Preliminary Findings

Second Community Meeting
November 15, 2016

Bolan Smart Associates / Retail & Development Strategies / Urban Design Associates
for Howard County and Columbia Association
Agenda

- **Presentation** – 7:00 pm
  - Introductions
  - Study Process
  - Feasibility, Opportunities and Principles
  - Design Framework

- **Questions and Discussion** – 8:00 pm

- **Conclusion** – 9:00 pm
Oakland Mills Village Center Area Redevelopment Feasibility Study

Process and Timeline

- Study Kickoff
  - June 6

- Research Outreach Analysis
  - June - Oct

- Preliminary Findings
  - Nov 15

- Public Comment Period
  - Nov 15 – Dec 9

- Final Report Presentation
  - Early 2017
Research, Outreach and Analysis Steps

- Prior, ongoing and upcoming studies
- Village center dynamics / destination functions
- Existing conditions
- Stakeholder engagement:
  - Community groups and residents
  - Property owners
  - Users / building occupants
  - Planning and regulatory agencies
  - Past and currently active developers
Community Background

- Objectives from OMCA 2007 to 2015 planning documents
  - Mixed-use and more density – support retail / attract new families
  - Leverage proximity to Downtown Columbia
  - Promote a full spectrum of housing / change current mix
  - Urban design principles, ecological standards and sustainability
  - Destination uses (i.e. sports) highlighted as key to revitalization
2014 Columbia Market Study

- Dramatic changes in retail sector over last 50 years
- Original Village Center shopping center concept less viable
- Investigation of alternative new uses warranted
What We Heard

- Community groups / residents
  - Mix of uses, sports interests, connectivity, security, neighborhood scale
- Property owners (contacted all owners in study area)
  - Major existing investments and obligations to tenants / users
  - Interested in collaboration and adding value
- Users / building occupants – focused on present, hopeful regarding future
- Planning and regulatory agencies – requirements and procedures
- Past and current active developers
  - Historical perspective
  - Cautiously optimistic, interested in change
Study Areas

- Oakland Mills Village Center Core
- Oakland Mills Village Center Area
- Village of Oakland Mills Neighborhoods
- Functional Market Areas
  - Retail
  - Office
  - Sports
  - Residential
Purpose of Development Feasibility Study?

- Produce a **Technical Report** on what may be economically possible:
  - Test different land uses ([2015 OMCA Community Plan](#), other opportunities)
- Not a master plan, wish list of desires, or detailed road map
- Feasibility involves evaluating many factors that influence implementation (not just a market study)
# Feasibility Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Interest / Market Demand</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Potential / Synergies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Financial Viability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Permissible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retail Context

- Existing conditions
  - Committed existing businesses (incl. transition to Weis Markets)
  - Mixed of auto, bus, cycling and pedestrian based patronage
  - Limited market capture from OMVC destination users

- Relationship to OM neighborhoods
  - Neighborhood serving conveniences important to OMVC identity
  - OMVC represents a limited draw for residential locational decisions
  - Regardless, OM is in the middle of retailing mecca
Retail Trade Area

- Resident / Employee Based
  - OM neighborhoods –
    - 8,700 population
    - $80,000 median HH incomes
  - Five-minute drive time –
    - 12,250 population
    - 5,500 employees
Retail Trade Area

- OMVC Destination related visits
  - High & Middle Schools – visitors from outside defined trade area
  - Interfaith Center (OMIC) – 105,000 estimated annually
  - Columbia Ice Rink – 95,000 annually
  - Barns – 25,000+ annually
  - Stevens Forest Professional Center – 25,000+ annually
  - Blandair Park – TBD
  - Other – 50,000+ annually (from office parks, Walgreens, DoubleTree Hotel, etc.)

