

For Internal Use Only



**BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL
WAYS AND MEANS
COMMITTEE**

Mission Statement

The Committee on Ways and Means (WM) is responsible for ensuring taxpayer dollars are expended prudently and equitably. WM will exercise regular oversight of the City's budget, expenditures, loans, and other financial matters. The committee's areas of jurisdiction include budget & appropriations, taxation, financial services, consumer protection, audits, and the Comptroller's Office.

**The Honorable Eric T. Costello
Chairman**

PUBLIC HEARING

**THURSDAY, MAY 26, 2022
2:58 PM**

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Council Bill 22-0239

Sale of Property – 2001 Park Avenue

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEES

ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (ECD)

Sharon Green Middleton, Chair
John Bullock – Vice Chair
Mark Conway
Ryan Dorsey
Antonio Glover
Odette Ramos
Robert Stokes
Staff: Jennifer Coates (410-396-1260)

WAYS AND MEANS (W&M)

Eric Costello, Chair
Krisferfer Burnett
Ryan Dorsey
Danielle McCray
Sharon Green Middleton
Isaac "Yitzy" Schleifer
Robert Stokes
Staff: Marguerite Currin (443-984-3485)

PUBLIC SAFETY AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (SGO)

Mark Conway – Chair
Krisferfer Burnett
Zeke Cohen
Eric Costello
Antonio Glover
Phylicia Porter
Odette Ramos
Staff: Samuel Johnson (410-396-1091)

EDUCATION, WORKFORCE, AND YOUTH(EWY)

Robert Stokes – Chair
John Bullock
Zeke Cohen
Antonio Glover
Sharon Green Middleton
Phylicia Porter
James Torrence
Staff: Marguerite Currin (443-984-3485)

HEALTH, ENVIRONMENT, AND TECHNOLOGY (HET)

Danielle McCray – Chair
John Bullock
Mark Conway
Ryan Dorsey
Phylicia Porter
James Torrence
Isaac "Yitzy" Schleifer
Staff: Matthew Peters (410-396-1268)

RULES AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT (OVERSIGHT)

Isaac "Yitzy" Schleifer, Chair
Krisferfer Burnett
Mark Conway
Eric Costello
Sharon Green Middleton
Odette Ramos
James Torrence
Staff: Richard Krummerich (410-396-1266)



BILL SYNOPSIS

Committee: Ways and Means

Bill: 22-0239

Sale of Property – 2001 Park Avenue

Sponsor: *President Mosby at the request of the Department of Real Estate*

Introduced: *May 16, 2022*

Purpose:

For the purpose of authorizing the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to sell, at either public or private sale, all its interest in certain property that is located at 2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448; Lot 030) and is no longer needed for public use; and providing for a special effective date.

Effective: **On the date it is enacted.**

Agency Reports

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Law Department | Favorable |
| Department of Planning | Favorable |
| Department of Housing and Community Development | None as of this writing |
| Department of Transportation | None as of this writing |
| Department of Real Estate | Favorable |
| Department of Finance | None as of this writing |
| Baltimore City Parking Authority | None as of this writing |
| Board of Estimates | To be sent to BOE for approval |

Analysis

Current Law

Article V – Comptroller; Section 5(b); Baltimore City Charter; (1996 Edition)

Background

If enacted, Bill 22-0239 would authorize the sale of the property located at 2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448; Lot 030) in the **Reservoir Hill** neighborhood of the City; Council District #7. **See attached pictures.**

Per the Real Estate, Request for Proposals (RFP's) were sent out in January 2022 and three (3) proposals were received. The bidders/developers will present their proposals at a community meeting on June 9, 2022. A detailed writing of the history of this property is outlined in the agency report. **See attached Real Estate's agency report.**

Upon approval by the Mayor and City Council, **the Board of Estimates** would have to approve the deal to finalize the disposition.

Additional Information

Fiscal Note: None

Information Source(s): City Charter, Council Bill 22-0239, and all agency reports received as of this writing.

Analysis by: *Marguerite M. Currin*
Analysis Date: May 23, 2022

Direct Inquiries to: (443) 984-3485



2001 PARK AVENUE



2001 PARK AVENUE



2001 PARK AVENUE



2001 Park Ave

15,194 SF Specialty Building Offered for Sale in Baltimore, MD

Council Bill 22-0239

AGENCY REPORTS

See attached

CITY OF BALTIMORE

BRANDON M. SCOTT
Mayor



DEPARTMENT OF LAW
JAMES L. SHEA
100 N. HOLLIDAY STREET
SUITE 101, CITY HALL
BALTIMORE, MD 21202

May 20, 2022

The Honorable President and Members
of the Baltimore City Council
Attn: Natawna B. Austin, Executive Secretary
Room 409, City Hall
100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Re: City Council Bill 22-0239 - Sale of Property -2001 Park Avenue

President and City Council Members:

The Law Department has reviewed City Council Bill 2-0239 for form and legal sufficiency. The bill would allow the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to sell its interest in the property located at 2001 Park Ave. Street and declaring it no longer needed for public use. The bill also provides for a special effective date.



Article V, Section 5(b) of the Baltimore City Charter grants the Department of Real Estate in the Comptroller's Office the power to arrange for the disposition of any building or parcel of land no longer needed by the City for public use, if that sale is approved by the Board of Estimates. Assuming the agency reports reveal that the property is no longer needed for public use, this is the appropriate ordinance to authorize disposition of the subject property. Therefore, the Law Department approves the bill for form and legal sufficiency.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elena DiPietro".

Elena R. DiPietro

Cc: Natasha Mehu
Nikki Thompson
Nina Themelis
Matt Stegman
Hilary Ruley
Victor Tervala
Ashlea Brown

| | | | | |
|------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| FROM | NAME & TITLE | CHRIS RYER, DIRECTOR  | CITY of BALTIMORE MEMO |  |
| | AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS | DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING 8 TH FLOOR, 417 EAST FAYETTE STREET | | |
| | SUBJECT | CITY COUNCIL BILL #22-0239/ SALE OF PROPERTY – 2001 PARK AVENUE | | |

DATE:

May 17, 2022

TO

The Honorable President and
Members of the City Council
City Hall, Room 400
100 North Holliday Street

The Department of Planning is in receipt of City Council Bill #22-0239, which is for the purpose of authorizing the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to sell, at either public or private sale, all its interest in certain property that is located at 2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448; Lot 030) and is no longer needed for public use; and providing for a special effective date.

The Department of Planning recommends **approval** of City Council Bill #22-0239. We understand that this property is no longer needed for any further public use, and has been offered for sale for private renovation. This property is located within the Mt. Royal Terrace Local Historic District, and our Historic Preservation staff are assisting with the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Eric Tiso, Division Chief, Land Use and Urban Design Division at 410-396-8358.

CR/ewt

cc: Ms. Natasha Mehu, Mayor's Office
Ms. Nina Themelis, Mayor's Office
Mr. Ethan Cohen, Mayor's Office
The Honorable Eric Costello, Council Rep. to Planning Commission
Mr. Matthew Stegman, City Council President's Office
Ms. Nikki Thompson, City Council President's Office
Mr. Colin Tarbert, BDC
Ms. Kathleen Byrne, BMZA
Mr. Geoffrey Veale, Zoning Administration
Ms. Stephanie Murdock, DHCD
Ms. Elena DiPietro, Law Dept.
Mr. Francis Burnszynski, PABC
Mr. Liam Davis, DOT
Ms. Natawna Austin, Council Services
Ms. KC Kelleher, Comptroller's Office



MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable President and Members of the City Council
c/o Natawna Austin, Executive Secretary

From: Andy Frank, Real Estate Officer,

Date: May 11, 2022

Re: 22-0239 Sale of Property – 2001 Park Avenue

Position: Support

The Department of Real Estate is reporting on CCB 22-0239 Sale of Property – 2001 Park Avenue. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to sell, at either public or private sale, all its interest in certain property that is located at 2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448; Lot 030) and provide for a special effective date. The property is no longer needed for public use. If CCB 22-0239 is approved by the City Council, the Board of Estimates will be asked to approve the deal to finalize the disposition.

