

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

<b>Date:</b>	August 10, 2017	<b>Meeting No.:</b> 244
<b>Project:</b>	UMMS MIDTOWN: Outpatient Center	<b>Phase:</b> Revised Final
<b>Location:</b>	Linden Avenue/N. Eutaw Street	

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Mr. Mark Wasserman, representing UMMS; informed the Panel that the building program, articulated in previous presentations, was now expanded to include three floors of inpatient care. Architect Chuck Goodman, representing CRGA Design; presented design revisions based upon the expanded building program.

The revisions included:

- Three additional floors, increasing the overall building height to 195' from the base point on Academy Way;
- Adjustments to vertical circulation elements in order to accommodate additional capacity and a second level pedestrian bridge,
- The addition of an inpatient emergency entry and drop-off zone along Linden Avenue,
- The incorporation of a six-story masonry base defining the first floor and garage above; and,
- The utilization of glass and precast panels to clad the upper floors above the garage.

**PANEL COMMENTS:**

In general, the Panel was supportive of the proposed increase in building height and program capacity. Minor changes proposed to the site and landscape plan were viewed favorably. The Panel expressed concern about the proposed exterior fenestration of the building as it represented a significant departure from the previous approved design.

Specifically, the Panel raised issues and requested additional study on the following elements:

1. Proportions of the masonry base: The Panel felt that increasing the height of the masonry base to six stories created a very strong “midpoint belt line”, resulting in a building less pedestrian friendly and visually more massive from an urban design context.
2. Articulation/Expression of the corners of the building:
  - The Panel felt the stair and elevator tower at the north east corner was “over” articulated. The separate expressions of the elevator and stair towers appeared to compete for dominance/attention. A more simplified, integrated approach to this highly visible corner is merited.
  - The Panel felt the termination of the pedestrian bridge at the corner of the building was not resolved and not integrated compositionally.
  - Concerned was expressed about the different approaches employed to express the corners of the building. At one corner of the building the masonry base extends up to the roof. At another corner the glass curtain wall extends down to the ground. A more consistent and rational approach would improve the clarity of composition and design intent.
3. Extensive use of Project/Campus Signage: The Panel questioned the need to have identity signs on every façade of the building as well as the “commercial” scale of roof-top signs.

PANEL ACTION:

The Panel recommends continued development addressing the comments above.

**Attending:**

Chuck Goodman, Juan Cardenas, David Peabody – CRGA Design  
Patrick Devereux, Mark Wasserman - UMMS

Bowden, Burns\*, O’Neill - UDARP Panel

Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo– Planning Department