= 350,000+ annual / 1,000 per day non-OM originated visitors
Overall Retail Economic Potential

- Landlords’ flexibility constrained by existing lease terms
- Retailer revenues support operating costs, less so new construction
- New OMVC land uses can help with demand, but limited scale won’t change the retailing dynamics
- Market opportunities point to some downsizing, reconfiguration and updating of retailing spaces
- Potential for new retail to piggyback on new residential development
OMVC Retail Feasibility

- Grocery store anchor – 15,000 to 40,000 sf (38,254 sf existing)
  - Supply / demand data = mixed potential
  - Operator strategy dependent (i.e. Food Lion ➔ Weis Markets)
  - Possible future format update

- Food / beverage (restaurants) – 5,000 to 10,000 sf (13,250 sf existing)
  - Modestly viable, proprietor driven

- Convenience / service retail – 5,000 to 8,000 sf (9,400 sf existing)
  - Sustainable on a limited scale

- Other destination retail – not feasible

= **15,000 sf (no grocery) to 45,000+ sf (68,420 sf existing)**
## Retail Feasibility Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Interest / Market Demand</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Potential / Synergies</td>
<td>❓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Possible</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Financial Viability</td>
<td>❓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Acceptable</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Permissible</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term Implementation</td>
<td>❓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</td>
<td>❓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office Context

- **Existing conditions**
  - Large office park inventory (750,000 sf); 12.5% vacancy (93,500 sf)
  - Viable 24,500 sf Stevens Forest Professional Center (condo and rental)
  - Generally stable overall supply / demand relationship
  - Rental rates do not support new construction

- **Relationship to OM neighborhoods**
  - Part of OMVC identity and visitorship
  - Limited contribution to OMVC retailing
Office Feasibility

- Location not feasible for new private sector regional serving destination office (downtown, I-95, Maple Lawn)

- Market rents do not support new neighborhood serving office space (already served)
# Office Feasibility Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Interest / Market Demand</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Potential / Synergies</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Possible</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Financial Viability</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Acceptable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Permissible</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term Implementation</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sports Complex Context

- **Existing conditions**
  - CA owned and subsidized indoor ice rink, $2M budgeted for maintenance and updates (also under-parked)
  - Destination gym / indoor tennis facilities already at other villages
  - Adjacent to regional serving HC sponsored Blandair Park ($50M)
  - HC Com College long-term plan for on-campus pool / athletic facility; not budgeted

- **Relationship to OM neighborhoods**
  - Columbia Ice Rink part of OMVC unique identity
  - Limited quantified retail or residential synergies
  - Destination sports more sub-regional impact than neighborhood
  - Various access and parking implications
Regional Examples

Gardens Ice House
Laurel, MD
125,000 sf on 10.0 acres

Edward T. Hall Aquatic Center
Calvert County, MD
41,000 sf on 6.0 acres

Skate Frederick
Frederick, MD
70,000 sf on 6.0 acres
Sports Complex Feasibility

- Expanded Columbia Ice Rink – not economic

- 2+ ice rinks or indoor pool – not economic, no available location
  - Facilities usually located arterial road proximate on no or low cost land
  - 5 to 10+ acres required land area (would require demo of something)
  - $8M to $15M+ for new construction, plus land cost ($5.0M+?)
  - Often have operating costs deficits
  - Not feasible for 100% private ownership (public partnership contingent)
  - Uncertain timeline in possibly putting together partnership funding

- Other possible sports components
  - Indoor track and field – large footprint, not stand alone feasible
## Sports Complex Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Interest / Market Demand</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Potential / Synergies</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Possible</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Financial Viability</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Acceptable</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Permissible</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term Implementation</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Context

- OM in the regional market
  - Location offers excellent access to employment centers and retailing
  - OM / Columbia amenities and resident diversity are marketing draws
  - Older housing in marketable condition, range of styles
  - OM offers value, with possible upside investment for new entrants
Residential Context (cont.)

