

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

**Date:** April 30, 2015

**Meeting No.:** 203

**Project:** One Light Street

**Phase:** Continued Schematic

**Location:** One Light Street bordered by East Baltimore Street (N), East Redwood Street (S) and Grant Street (E)

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Gerald Briggs, Director of Architecture at URS/AECOM presented the revised schematic design on behalf of the developer, Metropolitan Mirecourt Baltimore, LLC. Fundamentally, the project remains as previously presented, in summary, a mixed use project with 281,580 SF office, first floor retail of 20,695 SF retail and 340 multi-family housing units as well as 646 parking spaces contained within an above ground parking structure. The 3 part massing with a strong base element remains as the predominant design intent.

The presentation focused on a revised schematic design for the site which addresses many of the issues raised by the panel in the prior presentation of January 27, 2015. Major changes considered and addressed include:

1. The vehicular loading bays previously located on E. Baltimore Street have been moved to the corner and are accessible only from Grant Street.
2. The location of the E. Light Street Drop Off to the office entrance was studied but maintained based on topography and relationship to 10 Light Street.
3. E. Redwood Street has been redesigned as a 2 way street to facilitate traffic flow to the residential entrance.
4. Grant Street improvements will include widening of the street to 2 traffic lanes.
5. The architectural expression on the E. Baltimore façade has been set back in a re-centered massing with a strong vertical line to improve the buildings proportion of base to existing building. Raised head height of windows, a canopy and recessed columns have all been redesigned to establish a line at the top of the Thomas Building with the new building.
6. An intentionally striking change of elevation (both functional as well as architectural) has been introduced at the top of the building to draw the eye and visually connect the building with 10 Light Street.
7. High performance glazing has been added above the base to unify both the office and residential faced. Although slightly different, it is intentional that the appearance creates a unified architectural statement.
8. The roof at the plaza level is designed as a green roof; there is also potential for a green roof adjacent to the pet area on the top roof deck.
9. The building is being designed to qualify for LEED Silver.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PANEL:**

The Panel appreciated the changes that the architectural team introduced specifically moving the service entrance to Grant Street. Subtle design moves help to improve the design overall. However, the panel views the changes as somewhat insufficient given the iconic location and design opportunity the site affords to the City and surrounding community. Within the commentary, 2 major themes emerged for continued study:

1. The building’s monochromatic design approach masks the mixed-use aspects of the project. Further, as a neighbor of the Thomas Building, some design connectivity still remains desirable.
2. A well thought out, fully developed Landscape Plan is missing. For a project at this location and of this scale, it is critical that a human scaled Landscape Plan on all 4 streetscapes of the building be designed to interact with the building. The goal of the Landscape Plan is to create a human scale that announces the different functions of the building, office, residential and retail to pedestrians on all 4 streets. The results create a campus like sense of place that can be achieved through materiality, patterning and specific landscape design. A comprehensive Landscape Plan should strive for highlighting building entrances, opportunities for pedestrian seating, bicycle access and greening of the Street edge.

Overall, the Panel found the building design improved at the schematic level. The Panel looks for the Project Architect and supporting team members to address the comments at Final Presentation.

**PANEL ACTION:** Approval of Final Schematic w/ Comments.

---

**Attending:**

Gerald Briggs- URS/AECOM

Cary Euwer – Metropolitan

Joe Clark

Mackenzie Paull – DpoB

Adam Bednar – The Daily Record

Sarah Meehan – BBJ

Al Barry – AB Associates

Dr. Meany\*, Messr. Bowden, Burns and Rubin - UDARP Panel

Director Tom Stosur, Christina Hartsfield, Anthony Cataldo, Thoe Ngongang– Planning Department