Background

On January 24th, the Department of Real Estate advertised a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a historic property at 2001 Park Avenue on its web site and on LoopNet, a national multiple listing site. The 15,194-square foot stone mansion sits on 1.835 acres in Baltimore's Reservoir Hill neighborhood.

Over the decades the property has been known as the Birckhead Estate, the Bond House, Mount Royal, Norse Hill Home and the Norwegian Seaman's Merchants Home. The oldest structure in Reservoir Hill, the building is located in the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District and is designated a Baltimore City Landmark. Built in 1792 by Dr. Solomon Birckhead, the mansion served as a private residence until 1922 when ownership transferred to the Baltimore Monthly Meeting of Friends who used it as a home for aged members. In 1957 the Norwegian government purchased and renamed the property to the Norse Hill Home, also known as the Norwegian Seamen's Merchants Home, to house sailors. The City eventually took ownership and refitted the property for various uses including a Pratt library reading room, mayor's station and multi-purpose neighborhood center.

The City of Baltimore sought developers who were willing and able to develop the site in accordance with the Request for Proposal's goals and objectives, which were prepared with substantial input from the community. The Department of Real Estate (DoRE) received three proposals. DoRE convened a selection panel made up of City agency personnel and community representatives to evaluate the proposals. In addition, the developers will present their proposals at a community meeting on June 9, 2022.

Fiscal Impact

Per the Department of General Services, 2001 Park Ave on average costs Baltimore City approximately \$36,000 for utilities and maintenance.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Water <i>(based on 7-year average)</i> | \$3368 |
| Maintenance Cost <i>(based on 7-year average)</i> | \$24,285.71 |
| BGE <i>(approximate 2021 cost)</i> | \$9,000 |

The Department of Real Estate supports the passage of CCB 22-0239.

CC: Celeste Amato, Chief of Staff, Comptroller’s Office
KC Kelleher, Director of Communication, Comptroller’s Office
Nina Themelis, Mayor’s Office
Sophia Gebrehiwot, Mayor’s Office

Attachments:

2001 Park Ave Request for Proposals

Request for Proposals

2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448, Lot 030)

Baltimore, Maryland 21217



RFP Issue Date: January 24, 2022

Proposals Due: April 8, 2022

*Issued by the Office of the Comptroller Bill Henry through the Department of Real Estate
on behalf of the Mayor and City Council*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 2 |
| II. | Property Description | 3 |
| III. | Intent of Offering | 4 |
| IV. | Standards and Controls | 4 |
| V. | Proposal Contents | 6 |
| VI. | Submission Requirements..... | 8 |
| VII. | MBE/WBE Participation | 10 |
| VIII. | Non-discrimination..... | 10 |
| IX. | Employ Baltimore..... | 11 |
| X. | Evaluation Criteria | 11 |
| XI. | Rights Reserved by the Department of Real Estate | 12 |
| XII. | Exhibits | 13 |
| | A. Mount Royal Terrace Historic District | |
| | B. Vicinity Map | |
| | C. Block Plat | |
| | D. Existing Site Plan w/Headstone Location | |
| | E. Photographs of 2001 Park Avenue | |
| | F. 2001 Park Avenue Property Opinion Survey Results & Summary | |
| | G. Sources and Uses Statement Template | |
| | H. Ten-year Operating Pro Forma Template | |
| | I. Awards Procedures | |

I. INTRODUCTION

Through this Request for Proposals (RFP), the Office of the Comptroller Real Estate Department (“Real Estate”) is pleased to announce the offering of the City-owned Property located at 2001 Park Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21217 (Block 3448, Lot 030) (“Property”) in the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District of Reservoir Hill. Real Estate is seeking Proposals from Respondents with experience in adaptive reuse of historic properties in compliance with this RFP.

Proposals, accompanied by a \$150 non-refundable fee, payable to the Director of Finance, are due to Real Estate (Baltimore City Hall, 100 N. Holliday Street, Room 304, Baltimore, Maryland 21202) no later than noon, on April 8, 2022.

RELEVANT DATES

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Advertisement for RFP | January 24, 2022 |
| RSVP for Pre-Bid Proposal Conference/Open House | February 14, 2022 |
| Pre-Bid Proposal Conference | February 18, 2022 |
| Property Tour | TBD |
| Written Questions Due | TBD |
| Proposals Due | April 8, 2022 |

II. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Location: Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Property is located at 2001 Park Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21217 (Ward 13, Section 11, Block 3448, Lot 030) in the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District of Reservoir Hill. (See Exhibits A through E.)

The Property is also known as the Birckhead Estate, the Bond House, Mount Royal, Norse Hill Home and the Norwegian Seaman's Merchants Home. The building consists of approximately 15,194 gross square feet, sited on more or less 1.835 acres. The Property has been previously used as a multipurpose center, day care center, community meeting space, and offices.

History: Physician Dr. Solomon Birckhead built the property in 1792 as a private residence on the on grounds once owned by Charles Carroll of Carrollton. It is the oldest surviving building in Reservoir Hill. A heavy stone retaining wall surrounds the Property, which is situated on a heavily wooded nearly two-acre site at different levels. In 1922, ownership transferred to the Baltimore Monthly Meeting of Friends, which used Mount Royal as a home for their aged members. By 1957, the Norwegian government purchased and renamed Mount Royal to the Norse Hill Home, also known as the Norwegian Seamen's Home, to house 55 sailors. (At the time, Norway had more ships at the Port of Baltimore than any other country.) The City took ownership soon after and converted the Property into institutional uses: a Pratt library reading room, mayor's station and multi-purpose neighborhood center.

Neighborhood: Reservoir Hill is an urban neighborhood just south of Druid Hill Park. The majority of the properties are late-nineteenth to early twentieth century row houses, but the district includes other historic building types from grand mansions to multi-story apartment buildings, a handful of religious and commercial buildings, and a few public monuments. Six to fourteen-story tall early-twentieth century apartment houses front on Druid Hill Park at the northern edge of the district. Individual mansions built in a variety of styles, two older synagogues and one church, and a few commercial buildings provide a break from the neighborhood's row house character.

Reservoir Hill is architecturally significant under National Register Criteria C for numerous individual buildings designed by noteworthy local architects, a variety of residential building types representing the evolving character of the district from scattered country estates to an urban row house neighborhood, and distinctive architectural details reflecting a high level of craftsmanship found in architectural styles from the Victorian and Edwardian eras. The area is also associated with the lives of significant persons under National Register Criteria B including former Communist Whittaker Chambers, writers James M. Cain, Gertrude Stein, and Christopher Morely; photographer, David Bachrach; entrepreneurs Isaac Emerson and Jacob Epstein; and peace activist, Phillip Bergan.

