

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

Date: June 18, 2026

Meeting #111

Project: Residence Hall

Phase: Schematic I

Location: 3201-3211 N. Charles Street

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND:

Proposed 12 story dorm on the east side of N. Charles Street across from the Johns Hopkins Campus boundary. Approximately 900 suites, each being shared by up to 4 students. There are four existing buildings on site that are to be demolished. The Abel Wolman Building to the north is to remain and be renovated and kept in its historic character. The property is located within the North Charles Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) boundary. This PUD is unique as it is the only community generated PUD in the city. It has over 500 property owners in the boundary so an amendment would be preferred over repealing and replacing the PUD.

QUESTION:

- Pavlina Ilieva: The loading dock will only encumber the ground/first floor, not the entirety of the structure, correct?
Applicant Response: Yes

- Kevin Storm: What is the proposed front setback alignment? It appears some of the diagrams have some substantial inconsistencies that make it difficult to tell where the building will land.
Applicant Response: Building has been shifted to the east and 26ft is the current proposed setback.
KS: What is the design motivation to move the building more forward than the existing Study Hotel?
R: The lessened setback compared to the Study Hotel is defined by the program of the dorm.
KS: Will the loading and trash cutout only be on the lower levels?
R: Yes
KS: How does the building speak to the Abel Wolman House? And to the programming that occurs in this space?
R: The Abel Wolman services office uses and some research uses.
Q: Is there outdoor programming around Abel Wolman?

R: Project team is unaware, but plans to use this as an opportunity to better integrate the outdoor space with the new building.

Q: How did the project team get to the proposed height for this space, given the context of the area?

R: Some of the driving factors are programmatic, while other factors include the context of other structures, both north\south and east\west.

- Osborne Anthony: Given the current submittal, it appears that the massing omits the context of the Abel Wolman building, and the structures to the south of the site along N Charles Street.

Applicant Response:

OA: What is the justification for the uniformity in massing and symmetry for the project?

R: Symmetry is an attempt to coordinate with the symmetry of other structures in this corridor. The site does have a grade change that should assist in the feeling of place with the uniformity and height.

OA: The west side of N Charles Street is highly active – would the massing and symmetry be better served responding to this context, rather than omitting it for the sake of symmetry?

R: Project team will take it under advisement.

- Sharon Bradley: Is the new structure proposed to be back-to-back with 3200 E St. Paul Street along the East? Will the height of the new dorm impact the east courtyard?

Applicant Response: This green area is elevated on top of a parking garage, and is already shaded by the south wing of the existing structure.

SB: The north side of the courtyard allows for a grade entrance, correct?

R: Yes.

SB: Is there proposed to be street-level access for the amenity space at the corner of N Charles Street and E 32nd Street?

R: Yes.

SB: Will the ramp and stair design on the west side of the courtyard remain in its current location?

R: The project team is currently refining this design.

Q: Is the project team coordinating with a landscape architect, whether on staff or in a partner capacity?

A: Yes, MRA is the landscape team, but are not on the call today.

Q: What is the anticipated programming for the courtyard area?

A: The north side is anticipated to be quieter programming and low impact interventions, and the south side of the courtyard is anticipated to be the higher level of impact and integration with the structure.

DISCUSSION:

- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – Landscape architecture is a required component for future discussions of this project, as it is the integration between the structure and the urban environment. The presentation would be very highly served by adding this context and planning in all future phases. The project will be highly served by showing sight selections for future reviews to refine these connections and interactions.
Applicant Response: Acknowledged and taken under advisement.
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – The symmetry of the proposed design may be restricting the design team and limiting the vision for how the site can be more fully developed in its urban context. It would be beneficial for the team to look at some of the early concepts to see if another design would better address the urban context of the site. The panel is highly understanding that there are always programmatic and urban design conflicts, but the project team is encouraged to embrace these conflicts to find novel and innovative solutions prior to locking down the massing and design any further.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – The design needs to much more strongly consider the context of the Abel Wolman building. At the current massing, the presentation lacks adequate consideration of this building in the urban context of this building. Given the current level of design, this is the perfect time to work to solve the challenge this existing Abel Wolman building provides.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – Project team should consider the continuous height datum along the N Charles Street corridor and how it impacts the feel of the structure in its urban context. This is a highly important element given the existing grade of the street and how other structures in this corridor respond to it.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – The project team should consider how the east context of the building will impact the actual lived experience of the building.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – The project team is encouraged to further develop the landscape and connection to the ground level for future presentations.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – We commend the work to address the historic context of the site. However, this does not mandate that the project needs to be a light cast stone base with orange brick. If not addressed with appropriate care, the project risks appearing derivative compared to the true historic context of the urban fabric. The project team should approach the facades with a critical eye to ensure the structure can stand on its own, especially as the building will be one of the largest in the corridor.
Applicant Response:
- Panel Comments: **PAVLINA** – This site is largely designed for college-age users, so there should be conscious effort to integrate the perspective of the actual users of the site to provide joy and a sense of place for students who will be living and working in this space.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **KEVIN** – We commend the project team for maintaining the Abel Wolman Building, and note that keeping this structure provides novel challenges. The design should truly incorporate this historic context, rather than saving the structure for the sake of saving it. Is there a way to design the structure to better provide breathing room or other appreciation of the Abel Wolman building?

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **KEVIN** – The symmetry is highly interesting and compelling as a concept, but the project team is cautioned that the nuances required to successfully pull off a fully symmetrical building will grow exponentially as the scale of the structure increases. The site may be better served by providing a better understanding of why symmetry works for the smaller buildings, but is likely to meet substantial challenges at the scale of the proposed structure.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **KEVIN** – With the current style, the project risks trending towards an older articulation of historic context, rather than a more nuanced modern understanding of how the project can embrace history and still represent its modern construction.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **OSBOURNE** – Abel Wolman cannot be the only driver for massing and considerations, but it also cannot be ignored in its context with the new structure. This site is very large, and while N Charles Street is an ample right-of-way, the new campus structures still provide an important urban context that the new dorm should respond to. This is especially apparent in the connections that will be required to ensure a flow of students across the N Charles Street corridor.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **OSBOURNE** – The project should better articulate a modern understanding of urban connection and have a strong sense of connection to the sidewalk and urban area. The current design should be more highly fleshed out

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **OSBOURNE** – The south façade as currently designed could be highly imposing along the E 32nd Street corridor, especially with a strict adherence to the symmetrical design philosophy.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **OSBOURNE** – The massing of the building will be quite imposing when taken as a whole, and the project team should consider methods of how to break up this massing effectively. Simple treatments of additional materials are unlikely to satisfactorily solve this design challenge, which should be approached with delicacy and a strong understanding of making the building articulate as a whole.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **SHARON** – It is great that the landscape architect is already working with the team, however, their input should be taken in early and often to meet the challenges of the site head on and with true effort. The entrance sequence for this site is a prime example of an area

that the landscape architect team can provide substantive feedback on how to create unambiguous flows to the building, rather than having connections being an afterthought.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **SHARON** – The project team should consider how programming of the courtyard will interact with the public realm. Given the current design and programming, each of them seem at odds with each other. Consider a change to the programming plan to respond to the actual flows of people through the space, rather than in opposition to the flows.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **SHARON** – the E 32nd Street corridor will be a focal point and major arrival/entrance area to the campus. The building should better respond to the pedestrian entrance sequence to the campus from this perspective.

Applicant Response:

- Panel Comments: **SHARON** – Building needs to better respond to the Abel Wolman building.

Applicant Response:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Staff Comments: **NICK** – Please share the updated presentation with Caitlin and Antoine to add to the public record for this project.

NEXT STEPS:

Continue the schematic design of the project addressing the comments above. Meet with Planning after responding to comments to determine if an additional UDAAP session is needed.

ATTENDEES:

Developer: Maslow's Campus Communities

Design Team: SCB

Pavlina Ilieva*, Sharon Bradly, Kevin Storm, Osborn Anthony – UDAAP Panel

Antoine Heath**, Caitlin Audette, Nick Cheupin, Brandon Kanoy– Planning

* UDAAP Chairperson

** Assigned Planning Staff