

MEETING MINUTES

Largo Town Center Development Board

County Administration Building, Room 2027

14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive

Upper Marlboro, MD

Monthly Meeting: March 7th, 2016

5:00pm – 7:00pm

Member Attendees: Dr. Jacqueline Brown, Donny James, David Iannucci, Nellvenia Johnson, Charles Renninger, Louise McNairn, Kierre McCune, Kelvin Robinson, Dr. Rodney Harrell (attended via phone).
(Quorum Achieved)

Staff Attendees: Jackie Brown, Barbara Stone, Jordan Exantus, Leroy Maddox, Vanessa Akins.

Absent: Larry Hentz, Kenneth Baker, Armin Groeschel, John Lupo, Andrew Scott and Mark Wasserman.

In order according to the agenda:

I. Welcome, Approval of Meeting Minutes – Dr. Jacqueline L. Brown

- i. Minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously.

II. Referral Request – Pre-review of Largo Height Modification (for consideration of future site plan)

- i. Dr. Brown introduced the discussion topic of the Referral Request.
 - a) Mr. Exantus – Referral Request submitted to the Board by the Development Review Division of the Prince George’s County Planning Department. Seeking comments from the board on the pre-application proposed development scenario at Largo Town Center.
 - b) Mr. McCune – Pre-application is used to gauge perception of a project.
 - c) Mr. Renninger – Community groups within the Largo Town Center area are in opposition to the proposed development. The Referral Request seems like an effort to circumvent the Sector Plan, specifically, the height requirements.
 - d) Mr. Iannucci – There is tremendous controversy regarding the minimum building heights requirements. The ULI TAP members criticized the height regulations. This process represents a request for a waiver from the height regulations. Difficulties during the hospital negotiations saw the development of legislation granting developers the right to depart from height requirements by 1-story.
 - e) Mr. Renninger – Allowing this development to occur would set a very bad precedent. If we want to truly encourage TOD, we need to build “up” to achieve the vision of the plan and density at the Metro station. This is the reason why heights were included as part of the Sector Plan. We understand that the market is “spongy” but we are planning for the future, if we start changing our standards for each development, you create a “me too” dynamic in your planned downtown.
 - f) Mrs. Johnson – a 3-4 story departure from the requirements is very significant. This would have a detrimental impact on the sector plan.
 - g) Dr. Brown – If we approve, what’s to stop everyone from going around the plan?
 - h) Mr. McCune – There is consideration in this context of the “core” versus “edge” → this property is located towards the edge of the TOD core and thus does not need to be as dense as the core. There are issues with the massing and look of the building, perhaps two-stories would be more appropriate.

- i) Dr. Harrell – The sector plan does establish edges with slightly looser regulations than the core. However, it defeats the purpose of the plan to grant exceptions to the “first person through the door”. Not our job to redefine the vision of the plan, it is our job to promote the vision of the plan.
- j) Mr. James – You cannot force the developer to build something the market does not support. Height restrictions present a real challenge.
- k) Mrs. Johnson – The Largo Town Center Sector Plan was a collaborative 18-month effort by the County and the community. We need to push for the desired vision.
- l) Mr. Renninger – public sector can (and should) be driver of development. Years ago, the community fought for a metro station to help achieve high density development at Largo. There has been millions in capital investment in infrastructure to support growth of Largo Town Center.
- m) Mr. Iannucci – the reason the County chose to put the Regional Medical Center at Largo was to help achieve the Sector Plan Vision. A 5-14 story hospital will be the driver for density at the core. Market is not yet there, lease rates are much lower than other areas. You can't force a developer to build up, it will be a choice between no development or low-density development.
- n) Mrs. Johnson – We have to make a decision what we want to become. We can continue to allow suburban sprawl or we can encourage more urban development. Already an ALDI on 202. Already a discount grocer at Largo Town Center. We need development that will complement the hospital development.
- o) Dr. Harrell – Not necessarily opposed to not developing site if what we want isn't achievable. If we are going to make an exception, it should be for something we really want.
- p) Dr. Brown – Plan was put in place for a reason. Profit and costs are the motivation in this scenario. Urban markets have multi-level retail, so plan conformance does occur! There is a problem with requesting for an exception without any negotiations or compromise.
- q) Mr. Renninger – read from CR-32-2014 – The Largo Town Center Development Board was created to help achieve the vision of the Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment, “recommend a strategic implementation plan that maximizes development potential within the Largo Town Center plan area, builds consensus of vision in the community, and provides procedural certainty of process...”
- r) Mr. Renninger - Motion – respond to this referral with language that states that this request does not conform to, or meet the goals of the sector plan.
 - 2nd – Mrs. Johnson
 - Discussion:
 - Mrs. Brown – what will text to Henry say?
 - It is not consistent with the sector plan, goals, nor does it help achieve consensus of vision.
 - Vote - Passed

III. Revised Largo Town Center Development Board Bylaws – Leroy Maddox

- i. Mr. Maddox opened the topic by stating that all references to term limits have been removed from the bylaws text.
- ii. Mr. Iannucci – at the last meeting, there was a positive vote for a provision stating that the attendance requirement would be 50% of meetings in a calendar year.
- iii. Mr. Renninger – Motion – Adopt bylaws as amended with 50% meeting attendance requirement added.
 - a) Vote – Passed unanimously

IV. Scheduling of Future Board Meetings

- i. Dr. Brown – 5pm is challenging
- ii. Motion – Bi-Monthly meetings starting at 7pm

a) Vote – Passed

V. Adjourn

- i. Next meeting – May 9th at 7pm