III. INTENT OF OFFERING

Goals: Real Estate is seeking proposals from qualified developers to purchase and redevelop the site in compliance with the objectives, goals, and regulations as stated herein. The goals of Real Estate in offering the site for sale include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Achieve a high-quality development that complements neighboring homes, preserves the character of the neighborhood, and enhances the surrounding community.
- B. Preserve buildings with an emphasis on historic architectural components.
- C. Select a qualified architect for the Project who has demonstrated design excellence and achieve the highest quality of architectural exterior/interior design and best construction practices.
- D. Undertake redevelopment in a timely fashion.
- E. Offer opportunities for community input and participation.
- F. Create opportunities for Minority- and Women-Owned Business Enterprises.
- G. Generate real property and other taxes for the City of Baltimore.
- H. Implement the development concept with minimal or no City subsidy.

IV. STANDARDS AND CONTROLS

- A. **City Landmark:** 2001 Park Avenue is a contributing property to the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District, a locally designated Baltimore City historic district. Consequently, proposed modifications to the exterior building and grounds will be subject to review and prior authorization by the Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation (CHAP). The property is also individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (Inventory #: B-49). Respondents should refer to the [Baltimore City Historic Preservation Rules and Regulations](#) (2015) and [Baltimore City Historic Preservation Design Guidelines](#) (2015) for guidance on what types of modifications to the property will be permissible and the process for obtaining permits. Parties interested in applying for the Baltimore City Tax Credit for Historic Rehabilitations and Restorations should carefully review the [CHAP tax credit procedures](#) early in the planning stage. Rehabilitation projects at this site may be eligible for tax credits through the [Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program](#) and/or the [Maryland Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program](#). Respondents are solely responsible for consulting with the National Park Service and the Maryland Historical Trust for more information, should they wish to participate in either of those programs.
- B. **Property Condition:** The property is offered in as-is condition.
- C. **Opinion Survey:** The Proposal shall be informed by the 2001 Park Avenue Task Force Opinion Survey Results and Summary dated March 31, 2019. (See Exhibit F.)

- D. **Codes:** The Project shall comply to all appropriate provisions of the Zoning Code of Baltimore City, land-use regulations, and building/fire codes of Baltimore City. The Property is within a R-7 Zoning District. The Zoning Code of Baltimore City is available at: <https://zoning.baltimorecity.gov/>. Proposals that contemplate a variance or change in Zoning may be acceptable provided that the issue is addressed appropriately in Submission Requirements. Real Estate cannot guarantee approval of any requested regulatory changes
- E. **Opening Dimensions:** The original dimensions of exterior doors and window openings on the exterior façades shall be maintained.
- F. **Materials and Design:** Building materials shall be compatible with and reflect the characteristic materials and features of the existing building. Materials conveying permanence, such as masonry, are encouraged. Exterior design shall comply with federal, state, and local laws, Baltimore City Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Property, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and addenda.
- G. **Mechanical and Electrical Devices:** Screen from view or locate as directed all mechanical and electrical equipment (including, but not limited to rooftop units and devices, television antennas, satellite dishes, or various communications antenna types that are visible from Property/site-adjacent streets and alleyways).
- H. **Exterior Walls:** Where visible from a public street, alley, and Property driveway, exterior walls shall be harmonious with the Property’s existing elevations.
- I. **Parking:** The number of parking spaces must comply with the zoning code, while addressing sensitivity to the existing buildings and to the surrounding residential neighborhood.
- J. **Signage:** Only signs that identify the Property’s use or occupants are permitted. Signs shall comply with the requirements established in the Zoning Ordinance of Baltimore City.
- K. **Archeology:** Documented human occupation of the site dates at least to the 18th century and a historical burial ground with human remains might be present on the property. Therefore, the site is to be considered of high archaeological interest and sensitivity. Any new ground disturbance beyond the footprint of the existing improvements will require an archeological survey and monitored excavation, the extent of which will be determined at the discretion of CHAP and in accordance with all applicable state law. The north end of the property with a lower elevation (known as “The Dell”) is suspected to be an abandoned burial ground due to the presence of what appears to be an early 20th century unmarked gravestone. Respondents are encouraged to avoid ground disturbance in this area and to retain the area as a permanent green space. Respondents must abide by all applicable state laws governing human remains and gravestones including, but not limited to, Sections 10-402 and 10-404, Criminal Law Article, Annotated Code of Maryland. (See Exhibit D.)
- A. **Financial Assistance and Credits:** Reliance on public financial assistance, other than any applicable potentially entitled incentives such as High-Performance Market-rate Residential Tax Credits, relevant Historic Tax Credits, or other such available credits, is discouraged.

- B. Environmental Hazards:** The Property may contain environmental hazards that require remediation by the selected Respondent prior to the Project's redevelopment to the extent that selected Respondent's liability is not preempted by federal, state, or other law. The City does not make any representation, guaranty, or warranty concerning site and building conditions, including the possible presence of environmentally hazardous materials.
- C. Property Title.** Issues and concerns regarding title shall be addressed through the Land Disposition Agreement with the selected Respondent. The Respondent is encouraged to conduct such title investigations as it deems necessary in completing the Proposal.
- D. Other Costs:** The selected Respondent shall be responsible for obtaining, at its sole expense as is required, all government approvals such as permits, zoning appeals, subdivision approvals, and engineering and environmental protection studies. Any costs of appraisals, surveys, legal descriptions, and any other development "soft costs" shall be borne by the selected Respondent at its sole expense.
- E. Review Panel:** The Panel reviews respondent proposals and ultimately will recommend the proposal that its members believe should be selected. The Review Panel includes representatives from Baltimore City and community representatives.

V. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Format: Proposals shall provide a clear and concise demonstration of the Respondent's capability to satisfy the requirements and objectives of this RFP. Proposals are not intended to be elaborate or costly but are to be prepared in a professional manner. Proposals may include background or other supporting information that the Respondent considers necessary, and shall include, at a minimum, the required response items listed in this RFP. The following information shall be submitted by Respondents:

- A. Cover Letter (300 words maximum):** A cover letter signed by an officer who is authorized to make binding contractual commitments on behalf of the Respondent.
- B. Table of Contents:** Proposals shall include a table of contents referencing each of the lettered submission requirements in this section, Section V. Each lettered item included in the table of contents shall provide a corresponding section with a labeled index tab for each section.
- C. Ownership:** Proposed ownership structure, entity or entities, individual members and ownership percentages.
- D. Project Description (500 words maximum):** A detailed proposal narrative that clearly describes the scope of work, scale, and character of the Project and any applicable conditions thereon.
- E. Purchase Price:** The proposed purchase price, terms of operation if applicable, and any and all conditions of the settlement.
- F. Schematic Drawings:** Schematic drawings, showing building floor plan(s) and elevations of fronts (south), sides (east and west), and rear (north) of structures and proposed site / landscape plans.

G. **Previous Experience (500 words maximum):** A narrative describing the previous experience of the Respondent and its project team with particular regard to projects that are similar in scale and character to the proposed development and emphasizing aspects of the developer's qualifications that are exceptional or unique. Include a list of examples of the Respondent's similar historic projects that are in the process including the dollar value of the development, the project manager's name, address, and telephone number.

Resumes: Include resumes, as appropriate, of the proposed project team, including, but not limited to, architect, landscape architect, engineers, contractor, construction manager, and real estate management firm.

H. **Economic Feasibility (300 words maximum):** A narrative explaining why the proposed Project use is economically feasible, including the market assumptions that support revenue projections.

I. **Sources and Uses Budget and Operating Pro Forma:** A detailed complete Sources and Uses Statement clearly identifying the amount of debt and equity financing by source. (See Exhibits G and H)

J. **Debt Financing:** Disclosure of terms and sources for debts and a letter from a lending institution is highly desirable.

