

July 15, 2014

Reinventing Oakland Mills Task Force Meeting

Opening: Ginny Thomas informed the attendees that OM boundaries for the new community plan to be created have not been decided but discussion. Discussion of proposed boundaries include Santiago Road to Village Center and the surrounding apartment complexes and other locations including: Schools, Interfaith Center, Ice Rink, Talbott Springs Pool, Verona, Forest Ridge, Autumn Crest and Grand Pointe apartments.

Presentation: On behalf of Kimco, Mr. Glazer thanked Mr. Dorton and presented Mr. Dorton an “encased brick” from Wilde Lake as a gift of appreciation for Mr. Dorton’s 7 years of volunteering on the Wilde Lake Architectural Design Panel during the redevelopment process.

Geoff Glazer, V.P. Acquisitions & Development, Mid-Atlantic Region, Kimco Realty Corp.

Lessons Learned from Wilde Lake Village Center Redevelopment

Wilde Lake redevelopment process to this point has been a 7 year process.

The process initiated the County process and CB 29 which is now in place for the villages as they create community plans.

Missing from current OM Task Force:

Young residents

Developers, those who own property in/around the enter

Need the current owners of property to be a part of the task force.

Need the large financial stakeholders to know why we want them to do something different.

Columbia has changed from the Rouse days.

Need to make OM unique, pull people here.

Q: how can we reconfigure our assets?

CA needs to be involved. Need to know the covenant agreements of all properties. See what is applicable.

Look at OM Covenants and CB 29 regarding major redevelopment.

WL process involved too many meetings, many of which were duplicate. When amending CB 29 this should be addressed.

Development will not happen quickly, process will not happen quickly

Need property owners time and money without that we will not move forward.

Development will not happen with a small developer.

Need to engage younger generation.

Different age groups will have different things they want in a village center

WL will have mixed use development w/235 market rate, class A residential rental apartments.

Residential adds new life to a complex

Approx. 50-60% 1 bedroom

30% 2 bedroom

15% 3 bedroom

WL overall planning/design created the biggest disagreements

Need to be persistent – example is that the developer realized the need for a pharmacy and was persistent in attracting attracting CVS

Need to make entire area work as a whole.

Create a good plan that all sides agree on.

CB 29 will be looked at later this year.

Q: Would CB 29 cover apartments and all OM wants?

A: Whomever makes the submission gets to create the boundary plan.

In future years other developers can propose other boundaries.

Village can recommend boundaries in plan, land owners make submissions and we work with them.

Q: How do we deal with the current (multiple) 13 property owners?

A: Choose the biggest land owners and bring them to the table before the smaller ones.

Understand and capitalize on surrounding areas and wrap it into Oakland Mills.

Q: What were concerns in WL with regard to surrounding school properties and redevelopment?

A: Several meetings were held w/principals, board of ed. Kimco had concerns with students and security at the center.

Traffic is good, needs to be safe and planned. WL changed very little infrastructure. New roads in center will slope up, use of pavers to slow down, let drivers know it is a pedestrian safe zone. Developer spent a lot of time on traffic engineering.

Q: How do we get developers to the table?

A: Call them

Reach out to key players – senior level

Meet w/them in small groups (3)

Needs to make economic sense to developers

Possible tax incentives

Q: Does Columbia, village structure, board turnover created a convoluted process for the Developers.

A: Columbia is not unique – in general administration and villages were positive through the process. Challenge was 1 year board terms, some stayed on the board to see the process through.

OM will spend next 2 months talking to property owners

Land owner is key participant

Scott Templin, Community Planner, CA

Refer to process timeline sheet attached.

Community Plan created through HC CB29. Create one vision.

Developer needs to respond to what is in the plan

No right or wrong way to do a plan, do what works for the village

Parts of plan are:

 Civic engagement process

 Engage Cedar Properties

 Communicate to community

Suggested a walkabout to look at boundary areas

Get environmental and land use maps from CA

Look at CA demographic study

Q: We have a master plan – can we get advise for amending the plan?

A: Highlight the areas we want to keep from existing MP, see if the community still likes what we like.

River Hill created boundary lines and in addition they created impact areas outside the boundaries realizing that development in the impact area could affect what is within the boundary area.

Q: OM big challenge is multiple owners, apartment complexes and schools.

A: We have a lot more entities to contact and need to be persistent.

Q: CA is a big player in OM owning the Barn/Other Barn, Ice Rink, Tennis Courts, TS Pool – who do we work with at CA?

