

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

Date: February 14, 2008

Meeting No.: 75

Project: UMB BioPark Research Bldg #3

Phase: Final

Location: SE corner W. Baltimore and Poppleton Streets

PRESENTATION:

Brent Flickinger, District Planner for the Baltimore City Department of Planning, began the presentation by reviewing the context of the building site. Jim Bartlett (Gaudreau Associates) then presented four options of design revisions to the building, revisions to the entrance canopy, building sections, and a sample of the metal cladding.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL:

The Panel appreciated seeing different design options for building, especially as they related to different comments made at the previous meeting. Panel comments were:

1. The majority of the Panel members thought that the treatment of West Baltimore Street in Option A, with the implied two-story glass treatment, was the most successful. One Panel member suggested that the architects might want to consider two brick bays along Baltimore Street, at the eastern end, rather than one to create a more asymmetrical façade that would further differentiate this end of the building from the Poppleton end.
2. Panel members felt that Option C was a better treatment of the Poppleton Street façade – the small notch at the top shown in another option did little to relate the building to its neighbors and the metal cladding options seemed arbitrary. It was suggested by some that the two-story window treatment at the top of the bays facing Baltimore Street and the church be continued on the Poppleton side (the Panel was split on this recommendation).
3. Additional thought and study should be given to the building's silhouette – some Panel members felt that the top could use more articulation, especially on West Baltimore Street.
4. Panel reactions to the canopy options were split, some favoring the break in the “fin” to create a taller entry space while others liked the glass canopy. Also, the Panel was split regarding the curved glass wall at the ground floor and how deep it should be. It was suggested, however, that the glass curving wall and the canopy/entrance treatment should better relate in materials and form, regardless of which option is chosen.
5. Additional material samples are needed for both the building and the streetscape treatment, as well as information regarding signage and lighting. Additionally, because the building has a clean simplicity to it, the detailing of how materials come together, and how elements relate

to one another, is important. The Panel recommends that larger scaled sections of the facades be presented to illustrate this.

The Panel feels that, while the building's design has progressed nicely and that several initial concerns have been addressed, final approval could not be given because of the lack of information regarding materials, lighting, and signage.

PANEL ACTION:

Final Approval withheld pending response to comments.

Attending:

Jim Hughes – UMB/UMB Biopark
Stephen Hanssen – Wexford
Bill Gaudreau, Jim Bartlett – Gaudreau, Inc.
Jay Brodie, John Thompson - BDC

Ms. Eig; Messrs. Bowden, Schack, Britt and Cameron – Panel
Doug McCoach, Brent Flickinger, Brigitte Fessenden, Bob Quilter - Planning