K. **Financial Capacity:** Companies or entities shall submit audited accountant-prepared financial statements for the most recent fiscal year-end and/or objective estimate of estimated relevant market value. Real Estate may request a document providing relevant evidence to establish the respondent's ability to complete this Project including approximate net worth and/or liquid assets that will be allocated to complete the Project.

L. **Project Schedule.** A schedule of the design and construction phases, dates, and anticipated occupancy date(s)

M. **MBE/WBE Participation:** A statement describing compliance with Article 5, Subtitle 28 of the Baltimore City Code regarding the participation of MBE and WBE in the Project design and construction.

The statement shall address: a) the MBE and WBE participation in the Respondent's development team/plan; b) a list of potential MBEs and WBEs and contractors who will participate in this Project; c) steps that will be taken by the Respondent to maximize MBE and WBE participation in the various stages of development; and, d) provisions for ownership with an indication of percentage and type (such as "equity partner," "owner of X shares of LLC," or "joint venture," etc.) by minority individuals, women, minority-owned and/or women's-owned businesses in the completed project. Indicate the member of the Project development team who will be responsible for monitoring compliance with the Project's MBE and WBE participation goals.

- N. **Community Participation (250 words maximum).** Describe how the team will involve the community in the planning and implementation of redevelopment activities. The response must include a discussion of the approach and methods your team will utilize to assure meaningful participation by the residents of the neighborhood, community stakeholders, and local government entities in the planning and implementation of the project.

VI. SUBMISSION INFORMATION AND REQUIREMENTS

- A. **Closing Date:** The closing date for receipt in the Issuing Office of proposals is 12:00 pm on April 8, 2022.
- B. **Proposal Submission:** Proposals must be submitted to Real Estate before the close of business (4:30 P.M.) on the closing date stated in this RFP via e-mail. Project financial information requested in Section V of this RFP must be submitted in an electronic, machine readable format. All proposals must be sent to andy.frank@BaltimoreCity.gov; cc: sharon.kempa@BaltimoreCity.gov.
- Oral, fax, telegraphic, paper or mail-gram proposals are not accepted.
 - Proposals or unsolicited amendments to proposals that arrive after the closing date and time are not accepted.
 - Failure to submit the proposal in the manner described above may result in the proposal being not accepted.
- C. **RFP Fee:** A \$150.00 non-refundable fee. Make checks payable to the Director of Finance. Proposals that are not accompanied by a certified check or money order for the fee will not be accepted. Please mail or hand deliver the RFP fee to:
- Ms. Sharon Kempa, Issuing Officer, Real Estate Agent**
Department of Real Estate
Room 304 - City Hall
100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
- D. **Not Limited to the RFP:** Real Estate and the Review Panel are not limited to consider solely the information provided by the Respondent but may consider other sources of information that is deemed to be useful in evaluating the Proposal. Additional information or modifications to proposals from any Respondent may be requested.
- E. **Duration of Proposal:** Proposals are valid and irrevocable for a period of one hundred and twenty (120) calendar days following the closing date for proposals. The period may be extended by written mutual agreement between the Real Estate and the Respondent that is recommended for award.

- F. **Proposal Acceptance:** To be considered, the Respondent shall submit a complete, written response to this RFP including the issued addenda. It is essential that each Respondent adheres to these guidelines and in Section V, Proposal Content. Failure to do so is grounds for proposal rejection.
- G. **Pre-Bid Conference.** A Pre-Bid Proposal Conference shall be held on February 18, 2022 to offer prospective Respondents the opportunity to ask questions of community representatives and City staff. Please RSVP your attendance to: sharon.kempa@baltimorecity.gov. If special accommodations are required to participate in the Conference, please contact Sharon Kempa at least five (5) business days prior to the Pre-Bid Proposal Conference.
- H. **RFP Questions:** Questions, both verbal and written, are accepted from Respondents attending the Pre-Bid Proposal Conference. Real Estate may, but is not obligated to, invite questions apart from the Pre-Bid Proposal Conference. Questions and answers are to be distributed to all Respondents receiving the RFP. Questions and inquiries shall be directed to Ms. Kempa. The closing time and date for submitting written questions will be determined.
- I. **RFP Revision:** Should it become necessary by Real Estate to: 1) revise the RFP; b) provide additional information necessary; or, c) respond to written inquiries, an Addendum to the RFP shall be provided to each Respondent who received the initial RFP.
- J. **RFP Cancellation:** Real Estate may, in its sole discretion, cancel this RFP, or reject Respondent proposals that are submitted if such action is determined to be in the best interest of Baltimore City.
- K. **Incurring Expenses:** The City of Baltimore is not responsible for costs incurred by Respondents in preparing and submitting a proposal or requested supplemental information in response to the RFP.

VII. MBE / WBE PARTICIPATION

It is Baltimore City's policy that MBEs and WBEs shall be offered an opportunity to participate in all components of the Project. In consideration of receiving the Land Disposition Agreement (LDA), the Respondent agrees to comply with Article 5, Subtitle 28 of the Baltimore City Code regarding the participation of MBE and WBE in the Project design and construction. The Respondent covenants and agrees to use a good-faith effort to meet the MBE and WBE participation goals for the Project and to execute a "Commitment to Comply" Agreement. Minority and women's business enterprises shall be certified by the City for their participation to comply with the Project goals.

The City's Minority and Women's Business Opportunity Office (MWBOO) is designated to monitor MBE and WBE participation in this Project. The selected Respondent shall comply with the rules and regulations of the MWBOO in meeting the MBE and WBE requirements.

VIII. NON-DISCRIMINATION

The Respondent shall agree to not enter into, execute, or be a party to any Covenant, Agreement, Lease, Deed, Assignment, Conveyance, or any other written instrument that restricts the sale, lease, use, or occupancy of the Property or any part thereof, upon the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and shall comply with Federal, State, and local laws, in effect from time to time, prohibiting discrimination or segregation and shall not discriminate by reason of race, color, religion, sex or national origin in the sale, lease, use or occupancy of the Property.

IX. EMPLOY BALTIMORE

Employ Baltimore is designed to create opportunities that receive municipal contracts to access qualified City residents to meet their workforce needs. The initiative will also ensure that City dollars contribute to the local economy and improve the lives of employable Baltimoreans. All vendors responding to this solicitation shall complete the Certification Statement that is included as an attachment of this RFP. The selected contractor must contact the Mayor's Office of Employment Development (OED) within two (2) weeks of receiving the award and shall be expected to comply with the reporting requirements. For additional information, please call OED 443-984-3014.

X. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria used in the evaluation of proposals shall include, but not limited to, the following:

- A. **Scope/Quality:** The scope, quality (including design and construction), and degree to which the Respondent's Proposal addresses the RFP's goals, intents, and terms of the offering.
- B. **Experience:** The Respondent's experience in planning, financing, constructing, marketing, and managing projects similar in size and scope to the proposed Project.
- C. **Financial Capacity:** The Respondent's ability to provide or obtain sufficient financial resources to start and complete the Project in accordance with an established timetable.
- D. **MBE/WBE Compliance:** Compliance with Article 5, Subtitle 28 of the Baltimore City Code regarding participation by MBE and WBE in the development of the project during design and construction.
- E. **MBE/WBE Equity:** Provisions for ownership and/or management, in full or in part, of the completed project by minority individuals, women, and minority-owned businesses, and/or women-owned businesses.
- F. **Collateral Benefits:** Benefits to the Historic District, Reservoir Hill Neighborhood, and the City, including job retention and creation.
- G. **Financial Returns:** Financial returns to the City, including, but not limited to, incremental tax revenues, and Property sale revenue.
- H. **Law Compliance:** The proposed development shall comply with Federal, State, and City laws, ordinances, and regulations.