- Ownership properties (as of summer 2016 data)
  - Single-family detached units selling @ $350K avg. (71% Columbia avg.)
  - Townhomes $250K avg. (83% Columbia avg.)
  - Selling prices of $165-175 per sf is 92%+ of Columbia average
  - No or limited new singles or townhomes proximate to village centers

- Rentals
  - Primarily market rate apts incl. some moderate income qualified (<15% units)
  - Major recent property acquisitions; some current renovations
  - Major construction of apts occurring at non-OM higher value locations
  - Rental rates in OM (<$2.00psf) do not justify new construction at OMVC
  - Owned properties rented (est. at 50% condos, 20% TH, <10% singles)
Residential Feasibility = Opportunities

- New Ownership Townhomes – 100 to 150+ units
  - Alternative to existing older inventory
  - OMVC market differentiation; limited new townhomes at other villages
  - Social / community market appeal linked to OM amenities and character
  - Needs minimum 40+ units; economies for cost effective development
  - Implementation aided by development across multiple properties
  - Pricing comparable to existing range of OM single family homes ($375K+)
  - Economic return on THs could incentivize land owner redevelopment
  - TH densities can be transformational without large volume of new units
Residential Feasibility = Opportunities (cont.)

- Potential for Senior Housing – 100+ units in single 3-4 story building
  - Underserved market, value priced potential, opportunity to age in place
  - Positive OMVC synergies

- Multifamily Apartments – not near-term
  - Unlimited rental potential, but construction elsewhere, combined with value pricing for OM, not likely to support new near-term development
  - Rental rates in OM do not justify new construction at OMVC
  - Grand Pointe and Verona both new $$ into existing properties ($100M)
## Residential Feasibility Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>Senior Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Interest / Market Demand</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Potential / Synergies</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Possible</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Financial Viability</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Acceptable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Permissible</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term Implementation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TH** indicates a green background, indicating a positive assessment, while **Senior Housing** indicates a yellow background, suggesting a potential issue or unknown status.
Other Uses

- Faith Based – Interfaith Center 5+ congregations, considering expansion
- Community Services – the Barns, multi-use, some underused capacity
- Arts / Cultural – primary venues part of other villages
- Farmers’ Market – Sundays at OMVC, numerous other HC locations
- Pre-school – in neighborhood center and Montessori in the Interfaith Center
Other Uses (con’t)

- Auto Related – no longer at this location
- Lodging – in OM Villages (DoubleTree), but no prospect for OMVC
- Medical Office / Health Clinic – variety of alternative locations
- Howard Community College – no prospects, existing campus centric
- Howard County Hospital – OMVC not a probable ancillary site
Property Profiles
Property Profile Summary

- **Village Core – 39 acres**
  - Mix of uses, multiple property owners
  - Five+ acres of county owned right-of-ways
  - Overall 0.21 FAR (built area to land area) = low density
  - Assessed property values $600 to $1.7M per acre as improved

- **Greater Village Study Area – 196 acres**
  - Four apartment properties plus schools
  - All rental apartments circa 1970s with periodic reinvestments
  - Apartment land 0.30+ FAR (built area to land area) = moderate density
  - Recent property sales @ $2.4M+ per acre as improved
Redevelopment Principles

- Essential to reinforce existing land uses and businesses
- Destination uses important activity contributors
- Critical mass of new investment / construction is key
  - New projects = attention (and positive spin-offs on existing)
- Need visible community identity / central place
- Neighborhood serving retail part of Village dynamics
- Physical and economic use synergies can guide priorities
Redevelopment Opportunities

- Principal market economic driver is new residential uses
  - New townhomes differentiate OMVC from other Columbia village centers
  - New spectrum of housing will adjust overall mix of OM residential
  - Mixed socio-economic characteristics part of OM residential identity
Implementation

- Implementation should not depend on a single plan or developer
  - i.e., near term focus on opportunity sites, shopping center?
- Implementation should not depend on hypothetical public $$
- Reallocation of underutilized land (including right-of-ways)?
- Challenges regarding deed restrictions and current land use regulations
- Older water and sewer systems and road networks may present additional but unknown redevelopment costs
Possible Development Blocks

