

**BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**  
**URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE REVIEW PANEL**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** September 13, 2007

**Meeting No.:** 67

---

**Project:** The Fitzgerald

**Phase:** Continued Schematic

**Location:** Mount Royal and Oliver

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Toby Bozzuto, of Bozzuto Development, introduced the project, including the financial obligations and schedule. Chris Harvey, architect with Design Collective, presented the design changes and development of the project since the last meeting, addressing the Panel's previous comments. Scott Rykiel of Mahan Rykiel Associates presented the site and landscape plan.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL:**

The Panel complimented the design team for the development of the project and the changes made since the last meeting, in particular the consistency of major elements, the articulation of the building skin, the various corner treatments, and the landscape and public space plan. While the project is progressing nicely, the Panel was still concerned with several items:

1. Oliver and Mt. Royal corner: The Panel felt that the consistent language of corner treatment was a positive change; however, the Panel feels that the building's treatment at the corner at Oliver and Mt. Royal still needs work. Several members expressed concern with the proportion of the metal panel skin above the retail glass (too close to equal in their height) and suggested that possibly the metal skin be increased in height at this location or that the sign canopy be made a more substantial part of the composition. Also, although the rationale of not having the balconies project at the corner slot is understandable, this portion of the corner treatment appears less substantial than the one further east on Oliver.

Also, the inclusion of the pergola is generally welcomed its treatment needs additional study – it appears too small as a cap to this corner and should better relate to the rest of the building.

2. Entrance / Bridge: It was recommended that the entrance bridge be treated more "bridge-like" as an element with more glazing and less as a trimmed box. This would better set it apart from the entrance walls.

Additionally, the wood entrance wall was well received (given its warmth and color) and it was suggested that it possibly wrap the corner or that there may be opportunities to introduce wood in various landscape elements.

Finally, the carrying through of plants and paving from the entrance plaza to the interior lobby and court echoes well the continuation of the walls from outside to inside; however, it was suggested that the grass panels be eliminated – they seemed to add little to the design and pose a maintenance problem.

3. Garage: The “cleaning-up” of the passage through the garage was well-received. It was further recommended to widen the end where the elevators are located – the space is too tight and by widening a better view of the gallery would be provided from the other end. Also, some of the exterior paving material should be brought into this passageway to echo the continuation of exterior / interior at other entrance locations.

It was also suggested that there might be opportunities to incorporate some of the other materials used in the building at the garage at key visual locations. Finally, how the ceiling of the garage is treated, including lighting, needs to be presented at the next meeting given that this will be visible from I-83 and other locations around the building.

4. Materials: The Panel applauded the elimination of the cementitious material and feels that the current thinking about the building’s skin is in the right direction. Additional thought should be given to how the metal panel meets the ground, possibly introducing another material or reveal. Also, the use of a blue / grey metal panel is welcomed and the Panel looks forward to reviewing the material choices and colors. The relationship of window trim to the retail glazing also needs further study.

Finally, at the next presentation the Panel would like to see larger wall elevations to better understand how various materials meet, depth relationships, etc. The success of achieving the simplicity and boldness of the building elements and materials are dependant on the detailing of the outer skin.

5. Miscellaneous Comments:

Additional attention to the window pattern and division is needed in order to strengthen the order of these elements.

One Panel member felt that the bent corner element adjacent to the garage should be parallel to the bent corner element at Oliver Street.

The Panel would like to see the sun / shadow studies for the courtyards at the next presentation.

## **PANEL ACTION:**

Schematic Approval with comments

---

### **Attending:**

Toby Bozzuto, Jeff Kayce – Bozzuto Development

Joan Millane, Steve Cassard – U B

Joel Cherington, Lyssandra Barbieri – Gould Property Co

Al Barry – AB Associates

Chris Harvey, Laurie McLain, Keith Peiffer, Nick Mansperger, Yangsheng Zou, Aaron  
Thompson – Design Collective

Scott Rykiel, Peng Gu – Mahan Rykiel

Ed Gunts – Sunpapers

Jay Brodie, Michael Pokorny, Molly Buckheit – BDC

Messrs. Bowden, Ramberg, Schack Britt and Cameron – Panel

Doug McCoach, Theo Ngongang, Laurie Feinberg, Bob Quilter - Planning