

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

**Date:** April 14, 2016

**Meeting # 224**

**Project:** Master Plan – Stadium Place PUD

**Phase:** Master Plan

**Location:** Northeast Baltimore

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Nichole Battle CEO of GEDCO Development opened the discussion and reviewed the history of the Stadium Place project. She introduced representatives of their development partner, Commercial Development, as well as members of the design team. Magda Westerhout of Marks Thomas Architects described the current building proposal, within the PUD/Master Plan, called The Village Center, as being composed of ground level retail with three levels of residential development above. The L-shaped building is located at the corner of 33<sup>rd</sup> Street and Ednor Road with internal at-grade parking accessed from Ednor Road/Lakeside Avenue and a second entrance from 33<sup>rd</sup> Street. The 33<sup>rd</sup> Street parking entrance passes beneath the residential levels of the project. The residential entrance is accessed from the internal parking lot. Craig Richmond further described aspects of the landscape architecture proposal which included the internal parking areas, new curbside parking along 33<sup>rd</sup> street, landscape buffering of the parking areas, sidewalk paved areas and pedestrian connections to other elements within Stadium Place.

**Comments from the Panel:**

The Panel generally liked the placement of the latest proposal as an anchoring building at the corner of 33<sup>rd</sup> and Ednor Road. It was felt that the project as presented was a good beginning and the design and client team was encouraged to continue to clarify and strengthen aspects of the proposal through continued study and resolution as follows:

1. **Building Character -massing/roof form studies** – Some questions were raised about the lack of a more residential character, similar to the other buildings on the overall site. Further questions were raised regarding the choice of the flat roof form versus pitched forms as feeling overly commercial and office-like. Additionally, it was suggested that the corner treatment required re-study. Its form it was felt, suggested a main entrance, particularly with the vertical signing element and projecting canopy. Further, the more retail expression should be limited to 33<sup>rd</sup> Street and the corner and not extend much further into the residential nature of Ednor Road. It was emphasized that the team should continue to find ways to tie this building’s design to this specific environment/location.

It was suggested that more attention be given to the portion of the façade that accommodates the auto and pedestrian pass-through from 33<sup>rd</sup> Street , perhaps by pushing that section further back and creating a stronger recess. The project signing might also be more appropriate as part of this composition rather than at the corner of Ednor Road.

Although the introduction of the balconies are felt to be positive, more individual balconies rather than shared balconies were encouraged.

2. **Pedestrian Connectivity/ internal and along 33<sup>rd</sup> Street** – Study ways to strengthen the pathways through the parking areas connecting the various internal projects, the labyrinth area, the adjacent Greenhouse, so that the emphasis is on creating better, more urbane pedestrian connectivity, continuity and place-making. Ideas for clear connections included elimination of the 3 surface spaces off of Ednor Road near the service area in favor of more of a ‘street’ entrance design, potential pedestrian bridge that connects from 33<sup>rd</sup> St (bus stop) and the entrance to the residential, rethinking the use of landscape and trees to clearly identify primary pedestrian paths between buildings.

3. **Residential Entrance/ Storefront Treatment**- concern was voiced about the lack of an apparent and obvious entrance to the residential portion of the project from 33<sup>rd</sup> Street and transit and taxi-cab connections. Currently, the entrance feels like an afterthought. Please restudy. The nature of the retail base of the project requires further study as well with piers, sign-bands, lighting, awnings and landscape areas fully integrated. Study is also needed at the lower level secondary residential entrance.

**Panel Action:** Recommend approval of Master Plan and continuing Schematics study with above comments to be addressed.

**Attending:**

Nichole Battle - GEDCO Development  
Keith Barker, Ed Nottingham – Commercial Development  
Magda Westerhout, Nancy Liebrecht - Marks Thomas Architects  
Craig Richmond – Craig Richmond Landscape Arch.

Bowden\*, Haresign, Illeva - UDARP Panel  
Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo, Wolde Ararsa, Caitlin Audette, Reni Lawal, Elina Bravve  
–Planning Dept.