XI. RIGHTS RESERVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

Real Estate reserves the right to the following:

- A. **Addenda:** Issue an RFP Addendum and Addenda to Respondents who received the initial RFP if it becomes necessary to revise this RFP, provide additional information that is deemed necessary to adequately interpret provisions and requirements of this RFP, or respond to written inquiries concerning the RFP.
- B. **Dates and Times:** Revise or extend Due Dates and times.
- C. **Development Contract:** Incorporate, by reference, this RFP is part of the Project development contract. Contracts awarded in connection with the RFP are subject to required City approvals and laws, including the final approval by the Board of Estimates of Baltimore City.
- D. **Reviews and Approvals:** Review and approve the drawings, plans, and specifications for the Property's redevelopment, as part of the evaluation process, in compliance with the Project's revitalization goals, objectives, and requirements of this RFP.
- E. **Additional Information:** Request additional information from Respondents, if necessary, to clarify proposal content.

Request for Proposals

2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448, Lot 030)


Baltimore, Maryland 21217

Exhibits

Exhibit B Vicinity Map



Exhibit C Block Plat



SHEET 1

TRACED BY: C. R. Wood

LETTERED BY: C. R. Wood

CHECKED BY:

NOTICE

THIS IS A REAL PROPERTY PLAT AS PROVIDED FOR UNDER ARTICLE 76(d) OF THE CITY CHARTER. IT IS COMPILED FROM TITLE AND OTHER SOURCES AND IS NOT AN AUTHENTIC SURVEY.

CITY OF BALTIMORE
 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 BUREAU OF PLANS & SURVEYS
 PROPERTY LOCATION DIVISION

WARD 13 SECTION 11
BLOCK 3448

SCALE 1"=50' DATE Apr. 1935

Exhibit D Site Plan




Figure 1. Picture of headstone, shown with an X on the site plan.

Exhibit E
Photographs of 2001 Park Avenue






Exhibit F
2001 Park Avenue Property Opinion Survey Results & Summary



MOUNT ROYAL TERRACE - RESERVOIR HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT

THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS & SUMMARY MARCH 31, 2019

The following pages include an executive summary, explanation, and results of the **2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY** (“Survey”) of residents and owners of properties in the Reservoir Hill neighborhood of Baltimore City. The Survey pertains to the prospective sale and use of 2001 Park Avenue in the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District of Reservoir Hill, also known as the Birkhead Estate, the Bond House, and the Seaman’s Home based on past owners in its 227-year history. The Survey was requested by Baltimore City Councilman Leon Pinkett after the neighborhood learned of, and responded to, the City’s intention to sell the Mansion and its ~2-acre property in its prominent location at the top of a hill on Park Avenue.

Councilman Pinkett asked a Reservoir Hill resident to gather and lead a Task Force of volunteer neighbors, survey the neighborhood to solicit feedback regarding the future of the Mansion, and provide a summary analysis of the results. As was negotiated prior to proceeding with the Survey, Baltimore City Real Estate Officer Walter Horton agreed to include this Report in the City’s Request for Proposal (“RFP”) pertaining to 2001 Park Avenue and to include the Task Force among those whom the City will assign responsibility to review the proposals that are expected to be submitted by prospective buyers and to decide which buyer will be sold the Property and anything else pertaining to the Mansion’s disposition. All those who volunteered to serve on The Task Force did so originally. Several members discontinued participation as the Survey was drafted and the remaining members finalized, analyzed the Survey, and produced this Report of Survey Results and Summary prior to the City’s deadline of March 31, 2019 to ensure its inclusion in the City’s RFP (see actual Survey attached with important information about the property). We have provided objective and thorough information as a valid source for any prospective buyer’s feasibility study regarding a plan for the Mansion and its property. The Historic District will gladly link interested buyers with knowledgeable neighbors some of whom have resided near the property for close to a half-century (including architect, historian, arborist, landscaper, engineer, realtor and editor of the neighborhood’s history, etc.). The City’s Board of Real Estate will post the RFP on <https://comptroller.baltimorecity.gov/realestate>.

SOLICITED PARTICIPANTS AND SURVEY DISTRIBUTION

The Survey was distributed beginning mid-February 2019 and the submission deadline for respondents was March 15, 2019. The Task Force received 165 Surveys, reviewed and analyzed for this report. Given that some Reservoir Hill residents do not use email or computers, including many valued neighbors who have resided here more than half a century, some Task Force members felt that providing those neighbors information about the possible sale of this important property and soliciting their input was critical to the Survey’s validity. Roughly 4,500 copies were hand-delivered or mailed to households located ~1,600 properties. The Survey was mailed to the owners of properties surrounding the Mansion, excluding those resident homeowners of whom the Task Force was personally aware who were separately provided the Survey via email or personal delivery. Councilman Pinkett’s staff kindly hand-addressed the mailed envelopes in hopes of obtaining a higher response rate and it appears to have been worthwhile. One third of the Surveys were submitted by mail or hand delivery and a significant number were received by those who do not use a computer, which has contributed to the Survey’s success.





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recognize Mansion's history in its purpose, restoration, and preservation of core historic architectural elements

Seek owner with financial wherewithal to sustain itself and maintain the Mansion's historic architecture

Actively participate as Reservoir Hill stakeholder who, or that, enhances activity and ignites business

Preserve and maintain prominent trees and landscape elements on the grounds and at street level

Investigate and incorporate possible burial ground due to Mansion's era and history of use

Incorporate element of community accessibility, involvement, and/or patronage

Reservoir Hill owners and residents would like the 2001 Park Avenue's Mansion and land's significance to the neighborhood, City, State, and Country history to be recognized by its next buyer – and ask that the buyer be one who, or that, has direct interaction with residents. In doing so, preserving the stone elements of the Mansion's structure and its surrounding trees and retaining walls, garden walls, etc. is critical: these are considered essential visual elements to be maintained in the next phase of the Mansion's evolution and serve to protect the surrounding properties from potentially invasive lighting and sound.

In recognition of the significant investment that will be required to properly renovate the Mansion and its lot and restore its treasured historic architectural elements, respondents expect significant new construction to be needed to make this project financially feasible. It is essential that a talented architect and engineer, who are skilled in historic preservation, be selected to design proportionate and complementary renovations and additions and do it well. New architecture, that complements and enhances the existing stone walls and other historic elements while working around the trees and established greenery, is expected. Landscape architecture and planning is of equal importance given the significance of its nearly 2-acre lot in a City neighborhood and its visual prominence on top of the Park Ave. hill -- a principal Reservoir Hill entrance that becomes more significant as the ~9-acre lot between North Ave. and Lennox St., that is currently awaiting its development, evolves.

Reservoir Hill respondents illustrated, with their majority support for not limiting operational hours, liquor license support (if appropriate), lessee- or owner-occupant, and no strong opposition to parking permits, that they seek and welcome committed neighbors whom they can support and are "... *there to be stakeholders, not reliant on an influx of customer base.*" But the Task Force recognizes that nearly everything relies on a customer base – from investment firms to churches. So, the concern seems more that the not-for-profit, non-profit, or for-profit buyer will have planned for the long-term and has the needed capital and a history of stability with reliable funding sources for both immediate and long-term needs to make it happen. The Mansion has a history of apparent neglect that, according to residents who have lived here for the last half-century, was also evident while owned by some of the previous owners. The real fear is that an absentee landlord, neglectful owner, or one that requires constant search for external funding could lead to a lack of funds, result in neglect, and might repeat the cycle that has found the Mansion again seeking an owner. A non-profit able to support itself through grants received high ratings despite concern about that sector's self-reliance.

