

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

Date: April 9th, 2020

Meeting #32

Project: Cold Spring Lane
Continued Schematic

Phase:

Location: 3025 W. Coldspring Lane

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Fernando Bonilla began the presentation with a quick review of site context - site is surrounded by single- and multi-family residential, industrial, and school (existing context buildings are mostly low-rise). Mr. Bonilla next gave some background on the evolution of the design and a review of the Panel's comments.

Front parking lot entrance has been narrowed to 16' wide, special paving will be used and the parking area will be raised to the level of the sidewalk. A sidewalk connects from the interior courtyard and great room to the green area on the corner. The team wanted to embrace the connection between the building and the metro station, and highlighted the public art project proposed for the opposite corner of Cold Spring and Wabash Ave. The presentation continued by addressing changes made from previous presentation, mostly limited to facade.

DISCUSSION:

The Panel thanked the team for the succinct presentation. The Panel asked clarifying questions before moving into discussion. In general, the building and site do not seem very different from the previous design and the corner piece is not yet resolved.

Site:

- Simply narrowing the entry doesn't really address the comments about the parking lot at the front of the building. Parking has not changed enough. Circulation through the parking lot drop off area is not desirable and the parking lot does not give a gracious entry sequence.

- Opportunity to embrace the public art piece in the landscape - right now the corner does not have a presence. The landscape needs a lot more planting to achieve this.
- Relationship of the internal courtyard's relationship to rear parking lot is still problematic.
- Courtyard does not match the precedents shown, which were very programmed and planted. Proposed grassy area is expansive; hardscape creates an unfriendly experience without vegetation.
- Retaining wall is not friendly at a height that varies between 2' and 5' high. Building has not shifted back enough from Boarman Ave. because there was a zoning setback question that needed to be resolved but does not entirely address the imposing nature on that side.
- Public space needs to be designed properly - at the corner, sidewalk needs to reciprocate across Wabash and give a sense of arrival. Entry sequence needs more layers. Spaces for gathering need to be pulled closer to the building. More generous circulation should be provided at the corner.
- Parking should not be in front of the building - push this to Wabash. The forecourt of the building should definitely be given over to pedestrians only - no cars.
- There is a middle ground between the current design and the pre-UDAAP design. There is a real opportunity to correctly site the building and integrate with the neighborhood in a way that is not costly.

Building:

- Many aspects of the design have not changed, so team should also refer to the previous UDAAP comments.
- Building is not properly integrated into the neighborhood context.
- Entry is misaligned at the corner and the plaza area could extend through the entry with a raised path, but the larger problem is how the building is sighted. The building really needs to be set back from Boarman - this needs to be softened, perhaps with a terrace, in a much more deliberate way.
- Scale and proximity on Boarman Street feel intrusive.
- Building does not need to be a pentagon shape - there should be a balance between the security and the enclosure. Recommend moving the four units south of the stair to the Coldspring edge to shield the parking lot and give a better visual connection to the parking lot and the neighborhood beyond.
- Fortress-like building configuration sends a message to the neighborhood that it is closed off.

- Opportunity to further simplify the bays and pull them together - instead of three separate bays, make them one and allow them to share a roof line. This would simplify the downspout configuration with the revised roof condition.
- Quieting down the secondary facades is helpful and one more level of simplification will have positive impact.
- The way of the brick is distributed on the building seems additive only and feels piecemeal, needs more consolidated application.

Next Steps:

Continue into Design Development addressing the comments above. Planning and DOT staff are willing to have working session to help address comments, if needed.

Attending:

Andrew Hanson, Kerina Spencer - Conifer LLC

Yolanda Jiggetts - Park Heights Renaissance

Kelly Baccala - DHCD

Ethan McLeod, Scott Wolford, J. Griffen, Ed Gunts, Alex Arron, Nikyah - Attendees

Mr. Anthony, Mses. Ilieva, O'Neill and Bradley - UDAAP Panel

Laurie Feinberg*, Ren Southard, Tamara Woods, James Ashford - Planning