- Residential
- Mixed-Use
Implementation Thresholds: Conditions for Change

- Redevelopment values need to exceed existing property values
  - i.e., maybe possible at 15+ townhomes / acre; 35+ apts / acre

- Low-rise construction type – 1 to 4 stories

- Minimal structured parking (at expense of land value)

- Critical mass of new activity
  - Economies of scale for development, enough to be transformational

- Multiple property owners and impacts
  - Coordinated building blocks (with multi-property impacts)

- Possible feasibility enhancements / public interventions?
  - TBD – Technical Report private investment focus, not contingent on public $$
Development Opportunities Summary

- Retail – gradually reduced square footage and updated format
- Destination Sports Venue – numerous challenges
- New Residential – townhomes primary market $$ driver, senior housing maybe
- Existing Multi-family Redevelopment – future (2025+) case-by-case
- Possible Future Macro Public Investments (i.e., Bridge Columbia)
  - Too far into the future to underpin near-term private investment decisions
## Summary Feasibility Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>Senior Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Interest / Market Demand</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Potential / Synergies</strong></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physically Possible</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic and Financial Viability</strong></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Acceptable</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory Permissible</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Near-Term Implementation</strong></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Owner Motivated / Achievable</strong></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Concepts

- What Fits Physically
- What Could Enhance Feasibility
Greater OMVC Redevelopment Feasibility Study Areas

Oakland Mills Village Core
39 Acres

Greater OMVC Study Area
196 Acres
Existing Village Center
Village Center Design Principles

- Vehicular Access
- Bike Trail and Pedestrian Access
- Open Spaces and Place Making
Vehicular Access

- Maximize Retail Access
- Establish Grids / Blocks
- Thunder Hill Connection
- Santiago Right-of-Way?
Trail & Pedestrian Access

- Maximize Access
- Defined Routes
Open Space / Place Making Principles

Illustrative Gathering / Public Square
Fixed Elements
Opportunity Areas

- **Vacant**
- **Current Occupied**
Possible Development Blocks

- Residential
- Mixed-Use
Residential Use Focus Areas
Exxon Site / Interfaith Center Illustrative Concepts
Shadow Oak Illustrative Concepts

A

B

Multi-Family
Single-Family
Stevens Forest Road
Illustrative Concept

- Multi-Family
- Single-Family
Mixed-Use Focus Areas
Mixed-Use Illustrative Concepts

A

B

C

- Retail
- Institutional
- Single-Family
Sports Facility Illustrative Concepts
Greater OMVC Redevelopment Feasibility Study Areas
Common Elements with Prior Plans

2007 Master Plan

- Create village ‘green’ on which to focus re-organized development
- Extend courtyard to create civic plaza
- If apartment site over redevelops, bring new buildings up to street
- Bring new buildings up to the street to reinforce the pedestrian environment

Significant Improvements - Option 1: Square on Stevens Forest

2015 Community Plan

- Proposed Transit Connection Opportunity Sites
- Medium Density Residential (Townhouse Redevelopment)
- Mixed Use Village Center District
- Proposed Pedestrian and Bike Link

Higher Density Residential (Multifamily)
Higher Density Residential (Townhomes/condominiums)
Existing Park and Community Facilities
Existing Tennis Court Infrastructure
Lake Etiwanda
Mixed Use Village Center District
Proposed Pedestrian and Bike Link

April 2015

58
Next Steps

- Website updates (presentation to be posted online)
  
  https://www.howardcountymd.gov/Oakland-Mills-Village-Center

- Public comment period (through December 9th)

- Consultant stakeholder follow up, refinements to analysis (ongoing)

- Consultant / HC / CA integration of findings (December 2016 - early 2017)

- Final Report Presentation (early 2017)

- Final Technical Report
Questions and Discussion