Money is essential to this project. If a University's money can be partnered with some community meeting use, that would be ideal.

No more non-profit use. Needs someone with capital and a vision.

Buyers or lessees need proof of income that supports written maintenance standards to keep it from returning to its current state of neglect.





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

In addition to use ideas that were listed on the Survey, respondents suggested items ranging from banquet hall and ballroom for event rental to retail operations like Trader Joe's and Whole Foods or a food cooperative. Respondents overwhelmingly want a business that recognizes that Reservoir Hill residents must leave their neighborhood to enjoy a venue or business activities, hold a meeting, or host an event as simple as an art show. They submitted particularly creative and supportive suggestions to fill what appears to be a significant void. Housing of any kind, medical treatment facilities, utilities, telecommunications, parking structures, and places of worship are least desirable (see item #11 that lists items that respondents specifically point out as least desirable) – housing and places of worship are profuse in Reservoir Hill.

SUGGESTED PARTNERSHIP – PROFITABLE VENUE WITH COMMUNITY ORIENTED USES

The Mansion is located 2 blocks north of North Avenue (where a ~9-acre site awaits development), 3 blocks from JFX I-83 ramps, 5 blocks from the Metro, 10 blocks from Penn Station / MARC / AMTRAK, and close to MLK Blvd. Despite being atop a lovely hill in a residential neighborhood, respondents suggest that its logistics may support a multi-use application as a way to merge a commercial business bringing visitors regularly to Reservoir Hill and offer neighbors a place to convene (café, performance facility, hotel, bed & breakfast, health club, event rental [weddings, etc.]) with an educational facility (for elderly and children, library, self-supporting non-profit, cultural center, museum) and one that has community oriented space for use long term and an as-needed venue. This partnership concept seems appealing due to the Mansion's history and prominent location and was mentioned by several respondents and supported in others' comments.

The topography is challenging, and the lot is not fit for commercial use solely. It does not have adequate visibility for retail viability. A mixed-use concept will be best suited, for self-policing. Potentially on-site security presence will be necessary, since adjacent residents cannot watch what's going on.

During the Civil War, Union soldiers encamped on the property. Many participants mentioned a museum, cultural center, or dual-purpose educational or training space as a particularly valid and desirable use of the Mansion where, some suggest, soldiers may have been buried and slaves may have been owned that sits on property that ironically was once owned by Charles Carroll, one of those who signed the Declaration of Independence. Although ratings for a Museum use *alone* were lower, many support partnerships.

...this Property could serve as a powerful tool for telling the history of Reservoir Hill. From the days when the land likely housed enslaved people owned by the Carroll family, to Baltimore's rich architectural history, and its role as a major part.... Even the location of the mansion can be used to educate about the 1968 uprising and the impact of the war on drugs in the 1980s-1990s.....If the property could somehow be used for educational endeavors, activities/community resources...and to house local business I think it would ultimately uplift and give back to the overall neighborhood. It would be beautiful to transform the space...to benefit the 21st century residents while maintaining the 18th Century appearance as to not to erase the sometimes difficult to discuss history there.

Although a business headquarters did not receive highest ratings, a business in general is a top priority based on comments. The hope is that a profitable use be coupled with spaces and community-oriented occupants. There is a need for enforcement of an entity that proposes as a community partner. MICA is nearby and its students reside throughout the neighborhood. MICA has not maintained a sculpture blocks away located on North Avenue and its campus spaces have been made unaffordable, impractically priced for private lease, and is therefore unattainable for such use as local artist shows and gatherings. Enforcement mechanisms are requested to ensure that what is promised is attainable after the property changes hands.

MICA has not been a source of venue – they do not offer spaces at an affordable cost to neighbors for events. Artists on the Hill, to initiate a regular event, attempted to rent a space for a show for one weekend – then one night because it was so outrageously priced - MICA makes it intentionally unaffordable....





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Neighbors’ overwhelmingly support a moderately priced restaurant or café that can be a frequent, comfortable destination point that will attract visitors to enjoy Reservoir Hill and perhaps other operations on site.

A restaurant/cafe and/or other services would be great; I hate having to leave my neighborhood to do literally anything outside my home.

In the right context, respondents would support an operation with a liquor license. Respondents generally noted that a space that residents and others can use for meetings, events, etc. either as its primary business, as a rental (lease), or as a possible post-business hours venue is needed as there are currently few gathering places available. The included charts illustrate the respondents’ positions regarding items such as parking, traffic patterns, community park, preservation of historic appearance, and neighborhood business center. So, we decided not to belabor here where those indicators are self-evident in the following pages. It is readily apparent that Reservoir Hill residents and owners are prepared to invite and enthusiastically support businesses who sincerely **JOIN** the neighborhood.

Many thoughtful and expressive comments, reflected in this Summary Report, were submitted by respondents and would be worthwhile reading for those who are considering the purchase. All data and original submissions (comments, rankings, and other) from the Survey are available on the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District Facebook page “Mount Royal Terrace Historic District” and the District can be contacted at mrthistoricdistrict@gmail.com.

The 2001 Park Avenue Property Task Force and the City owe thanks to the volunteers who made the Survey possible. Carl Cleary was tremendously helpful. Keondra Prier assured the Survey was accessible on-line.

Keondra Prier
Ron Miles
Brian Salsberry
Randy Howell-Bey
Patrick Redmond

Carl Cleary
Mirella Vaglio
David Donald
Katie Davis
Susan Muhlbach
Gilda Bain-Pew
RHIC

Karen Bendersky
Kathryn Hendley
Michelle Cuellar
TyJuan Rice
Monique Marshall

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Forsyth

Paul L. Gentner, RA, AIA, CCS, CSI

cc Leon Pinkett, Baltimore City Council
Joan Pratt, Baltimore City Comptroller
Walter Horton, Baltimore City Real Estate Officer






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #1

Parking Permits: how do you feel about parking permits, if needed?

Parking Permit Acceptance




Respondents appear split regarding parking permits but 17% had no strong opinion which could significantly affect the results either way if added to the third of respondents who are opposed or the half of respondents who are comfortable with permits, if needed.

Question #2

Historic Exterior Preservation: maintain and preserve the visible exterior regardless of use?

It is apparent that those who have chosen to reside in an historic district that is located in an historic neighborhood on land that was once owned by a signer of the Declaration of Independence feel strongly that the Mansion and its property's visible historic elements should be preserved and incorporated eloquently in the next phase of its design (83%, yes, 94% if it includes "no opinion").

Interest in Historic Exterior Preservation






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #3

Community Park: favor a park feature in the Property's "dell?"

Interest in Community Park Feature in Property's Dell




The question did not point out something that has since been discussed among neighbors and may have altered respondents' input. The dell is an interesting issue, as some longstanding residents of nearly half a century have valid concern that the Property could be a burial ground for staff of former owners and / or Native Americans given the hill, stone retaining wall, and dell that includes what appears to be a headstone.

Given this recent information that is being investigated, the majority's favoring a park use or open space for the dell should obviously be considered as preferable.

Question #4

Property Vehicle Entry & Exit: Maintain existing one-way traffic pattern from Park Ave. entrance to the corner exit at Park Ave. & Reservoir St.

