

BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE ADVISORY PANEL

MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 31, 2022

Meeting #60

Project: Perkins Phase 3

Phase: Schematic Design

Location: East Baltimore

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Matt Flament with HCM introduced the project and reminded the panel of the site under review today and existing conditions. Lydia Kimball with Floura Teeter presented updates to the site design including the amenity spaces that use elements that are consistent with the overall development, but not identical. Matt Flament then reviewed the changes to the architecture in response to the panel's comments for Building H East and Santosh Chandane presented the changes to Building G. Alterations include the following;

- Alterations to materials at Building H East.
- Introduction of balconies at Building H East overlooking the park to the south.
- Relocation of trash at Building G
- Shifting the stoops along Pratt Street at Building G.

DISCUSSION:

The panel thanked the team for the presentation and encouraged them to include summary elements at the beginning of the presentation and more visual responses to comments.

Clarifications

- The plaza at the southeast corner of H West, what is this? *Can see a great relationship here from the corresponding area at G. There is an entrance here and plantings provide definition. Will investigate to provide lower plantings to provide visibility.*
- Do you connect at Claremont between G & F, or do you close it off and control activity? Can you walk us through this choice? They are not connected as the path does not lead to the amenity space, just the garage. A fence and vegetation are location there.
- Can you point out where the planting towers are? *Near the node between Buildings F and G, intended to frame the terminus between F and G.*

- Clarification on the levels at the amenity spaces at H East? *The area labeled 2 is raised, and the other area is at grade.*
- At G what is happening at the eastern edge? *There is a trellis above the seating area.*
- The trash at Block G, that is all handled inside, not dumpster? *Yes.*
- What are the boxes shown along Bethel, utilities? *Yes, these are utilities.*
- It seems that all of the amenity spaces are intended for only the residents? *They can be used by other residents, but intended for the building residents.*
- Is there only one entry into the parking lot? *No, there will be two one near Building F.*

H West:

- The changes to the Claremont façade work better and create more balance with H West.
- Focus on the transition between H West and H East, this area could benefit from mirroring what's happening at the transition to the east between the expanse of the building and the corner anchor.
- At the Pratt Street elevation, the rectangular elements at the second and third floor feel forced and aren't necessary.
- At the entry node at the corner of Claremont and Bond, need a level of refinement to connect the spaces on either side of Bond Street. Consider aligning the pavement or including a shared pavement so that they read as unified and connected elements.
- If you continue to provide benches at the node between Buildings F & G give them some more space to recede from the walkway.
- The courtyard side of the buildings needs attention, feel secondary especially at the ground level. Consider additional elements such as windows and lighting that can provide life and activity that will help people feel safe in these spaces.

Building G:

- If there is a better place for the utilities along Bethel they should be relocated to reinforce the creation of Bethel as a legitimate street with a true street edge. Perhaps move them slightly to allow for an additional tree so the street tree rhythm doesn't feel so broken.
- The entry to the parking lot adjacent to the tot lot could create safety concerns. Consider pushing back the vehicular entry or introducing a barrier at the play space.
- The courtyard side of the buildings needs attention, feel secondary especially at the ground level. Consider additional elements such as windows and lighting that can provide life and activity that will help people feel safe in these spaces.
- In general, the elevations read well, the building is in scale with its immediate surroundings. The exception is along Bond Street where more study should be completed to reduce the elevation changes on the interior and corresponding concerns to the exterior. Current elevations show a substantial grade difference in the southwest corner that results in a tall solid wall on a very visible corner.
- Consider removing or reducing the balconies along Bond Street to Juliet balconies given their height above ground level, which will begin to undermine the overall massing.

- Consider introducing a band of brick coursing at the water table to help ground the elevation and provide a base, especially if it ends up being taller than 4 feet. The material can be maintained, but simple coursing will add interest to blank space.

Next Steps:

Continue addressing the panels comments above as each building develops and work with Planning staff to finalize the review.

Attending:

Bart Harvey, Tim Pula – Beatty Development

Keval Thakkar, Santosh Chandane, Matt Flament – HCM

Pam Askew, Trace Shaughnessy – McCormack Baron Salazar

Matt Ellingson, Lydia Kimball – Floura Teeter

Melody Simmons – BBJ

Lembit Jogi – HABC

Stacy Freed, Jaye Matthews – DHCD

Amruta Mozarkar, Andrei Sestacovschi, Emma Weber, Klaus Phillipsen, - Attendees

Messrs. Anthony, Bradley and Ilieva - UDAAP Panel

Ren Southard, Tamara Woods, Caitlin Audette – Planning