

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

Date: May 12, 2022

Meeting #62

Project: TMB2 Under Armour Campus

Phase: Schematic Design

Location: Port Covington

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Vaki Mawema and JJ Richards of Gensler began the presentation with a reintroduction of the site and campus plan, and a very diagrammatic building form. The design team used five core principles of the Under Armour brand to guide this project:

- Stronger together
- Train, compete and recover
- Journey and destination
- Clarity, focus and audacity
- Next level performance

The project team sees this building as an icon, and with that in mind, incorporated stadium-like architecture into early concepts. The campus is organized around the field, with buildings framing the views on the north, east and west sides. Other buildings on campus have been constructed and are existing, and the northern Teammate Building will be the showpiece for the campus. The building sits high on the site and rises 80' above grade. The ground plane podium is a two-story space housing performance on one side facing the field, and retail space on the other facing the neighborhood to the north. The teammate space is located above these two ground floor uses, which anchor the building and point dynamically out to the northwest and southeast. The building will be LEED certified and a strong focus on incorporating biodiversity, energy production, and other sustainable measures was included. The UA brand is a leader in performance and innovation; this building is meant to reflect those ideas.

The team worked to address the following comments from their last presentation to the Panel:

- Manipulation of the ground plane to collect and direct circulation.
- Landscape features, such as site furniture and lighting.

DISCUSSION:

The Panel thanked the team for their presentation and continued with questions and comments. The team is expected to include the Panel's comments and how those comments have been addressed or studied in future presentations.

Clarification:

- *The arrival sequence off Cromwell – is it correct to assume most of the arrivals will be by car?* The team is expecting some multi-modal and pedestrian traffic, but most arrivals are anticipated to be single or double occupancy vehicle. Bus parking will also be provided.
- *Is the building inward or outward looking; meaning is the program intended to function as enclosed within the building or spill out onto the campus?* While some of what happens in the building is confidential, but it is important to the program for the teammates to have access to views, light, and air. There will be access to the outside from the performance center, but it will be a controlled porosity.
- *What is the assumption about where the primary routes are coming from; how are the different user groups accessing the site – what is the address of the site (are there two addresses)?* Pedestrians will enter the site from the north where it is assumed there will be future development by others. Teammates will utilize lots on the west edge of the site. There are 1400 seats in the track and field site, but the site only contains about 800 parking spaces. On game days, there will be additional personnel directing traffic. The north loop will serve parking for the retail and ride-share drop-off.
- *What is being done to address the shoreline, with regard to restoration and stewardship?* The treatment of the Middle Branch will be a primary focus; the site is designed to collect and hold runoff. There will be no restoration of the wharf in this phase of the project. The south side will be addressed in partnership with the buyer of the Locke Insulator site to the west.
- *Will (public) pedestrian access be maintained at the waterfront?* Ferry Bar Park will maintain vehicular and pedestrian access.

Site:

- The Panel is impressed that the architecture incorporates the core values so fully; Baltimore is very innovative. UA is a leader, and the proposed building represents that innovation leadership. Clearly this campus is about performance and the amazing

achievements of the human body, but it's also about integration of the site and sustainability.

- This proposal has a strong foundation, but there needs to be more integration to realize the potential of the site, which is quite spectacular.
- Diagrams and renders are very helpful for understanding how the site will be used. At the same time, there are a few steps still needed to improve the overall site function and integration with the new building.
- Previous comments about the circulation, especially on the north side of the building, need to be addressed.
 - Circulation still needs to be cleaned up and improved further.
 - The north side is still an anomaly; the front circulation is fragmented which erodes the elegance of the campus to the south of the building. The plan is not yet worthy of the high standard of the rest of the campus.
 - If the building is forward thinking, is there a way to test and rethink the north side to create a more memorable arrival sequence to match this intent?
 - The views are all looking through cars – the layout of the front lot memorializes cars. Design away from something that will be a problem in the future.
 - To remedy the view through cars and give the building more importance, consider moving the drop off to the west and eliminating the parking at the front. The arrival sequence is very important and needs to be clear for all users.
 - Clarity of movement will help to heighten the arrival experience and not detract from the grandeur of the building and campus. Don't allow the practical need of finding parking deter from this experience.
 - The point of arrival for pedestrians needs more study; this needs to be an important moment because the Panel imagines this will be immensely popular campus – a destination that will get lots of use.
 - To clarify the pedestrian entrance, it needs some kind of gesture at a more important scale, which will help it function as a collection point. There is an opportunity to start the landscape experience the moment visitors set foot on the site. Consider revising the north driveway as a plaza-like space.
 - There are concerns for the diagonal path at the northwest part of the site. This connection [to the future neighborhood] needs to be very deliberate and integrate meaningfully with the street grid and sidewalk network of the neighborhood. This could be achieved by shifting the building slightly to be more parallel to the shoreline and creating a node for pedestrians arriving on site from the north.
- With this iteration, there is starting to be more organization of the site and circulation to the south of the building, and a more deliberate and consistent relationship between

spaces. The parking now contributes to the narrative of sustainability with more plantings and the PV array.

- Prominent view on the east side needs more study. Consider what the building looks out toward and, vice versa, what people will see when looking back at the building.
- Allow the sustainability narrative to extend to the water. Appropriate to touch the water with the same intention and purpose as the rest of the campus.
- South outdoor plaza connecting the building to the field is an opportunity for more study – if the building must be misaligned from the field, the plaza could be designed with more movement and fluidity, rather than just a squiggle.

Building:

- Natural evolution of the company offers a growth opportunity; the iconic building will be a great destination. What separates truly successful iconic buildings from the ones that simply look good in photos is the memorable experience it leaves with everyone who encounters it.
- The building needs to consider the experience of all the different users and the subtleties of human behavior. Comments that may seem minor can in fact be critical to how the site is used. Work through the comments from the perspective of the different building occupants: the Teammates working there, the shopper visiting for the first time, the bus full of athletes, the fan arriving to see an event, etc.
- It will be great to see the building from some farther vantage points in the next presentation, as the building will be highly visible.
- What happens between the building skin on the north side and the ground? This element appears to fold over, but it's not clear whether it touches the ground – consider whether people will be able to walk in / under that space.
- How the building claims the site and integrates with it will need to be developed as the design moves forward – there is an opportunity to make the building special and unique to the site.
- Address what happens in the landscape where the building pushes out beyond the boundary. The core pieces of the program are opportunities to tie-in and integrate with the landscape.
- Consider whether the retail needs to be the same size as the performance center. Giving these pieces a hierarchy will help to explain the site and clarify the building expression.
- Programmatic diagram with diagonal volume with an axial bar is a very clear parti – materiality can help reinforce the simple and beautiful gesture of the diagram that seems to get lost in the use of same material of the base. This doesn't necessarily need to be a different material, but it could be a tonal difference.

Next Steps:

Address the Panel's comments above for next UDAAP presentation.

Attending:

Evan Grimm, Bob Perry, Jon Kraft, Nathan Foley, Neil Jurgens, Vaki Mawema – Development Team

Ed Gunts, Brendan Robinson, Jason Bell, Sandy Hillman, Scott Slosson, Melody Simmons, Alex Mathews, Sam Zankel, Ryan Solomon, Rick Abbruzzese, Klaus Philipsen, Kevin Lynch – Attendees

Mr. Anthony, Mses. Illeva and Bradley – UDAAP Panel

Tamara Woods, Ren Southard, Caitlin Audette – Planning