Interest in Maintaining One-Way Traffic on Park Avenue



Two thirds of respondents support the existing one-way traffic pattern with close to the remaining third having issued no opinion. Approximately 6% did not support the exiting traffic pattern.





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #5

Prospective Buyers suggestions provided by residents:

Frizzet Barnes is interested as a prospective buyer.
Contact Frizzer at 443.494.9168, fbarnes16@yahoo.com (provided by herself)

Victoria Day knows of someone who may be interested in the property for residential use.
Contact Victoria at 410.383.9400, VictoriaDay@msn.com

Anwar L Young recommends contacting Supreme Asset Management LLC.
Contact Anwar at 410.753.1285, young.anwar@gmail.com

Yolanda Lacan offered to consult on the Project, F&B Professional hotelier
Contact Yolanda at 2022572350, ylacan@gmail.com

One of the Survey distributors met an owner in the 2300 block of Eutaw Place who is interested in pursuing the Mansion as a buyer. We are investigating his name and contact address and will provide it once we have it.

The Mount Royal Terrace Historic District contact email is mrthistoricdistrict@gmail.com






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #6

Lease / Rental: Opinion, if any, regarding rental to an occupant under a long-term lease vs. sale to a buyer

The audience appears open and more devoted to finding a participatory neighbor who is invested in Reservoir Hill vs. focusing on whether that neighbor is a buyer or lessee – nearly half of respondents did not feel strongly one way or another and another one-third of respondents verified they are indifferent – totaling 75% who are open to either a tenant or an owner occupying the Mansion.

Occupant under a long-term lease vs. Sale to a buyer



The following are comments that were submitted.

Lease

- 1) Lease if tenant brings stabilization, historic renovation, and is community appropriate
- 2) Long-term (10+ year) tenant who respects historic significance
- 3) Rental could be disastrous for parking and night hour disturbance
- 4) Tenant that lifts community profile
- 5) Occupant more important than lease vs. buy

Sale

- 6) City or an agent of the City remains owner
- 7) Business office or office share that allows community reduced price
- 8) Buyer with historic preservation requirement
- 9) Stability and value, not turnover
- 10) Fear buyer will raze it (the Mansion) to build an ugly modern condo
- 11) Buyer with covenants to preserve historic nature of property and join the neighborhood trajectory
- 12) Ownership intuitively seems better in order to have a vested interest in the significant maintenance required. However, I would not want that to be a hinderance to bringing in the right renovation
- 13) MICA purchase

Either

- 14) Development that engages community throughout all phases
- 15) Either (sale or lease) if owner is held responsible for property maintenance including, and critical, the grounds, trees, shrubs, and all landscaping surrounding including street-level parameters
- 16) Owner, regardless of lease, shall comply with the historic preservation requirements
- 17) Prefer 501(c)3 or other qualified lease-to-buy occupant; deters future vacancy





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #7

Historic Architectural Appearances: Provide your considerations or suggestions, if any, regarding the exterior historic role / significance in the renovated appearance

Redundant comments were deleted from illustration but are reflected in Executive Summary observations and charts

Overall Appearance

- 1) Respecting the historic appearance is crucial to the project and the neighborhood.
- 2) Preserving the historic exterior is preferred because I fear an entity creating an ugly building (e.g., strip mall storefront). Having said that, I am not opposed to altering the exterior if it is done in an artful way even if it is modern (e.g., <https://weburbanist.com/2016/08/08/a-study-in-architectural-contrasts-12-modern-meets-historic-additions/>).
- 3) Renovate as reasonably as possible the exterior's historic architecture and maintain the dell as an historic garden or park.
- 4) The site which is visible to many of us from our homes is important to the historical character of the area, our choice to live here, and property values.
- 5) Doesn't have to be preserved
- 6) There is an important role of historic architecture and we should do our best to support this. However, I do not believe we should allow this to impede improving the site.
- 7) Yes, I love the front.
- 8) Maintaining the exterior is important. At least the portion that faces the streets.
- 9) I support restoration of the historic element of the exterior and removal of the addition of siding that has no historic significance and is an eyesore. I am opposed to any vinyl or other inappropriate materials being permitted and all window construction is paramount and should be held to historic restoration standards. I support an addition if it is well-designed by a skilled architect, not constructed like the new MICA / UB buildings without architectural talent, simple colored glass panels, etc. The Property should be held to historical CHAP standards in its entirety and CHAP's more recent allowance of poor and appropriate construction/design for windows, etc. that are not directly visible from the street should not be allowed due to the Property's historic significance.
- 10) Excessive ramp structures have chopped up the transition spaces.
- 11) Maintaining an appearance as close to the original 1792 structure would be best. It is important to remember that period of Baltimore History even if it makes people uncomfortable.
- 12) Identify, restore, and maintain historic building characteristics such as the original porch / portico, which have been removed or modified
- 13) It's very important. I agree that modern amenities are needed, but some level of historical preservation should remain. Not too strict.
- 14) I think we should be flexible depending on the end use.
- 15) Yes, as a guide within reason to allow for a new business to be able to succeed
- 16) Much of the property interest and value is tied to its history - particularly the outside appearance
- 17) The exterior should be true to its original design to the greatest practical extent, and consistent with the historic architecture of the neighborhood.





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

- 18) Question #7, Historic Architectural Appearances, *continued*
- 19) The more preservation the better. Including a plaque or sign detailing the history of the facade would be nice.
- 20) Windows should be replaced with historically accurate sizes and divided lite patterns, preferably chain-and-weight driven for longevity. The new owner should appreciate historic properties and be familiar with available tax credits and processes. Exterior should be fully restored on all sides using appropriate materials and colors, and grounds should be cleaned up and landscaped appropriately. Specimen trees should be preserved. Exterior Lighting should be minimal, shielded, and directed.
- 21) It's the oldest building in the neighborhood so it should be protected.
- 22) Property should maintain at least 50% of its original / current exterior appearance
- 23) I'd prefer they preserve the exterior, but not to the extent that some landmark statuses may require. It's going to be an expensive project, regardless. Better that we make it easier for someone to take it on.
- 24) Very important – 1) one of the oldest estates in Baltimore 2) Judge Bond (occupant) lead to break the
a. Ku Klux Klan in Maryland
- 25) The historical exterior elements should be preserved in some manner and left visible to the neighborhood. Tasteful additions are encouraged.
- 26) I think it is more important to sell for a good, productive use than to go above and beyond to maintain the exterior.
- 27) Favorable to keeping historical architectural appearance. More concerned with property upkeep - especially grounds maintenance.
- 28) The stone structure is all original building elements remaining – keep, and maintain trees on site (they help shade the bright flood lighting)
- 29) Reservoir Hill is not a museum, there is already plenty of history to look at. I think it's more important that any renovations are "tasteful"
- 30) I think the historic brick (masonry) architecture is beautiful and important to keep, but other areas are less important. In particular, I think the brick (masonry) portion you see when you look up at the house from the south, coming up from the intersection at Park Ave. and Reservoir, should be kept.
- 31) Comfortable with modifications to improve utility of the property for commercial use. Higher end restaurant? Inn?
- 32) I think whatever is financially feasible makes sense
- 33) The stone structure is all (there is of the) original building elements remaining.

