnect between the materials in the building and the design palate for the rest of the site. DAP suggested updating the color selection and recommended that the project design palate be cohesive.

DAP asked about the fiber cement siding shown in the renderings and the applicants intended use. The applicants said they were using Nichiha fiber cement siding in a lateral reveal system.

DAP stated that the Route 40 Design Guidelines prefer that buildings face Route 40 have the front façade front to Route 40. DAP asked that the elevations on the southside of the building be updated to appear as the front entrance of the building in addition to the front entrance appearance on the Bethany Lane side of the building.

#### Landscape

DAP noted the constraints of the street trees due to the easement and powerlines on the site, the Route 40 Design Guidelines intend for Route 40 to have a boulevard feel and suggested the applicant place the trees in a more regularized pattern to create a cadence that will hopefully continue on other properties along Route 40.

DAP suggested using other screening plants such as the native American Holly or non-native Cryptomeria or arborvitae such Green Giant for the evergreen screening.

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

DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman made the following motion:

To implore the applicant not to value-engineer the landscape solution.

DAP Chair Fred Marino seconded.

Vote: 5-0

DAP member Ethan Marchant made the following motion:

That the applicants study the pedestrian walkways to avoid bringing pedestrians through the parking lot but through landscaped elements to make walkway connections.

DAP Chair Fred Marino seconded.

Vote: 5-0

DAP Chair Fred Marino Gorman made the following motion:

That the applicant study the effectiveness of the entrance coming off Route 40 and consider sliding the building back into the green space to help solve traffic issues on the side of the façade facing Route 40.

DAP member Larry Quarrick seconded.

Vote: 5-0

DAP member Ethan Marchant made the following motion:

That the material palate be considered as a cohesive palate between the building and the hardscapes, specifically the color and textures, and the palate should work together as one design.

DAP Chair Fred Marino seconded.

Vote: 5-0

DAP member Larry Quarrick made the following motion:

That the applicants look at the façade of the building that faces Route 40 and enhance the elevation to make it look like a secondary front entrance to the building.

DAP member Fred Marino seconded

Vote: 5-0

#### **4. Other Business**

DAP does not have a second meeting for November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting date as no applications have been submitted.

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

Chair Fred Marino adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.