

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

Date: June 6, 2019

Meeting #19

Project: Rash Field - Pavilion

Phase: Design Development

Location: Rash Field – Inner Harbor

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Jason Castillo with Mahan Rykiel introduced the team and the revised project. He reviewed the previous UDAAP comments relating the site circulation and Peter Stubb with Gensler reviewed revisions made to the building and site geometry and the Shade Structure.

- Site Circulation – the loading dock area was removed from the pavilion and relocated on the site. This allows for the pathways to arrive at a main location, uninterrupted by loading and service.
- Geometry – The open space to the café and the articulation of the site steps have been re-organized and now partner with the shade structure to create a more cohesive and dynamic space. The landscape and geometry of the pavilion from Key Highway is intended to pull the pedestrians in from the street/plaza. The soffit of the pavilion references the shape of the site walls/benches to begin to tie the pieces together.
- Shade Structure – The vertical supports for the structure have been revised to be more integrated in the overall sculptural design of the shade structure. The form is intended to compliment the pavilion but to be different.

Ronni Younts with Younts Design reviewed the signage approach for the entire park. The approach is to use natural materials that are durable and don't require significant maintenance (wood, painted metal, and concrete). The wood is intended to be natural which will patina with time.

DISCUSSION:

The Panel acknowledges that the removal of the loading/service area solved a number of previous concerns. Changing the pavilion from an additive element to an integrated element of the park with the shade structure being the only additive feature here is significantly more clear and refined. The improvements to the shade structure are all well received.

Site:

- Continue to advance the site lighting approach to highlight the improvements made overall.
- Signage – It will be important to see the signage in context of lighting and surface paving (scored concrete) to understand how it ages over time. Investigate ways to reduce the amount of signage needed throughout the park and allow the park design to lead you. This may reduce the number of types of signage as well throughout the park. The current design also feels heavy in comparison to the other elements within the park. Reconsider the varied height of the wood elements but retain the angle as a reference to the pavilion architecture.

Building:

- The shaping/peeling away for the poured in place concrete is very successful. Continue refining this approach throughout the pavilion detailing, especially at the ‘pointed’ tip of the pavilion extension. The contrast to the sharpness of shade structure’s physical structure is successful.
- Revisit the proposed railing – can it float above the landscape in some way or become more of the concrete structure of the pavilion. Investigate a more horizontal read to the rail as an object that relates to the shade structure in detail. If rail is in white it must relate to the shade structure. If dark, it should relate to the materiality of the pavilion glazing.

Next Steps:

Continue development addressing the comments above with Department of Planning staff as you work towards construction.

Attending:

Laurie Schwartz, Ben Hyman – Waterfront Partnership

Nicole Hovermale, David Thomas, Ronni Youts – Younts Design

Cailin McGugh – Cap Ex

Tyler Miller, Peter Stubb – Gensler

Jason Castillo – Mahan Rykiel

Melody Simmons – BBJ

Mrs. Anthony, Ms. Wagner, O’Neill, Ilieva – UDAAP Panel

Anthony Cataldo*, Renata Southard- Planning