

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

**Date:** October 13, 2011

**Meeting No.:** 137

**Project:** Ripley's Museum - Tenant Fit-out/Signing

**Phase:** Continued Schematic

**Location:** Harborplace – Light Street Pavilion

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Mark Herbkersman of Brown Craig Turner introduced Gregg Dean of Ripley Entertainment who reviewed the changes to the design since the last presentation. Generally, the changes were as follows:

- All components of the proposed main signing/identity element were kept below the ridgeline of the pavilion;
- The “Chessie” 3-dimensional element primarily occupied space within the “porch” space and extended to the ground in two locations;
- The submarine component, was replaced by a rowboat which will serve as the major photo opportunity element;
- The main signing, on its own independent structure, was biased toward the downtown direction rather than parallel to the waterfront;
- Identity signing was also placed on both sides of the porch directly on the concrete structure of the pavilion;
- Additional free-standing pole signing was proposed along the main waterfront promenade;
- Secondary signing identifying two internal destinations were placed above the proposed Nano-wall doors at the main entry;
- The “coogle” element was placed centrally on the entry terrace;
- No specific revised proposal was made regarding the treatments along Light Street, although the previous submittal was referenced.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL:**

Although the Panel felt that the current proposal was somewhat responsive to their previous comments, continuing major concern was voiced as follows:

1. To suggest that the number of signs proposed (six) seemed excessive.
2. That the scale and content of the main sign continues to dominate the waterfront façade of the Pavilion and creates a precedent that could lead other tenants to request signage of similar graphic intensity and scale.

3. That no signing be allowed (as a principle) on the concrete structural bands of the pavilion as well as freestanding vertical pole signs along the promenade.
4. That all proposed signage and identity items be designed in ways that they can be easily removed without damage to the existing infrastructure of the pavilion.
5. That secondary signing be located within the “glass line” or tenant premises rather than expanded into the public domain.
6. That the proposed Nano-wall closure is out of character with the main edge glazing of the overall pavilion and creates confusion in the definition between public and private space.
7. That the proposal should be presented as a part of a more comprehensive vision of the entire project by General Growth Properties.
8. That a 3-dimensional model would be beneficial for any subsequent presentations, due to the unusual nature and complexity of this proposal.
9. That the “Chessie” character could benefit from being made less fierce-like.

**PANEL ACTION:**

No action taken.

---

**Attending:**

Scott Line, Gregg Dean – Ripley Entertainment  
Mark Herbkersman – Brown Craig Turner  
Chris Schardt, Josh Deckelbaum, Robin Higgins – GGP  
Colin Tarbert – Mayor’s Office  
Jay Brodie – BDC

Ms. Eig, Messrs. Bowden, Britt and Ramberg -UDARP  
Tom Stosur, Alex Hoffman, Anthony Cataldo, Bob Quilter – Planning