A: Dennis Matthey, Capital Projects, CA Board during budget hearing
Sean Harbaugh, Open Space.

Q: Ice rink is aging and may need possible reconstruction – are there opportunities to add to the space?

Q: What happens with board turnover?

Q: Who owns The Interfaith Center?

A: The Interfaith Board of 5 properties own the Interfaith Property.

Housing Committee Report

Bill McCormack

Committee will finalize their list of recommendations and vote next week then submit them to the Revitalization Task Force.

They will help create a Howard County Housing Policy and Plan.

Concern expressed over a discussion at the HC Housing Commission meeting where a resident (of OM) was building residences in Elkridge and wanted to locate 6 of the required MIHU offsite. Discussion was that 3 of the offsite units would be located in Oakland Mills.

Bill McCormack made the following motion: “There will be no offsite movement of MIHU units into Oakland Mills or communities with a fair amount of subsidized housing. MIHU unites should stay onsite”. Motion passed, no objections, no abstains.

Education Committee

Jonathan Edelson

Committee meets the 1st and 3rd Tues. before scheduled Revitalization Task Force meetings. Sept. 17th is the BOE Candidate’s Forum, Educ. And Sandy will organize
Co-sponsors are 10 villages and HCCA.

Education Committee is finalizing the committee’s objectives.

General Discussion

Comment on future closing of Oakland Mills Rd/Sohap and different access into Blandair Park and then a concern about increased traffic on Kilimanjaro.

Suggestion on re-routing OM Road through to Santiago and adding housing and parking lot to the back of the Middle School.

One resident (lives on TH Road) looks forward to the closing of OM Road.

Ginny asked to add discussion of Blandair Park (OM Road) to the July 22 BOD meeting.

Announced that there will be no August Task Force meetings and no Board meeting on Tues. August. 26.

Hi Tom,

Thanks for the clarifications. Our Task Force meetings are not recorded so the minutes aren't as refined as our village board meetings which we do record. We did get corrected at the meeting that it was the Housing and Community Development Board.

We did vote last night that the Task Force (which has all the village board members on it) position is:

We are against any and all off-site movement of MIHU requirements in the county.

We are against any more subsidized housing of any kind in Oakland Mills.

We are for deconcentration of subsidized housing in Oakland Mills and in the those communities that have a lot.

We are for placement of subsidized housing in those communities that have little or none.

We also voted to have me write to you expressing our position and ask that you and the HCD Board deny off-site movement of MIHU requirements and deny any more subsidized housing of any kind anywhere in Oakland Mills.

According to the rental housing study ~ 80% of subsidized housing in Howard County is in Columbia. Columbia only accounts for ~ 40% of the population of Howard County. Columbia has twice as much subsidized housing as it should.

Again, thank you for your timely reading of our minutes and the detailed explanation of the negotiations with Mr. Mehta.

Thanks,
Bill McCormack Jr.
Co-Chair Oakland Mills Village Board

On 07/16/14, Carbo, Tom<tcarbo@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Hi Bill,

I noted the following passage in the Task Force minutes and wanted to clarify a few points for you:

“Concern expressed over a discussion at the HC Housing Commission meeting where a resident (of OM) was building residences in Elkridge and wanted to locate 6 of the required MIHU offsite.

Discussion was that 3 of the offsite units would be located in Oakland Mills.”

First, the meeting was of the County ‘s Housing and Community Development Board, not the Housing Commission. The HCD Board is a separate County board that provides recommendations to the Department regarding housing issues including the MIHU program.

Second, the developer, Barry Mehta, is developing the second phase of the Elkridge Crossing property. He has asked to transfer six of his MIHU units off-site. The HCD Board recommended approval of the general request to move the 6 units off-site; subject, however to Mr. Mehta returning to the Board with the specific locations of the off-site units. They did not recommend approval of any specific sites.

Mr. Mehta had proposed to staff that he would provide the off-site MIHUs at properties he already owns, some of which are in Oakland Mills. Staff determined that 3 of the proposed properties are in census tract block groups that are over the 10% poverty rate; consequently, we informed Mr. Mehta that CB 18 prohibits those transfers.

Additionally, we informed Mr. Mehta that we would have to review the remaining properties to determine if they are suitable for the program. Staff has not accepted these units and the Board has not recommended them for transfer.

I hope this clarifies the matter. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Tom

Thomas P. Carbo

Thomas P. Carbo

Director/Executive Director

Howard County Housing

6751 Columbia Gateway Drive

Columbia, Maryland 21046

410-313-6348

tcarbo@howardcountymd.gov