

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

Date: January 28, 2016

Meeting # 220

Project: Master Plan – Under Armour Global Headquarters

Phase: Master Plan

Location: Port Covington

PRESENTATION:

Neil Jurgens, Vice President, Corporate Real Estate & Campus of Under Armour, opened the discussion by describing their vision to create an urbane global headquarters campus as the centerpiece of Baltimore’s anticipated Port Covington Master Plan with over 3.9 million square feet of offices, research facilities and performance spaces as well as garages accommodating over 5,000 parking spaces. It is anticipated that the overall campus would be delivered in 4 stages extending over a 15-20 year period. Members of the project design team included presenters Addison Palmer of STV civil engineers, Frank Gauman of Bohlin Cywinski Jackson, chief architect and planner, and landscape architect Jennifer Trompetter of Nelson Byrd Woltz landscape architects who further presented detailed aspects of the plan. The campus is located on an extended 50 acre point of land on the central southeastern tip of the greater Port Covington peninsula and includes a “waterfront walk” for public use surrounding the site’s maritime perimeter. Many of the building components will be built as low to mid-rise buildings although three high-rise towers are proposed in key locations throughout the site. Other elements of the plan include a high performance lake that utilizes bay and storm water runoff for irrigation and heat exchange as well as for filtration and recycling.

Comments from the Panel:

The Panel enthusiastically voiced their excitement and support for Under Armour’s continuing commitment to Baltimore and the region in planning its global headquarters at Port Covington. The Panel indicated concerns regarding issues pertaining mostly to the treatment of the edges or its perimeter. It was felt that the project as presented was an excellent beginning and the design and client team was encouraged to continue to clarify and develop certain aspects of the plan through continued study and resolution as follows:

1. **Expression of the Public Access “Waterfront walk”** – Concern was voiced that the current proposal does not sufficiently celebrate and integrate the continuous public access along the waterfront. It was suggested that the actual “public” edge experience should be softened by the inclusion of more landscape and that the separating security fence element should be designed to feel less like a barrier. Perhaps the security “fence” takes on more of a variety of expressions such as changes in grade, walls and/or berms in addition to a “fence”. Of particular concern was the area where the proposed playing field and the walkway come together in their path to Ferry Bar Park. It was suggested that the buildings just north of this area slide northward a modest amount to allow more physical public space along the water. It was also suggested that this landscape edge have more of a kindred spirit and relationship with the design of the East Waterfront Park since they are a part of the same system.
2. **The Parking garage Structures** - It was strongly suggested that the massive 8+/- story “wall” created by the proposed single 600+ ft long parking structure was not compatible with a goal of establishing future visual and developmental connectivity, even across West Peninsula Drive. Some attempt to open up this condition both visually and in its massing was recommended.
3. **Ferry Bar Park and West Peninsula Drive** – Several Panel members commented on the current “private” treatment of West Peninsula Drive. The Panel feels that this street, as potentially one of the primary streets with direct access to the water, Ferry Bar Park and the future re-development

of the adjacent Locke Insulator site should feel and act more like a public fully accessible street. The current plan appears to discourage the continued public use and accessibility of Ferry Bar Park as a consequence. Security separation between the Park and the Campus development requires further creative study and clarification. There was a strong desire to allow public vehicular access/drop-off with closer proximity to the actual Ferry Bar park space within that street design.

4. **Interface with main perimeter street system** - The currently proposed road plan, particularly where the two different sections of Cromwell Street approach the northern urban edge of the Campus plan appear to suggest considerable traffic challenges, pedestrian confusion and a lack of clear connectivity. Further study and clarification of this condition is suggested in future presentations.

Panel Action: Recommend approval with above comments to be addressed.

Attending:

Melody Simmons – BBJ

Steve Siegel, Elizabeth Alexander, Joe Geer, Michael Pokorny, Caroline Paff – SDC

RJ Eldridge – Toole Design Group

Mark Sardegna, Jacob Kain – Elkus-Manfredi Architects

Jennifer Missett, Jennifer Dowdell – Biohabitats

Mark Pollak – Ballard Spahr

Patrick Sutton – PSA

Will Dorfman, Davon Barbour – Downtown Partnership of Baltimore

Mitchell Schmale – Maroon PR

Brian Miller, Brendan Robinson, Neil Jurgens, R. Abbruzzese, Scott Gassen – UA

Amy Cha, Matthew Huber, Wolfram Arnold, Frank Grauman, Michael Maizse, Robert Aumer – Bohlin
Cywinski Jackson

Jeremy Jordan, Jen Trompetter – NBW

Steven Baumgartner – BuroHappold

Michael Middleton – Cherry Hill Community Council

Ed Gunts – AN/ Brew

Sean Evans – Freedom Temple Church

Patrick Terranova – BDC

Lauren Moloney – Waterfront Partnership of Baltimore

Tom O’Keefe – Wohlsen Construction

Dave Huber – Kaliber Construction Inc.

Kevin Lynch – SouthBMore.com

Betsy Boykin – Core Studio Design

Addison Palmer, Susan Williams – STV

Adam Bednar – The Daily Record

Bowden*, Burns, Haresign, Illeva, Rubin - UDARP Panel

Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo, Christina Hartsfield, Amy Gilder-Busatti, Andy Cook, Laurie Feinberg,
Mary Colleen Buettner –Planning Dept