

**BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**  
**URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE REVIEW PANEL**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** February 21, 2013

**Meeting No.:** 162

**Project:** 400 East Pratt Street Addition

**Phase:** Schematic

**Location:** Downtown Baltimore -- Inner Harbor

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Peter Fillat of Peter Filat Architects and Peter D. Leibowits of The Peter D. Liebowits Company presented background on 400 East Pratt Street and the reason why the proposal was seeking the proposed massing and footprint. Peter presented the process that was undertaken in response to UDARP's comments from the last presentation. Several options of a revised design that reflected a closer association with the main building were presented, and information as to their strengths and weaknesses discussed. The preferred scheme was described in detail. This scheme which calls for a direct visual connection to 400 East Pratt Street through the use of muscular metal arms reaching from the building and forming the skeleton of the new glass and metal addition.

Ronnie Younts of Ashton Design presented the signage proposal.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL:**

The Panel was pleased with the response to its comments from the last presentation. The members of the panel commented as follows:

1. The recognition/acknowledgment of the aesthetic of the existing main building is a critical improvement to the design.
2. The recognition of the main building through the extension of muscular metal arms as the frame used for the glass addition is an excellent approach to the problem.
3. The scale of the revised design is very successful.
4. The use of slate for the banding is very successful. To ensure its success a good quality material should be used.
5. The addition's corners need to be strengthened in respect of their importance to the design. The use of stepping of the corners to reflect the corner stepping found in the main building can improve the situation and should be reconsidered.
6. The mullion spacing along the glass walls does not present an effective rhythm and appears to limit the placement of tenant entry doors. It should be made more regular.

7. The entry needs to be studied more carefully to reinforce its role as the main entry to the building. The canopy should project farther from the plane of the addition. There should be serious consideration to the idea of setting back the entry doors to further strengthen the entry. This would also address the outswing of the entry doors so that they do not interfere with the new sidewalk.
8. The band is particularly successful as a “brow” of the glass and metal structure of the addition. Its role as the divider between tenant signage/canopies that will begin at the band and run downward as opposed its role for the entry canopy where it serves as the base is particularly successful.
9. How the second floor roof will be used by tenants of the main building is of interest to the Panel and more information is requested to allow for a better understanding of this feature.
10. The signage program is good and the tenant criteria are easily understood. The refusal to use logos or advertisements is appreciated.

**PANEL ACTION:**

Recommend Schematic Approval with Comments

---

**Attending:**

Peter Fillat, David Marcozzi - Peter Fillat Architects  
Peter D. Leibowits - The Peter D. Leibowits Company  
Ronnie Younts - Ashton Design  
Nan Roher, Kirby Fowler – Downtown Partnership  
Myron Feaster – Cushman Wakefield  
Tracey Barbour-Gillett – Abell Foundation  
Addison Palmer – STV  
Gary Haber – BBJ

Kerry DeVibliss - BDC

Ms. Eig\*; Messrs. Bowden, and Burns – Panel  
Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo, Christina Gaymon, Mark Cameron, Alex Hoffman - Planning