

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

Date: April 12, 2018

Meeting #1

Project: Bay Brook EL/MS

Phase: Discussion #3

Location: Brooklyn

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

The Architect and Landscape Architect for the project provided a broad overview of the project and context. Although encouraged ahead of time to move quickly to the architectural portion of the presentation they largely reviewed previously discussed areas of the project. Some noted changes to the site design were articulation of the nodes along a path and some zoomed in portions of the landscape. However, the majority of the site appeared largely unchanged since previous discussions. The team did bring in a limited material palette of three brick tones and several views of the updated architectural renderings for review and discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Site:

- The Panel noted potential safety concerns regarding conflicts between vehicle drop offs and pedestrian routes as well as some potential stacking issues at vehicular entrances. The primary site connection North not significantly designed in light of them being traveled daily by students to reach the play areas and are too compromised by vehicles and parking lot.
- Hierarchy of paths could be improved and nodes made into something more special than currently shown. Important paths could be something more than just wider. Investigate opportunities to make these more meaningful. The Panel noted that design team did not address previous comments and major pedestrian pathways and connections to context are not articulated sufficiently.
- Specific concern about walking children all the way around the building every day from drop off. It was suggested that the team evaluate shifting the parking lot south (within the circulation zone created with the rest of the site design) and shifting the Lower School entrance door to align with the drop-off area to help alleviate one factor. This would also clarify the overall site and interior circulation.
- Team should consider a campus approach using gateways or threshold articulation. These should be used to strengthen the east-west connections from the community to the recreational facility.
- Use of trees should be considered more strategically, perhaps used along special paths, in a grove and/or where shade is important.

Building:

- The Panel noted the current proposal seemed complicated with inconsistent articulation of volumes. There lacked a datum to hold everything together.
- Primary features and community space could be articulated but the rest of the building mass and elevational designs should be re-evaluated and edited to provide a stronger base to the building.
- Two bricks color choices area likely enough in complicated form. Investigate additional materials (ie. Metals, industrial materials?) as an accent. Consider more contrasting brick color choices used in a sophisticated way.
- Building may want to be considered not as something to blend in but to be understood as a civic structure, as a building on the hill. Viewed this way it could be more forward looking and more celebrated by community.
- Design team should look for more clarity and hierarchy in the overall massing and design moves. Simplify the diagram and the design moves. Investigate the entrance 'tower', making a more elegant statement. Evaluate the rear perspective where the 'tower' is lost to evaluate design moves to strengthen it.

Next Steps:

Discussion only.

Attending:

Rick LeBland, Todd Vukmanic - Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates

Michael Barry - MSA

Michael McBride - 21st Century Schools

Heidi Thomas - Mahan Rykiel Associates

Messrs. Anthony, Ostovar*, Mses. Wagner, O'Neill, and Ilieva - UDAAP Panel

Tom Stosur, Anthony Cataldo, Jennifer Leonard, Christina Hartsfield, Brent Flickinger - Planning