

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

**Date:** January 10, 2013

Meeting No: 160

**Project:** Harbor Point PUD – Exelon Headquarters

**Phase:** Schematic

**Location:** Harbor Point East

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Michael Beatty of Harbor Point provided an update of efforts to focus the design for the new Exelon Headquarters Building. He stressed the importance of creating a harbor with a great pedestrian experience. David Manfredi of Elkus/Manfredi restated UDARP’s comments and recommendations for the project made after December’s Planning Dept. working session and explained the changes made to the design in response to those recommendations.

**COMMENTS OF THE PANEL:**

Prior to offering comments, the Panel expressed concern as to the status of the Harbor Point Design Guidelines and how these design guidelines need to be reflected in the final design for the Exelon Building. The Planning Department staff explained that the Exelon project could not receive final approvals and permits until the Commission approves the Design Guidelines as part of the revisions to the PUD. This project is being handled as a “case study” for Harbor Point. Any discrepancy between the proposed design and the approved guidelines would require resolution prior to the approval of the building design.

Architectural:

Overall:

- 1) The response that has incorporated the Panel’s comments has provided a much more successful massing for the building’s overall massing.
- 2) The sides and “rear” of the building are somewhat more successful than its main elevation. This is the product of both the massing enabled by the geometry of the site on the “rear” and the fact that each of the sides presents only one design aesthetic. The main elevation suffers from the juxtaposition of the three components across a relatively flat plane.
- 3) The designs (massing, skin, and material treatment) of each of the three components of the building are too disparate to read as a single building with components. Although

each component on its own might be successful, there needs to be a better relationship among them. The components can be different, but they need to be more successfully coordinated so they form a visual whole.

- 4) The visual transition from the sheer glass skin of the West Tower to the more solid glass and masonry Plinth needs major improvement. This requires a re-visioning of the skin of the Center Tower within the context of the West Tower and the Plinth.
- 5) The building's use as the Exelon headquarters and, hence, its association with energy, should be expressed somehow through the architecture. The top of the West Tower is the obvious place for such a "celebration."
- 6) It is anticipated that the building's signage will be a critical design component of the project. Although typically signage follows building design, it is recommended that the signage concepts be incorporated into the early stages of the design development.

West Tower:

- 7) The West Tower is very elegant. Its revised massing and the incorporation of the mechanical penthouse within the envelope and skin of the west tower is a great improvement to the proportional relationship between the two towers. The expression of the sheer skin to the top of the building is particularly positive aspect of the treatment.
- 8) Although the top of the building is quite elegant in its simplicity, consideration should be given to whether it can be the location of the building's sign or some component that could express the building's association with "energy" in an exciting manner.

Center Tower:

- 9) The Center Tower does not establish the needed visual connection between the West Tower and the Plinth. Perhaps a less directional skin, such as a waffle-like texture would resolve the problem.
- 10) The way the Center Tower reaches the grounds needs re-study.
- 11) The entry canopy is too strong and should be simplified and better integrated into the Center Tower's design.

Plinth:

- 12) The plinth design appears too busy; fewer materials would be better.
- 13) The use of materials other than traditional brick is preferable. Materials with a modern expression/connotation (e.g. metallic glazed brick or metal panels) would provide a more interesting visual appearance.
- 14) The trading floor fenestration is, at the moment, too different from the glass grid used elsewhere. This should be better coordinated.
- 15) The parking garage screening needs to screen the parking levels better.

Landscape:

- 1) The Panel would like to see the fleshed out streetscape design so that the building's siting and the relationship of the streetscape with the building and the adjacent area can be evaluated.

**PANEL ACTION:**

Approval of Schematics with comments.

---

**Attending:**

Michael Ricketts, Michael Beatty, Jonathan Flesher – Harbor Point Development

David Manfredi – Elkus/Manfredi Architects

Todd Harvey – Beatty Harvey Architects

Carolyn Boitnott – Waterfront Coalition

Lorraine Mirabella – Baltimore Sun

Jack Lambert – BBJ

Ryan Potter - EGJ

Marianne Navaro, Darrell Doan – BDC

Ms. Eig\*, Messrs. Bowden and Burns – Panel

Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo, Tamara Woods, Mark Cameron, Natasha Becker, Christina Gaymon – Planning