Grounds / Landscaping

- 34) Most of my concerns regard maintaining and cleaning up the grounds that surround the property. The current house is nice, but it does need upgrades to the exterior. Please maintain as much of the historical aspects as possible
- 35) Remove all trees - should be visible from the street
- 36) Maintain trees on site (they help shade the bright flood lighting).
- 37) The exterior needs to be restored as the grounds restored to an attractive yet usable space
- 38) Keep mirror sign Reservoir Hill. It is beautiful
- 39) A lot of the trees on the hill are invasive/weedy, but the net result is that the building is barely visible from the street most of the year. I guess restoring the stairs attractively would be nice.
- 40) There are ways to preserve some of the exterior appearance and that is desirable, but it should be noted that this building is barely visible from the street, given the privacy hedge.
- 41) Fieldstone walls shall be retained and restored, whether remaining exterior or incorporated internally to new architecture. Additions of no historical/architectural importance may be demolished.






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #8

Business hours - Provide your feelings about operating hours – indicate any restricted hours of operation

Agreeable Hours of Operation




The majority of respondents were not interested in limiting operating hours of the occupant and, in fact, supported longer and weekend hours if the Property is used for activities that the neighborhood endorses and enjoys. As is illustrated, 62% of respondents had no desire to limit operations and almost three-quarters of respondents (74%) supported operations 5am until 11pm.

Question #9

Neighborhood Business Center - Many neighborhoods enjoy added pedestrian activity, interest, and convenience of businesses in the center of their neighborhood. For Example; “B Bistro”-Bolton, “Park Pharmacy & Park Café”-McMechen, “On the Hill”-John St.; “Roland Park Shopping Center”-Roland Ave. Would you want interactive businesses for this site to be actively pursue or avoided?

The chart says it all – Reservoir Hill wants to pursue an interactive business. Respondents seek a variety of businesses – see the 21 Charts on the next several pages that illustrate the number of respondents’ ranking each of the suggested uses that are not currently listed in the City’s permitted R7 uses.

Interactive Business: Pursue or Avoid






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019


Question #10. Rate each item reflecting your opinion about these suggestions as possible owners or tenants
Rate 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable (Note "0" is the number of times no response was submitted.)

Community museum




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Library/ computer learning center




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Community Meeting Place




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

MICA




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Coppin State University



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Other local nearby universities & colleges/partnership




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Performance facility




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Non-Profit - Able to support itself through grants




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Hotel or Cafe




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Senior Programs: education, recreation, social, cultural




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Employment training center



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Incubator




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable 0 = no response






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Shared office space



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Educational Facility for Children, Elderly




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

PLEASE NOTE


SCALE FOR ALL OTHERS IS 50 VOTES (LEFT, VERTICAL AXIS)
FOR THESE TWO CHARTS, THE SCALE IS "80" AS THEY ARE OVERWHELMINGLY DISFAVORED

Single Family Home




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Condos




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Business Headquarters



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Cultural center or artist's cooperative




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response






THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Restaurant




Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Day care center or school



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Adult gym with yoga and health-oriented option



Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable; 0 = No Response

Additional suggested uses that were mentioned favorably in respondents' notes but had obviously not been provided for ranking on the Survey by other respondents ~

Banquet hall
 Bistro
 Dog Park
 Event ballroom

Food Coop
 Grocery store (Trader Joe's, etc.
 with eatery
 Home Office
 MICA President's Home

Mixed-Use
 Open Space
 Tenant that accelerates area growth
 Wedding venue





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Question #11. The last two questions of non-R7-permitted and R7-permitted uses RESPONDENTS DO NOT WANT were merged. Chart #1 BY THE FREQUENCY respondents mentioned it in the Surveys & Chart #2 THE SAME ALPHABETICALLY. Respondents felt strongly enough to point out what they adamantly do not want on the site. Reference letters are from City's R-7 permitted uses, is noted on the left, where applicable.

| | | | |
|--|----|--|----|
| c Fraternity or sorority house | 82 | Coppin State University | 11 |
| h Rooming house (11 or more units) | 77 | o Community managed open space farm or garden | 10 |
| g Rooming house (10 or fewer units) | 75 | Other local nearby universities & colleges / partnership | 10 |
| e Residential care facility (16 or fewer residents) | 53 | p Park or playground | 10 |
| v Parking garage or lot | 50 | q Urban agriculture | 10 |
| f Residential care facility (17 or more residents) | 50 | t Alternative energy system-community based | 9 |
| u Electric substation | 49 | i Community center | 9 |
| b Dwelling, single or multi-family (attached, det., semi-det.) | 42 | Educational facility for children, elderly | 9 |
| n Place of worship | 38 | d Home occupation | 9 |
| w Telecommunications facility | 34 | Community museum | 8 |
| x Utilities | 32 | Day care center or school | 8 |
| Condos | 31 | s Neighborhood commercial establishment | 7 |
| a Day-care Home: adult or child | 29 | Restaurant | 7 |
| m Hospital | 27 | Incubator | 6 |
| y Wireless communications services | 23 | Library / computer learning center | 6 |
| Single-Family Home | 20 | Shared office space | 6 |
| l Government Facility | 19 | j Cultural facility | 5 |
| r Lodge or social club | 19 | Community meeting place | 4 |
| Employment training center | 18 | Cultural center or artist's cooperative | 4 |
| Business Headquarters | 17 | Non-profit - able to support itself through grants | 4 |
| MICA | 16 | Performance facility | 3 |
| k Educational facility (primary, secondary, post-secondary) | 13 | Senior Programs: education, recreation, social, cultural | 3 |
| Hotel, café | 12 | Adult gym with yoga and health-oriented option | 2 |

THE FOLLOWING LISTS THE SAME ABOVE BUT ALPHABETICALLY

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----|
| Adult gym with yoga and health-oriented option | 2 | Incubator | 6 |
| t Alternative energy system-community based | 9 | Library / computer learning center | 6 |
| Business Headquarters | 17 | r Lodge or social club | 19 |
| i Community center | 9 | MICA | 16 |
| o Community managed open space farm or garden | 10 | s Neighborhood commercial establishment | 7 |
| Community meeting place | 4 | Non-profit - able to support itself through grants | 4 |
| Community museum | 8 | Other local nearby universities & colleges | |
| Condos | 31 | partnership | 10 |
| Coppin State University | 11 | p Park or playground | 10 |
| Cultural center or artist's cooperative | 4 | v Parking garage or lot | 50 |
| j Cultural facility | 5 | Performance facility | 3 |
| Day care center or school | 8 | n Place of worship | 38 |
| a Day-care Home: adult or child | 29 | e Residential care facility (16 or fewer residents) | 53 |
| b Dwelling, single or multi-family (attached, det., semi-det.) | 42 | f Residential care facility (17 or more residents) | 50 |
| k Educational facility (primary, secondary, or post-secondary) | 13 | Restaurant | 7 |
| Educational facility for children, elderly | 9 | g Rooming house (10 or fewer units) | 75 |
| u Electric substation | 49 | h Rooming house (11 or more units) | 77 |
| Employment training center | 18 | Senior Programs: | |
| c Fraternity or sorority house | 82 | education, recreation, social, cultural | 3 |
| l Government Facility | 19 | Shared office space | 6 |
| d Home occupation | 9 | Single-Family Home | 20 |
| m Hospital | 27 | w Telecommunications facility | 34 |
| Hotel, café | 12 | q Urban agriculture | 10 |
| | | x Utilities | 32 |
| | | y Wireless communications services | 23 |





THE 2001 PARK AVENUE PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS
MARCH 31, 2019

Additional suggested uses that were mentioned unfavorably in respondents' notes but had obviously not been provided for ranking on the Survey by other respondents – noted is the number of times these were mentioned independently as unfavorable uses.

| | |
|--|----|
| Business not oriented to community needs | 1 |
| Liquor Store | 1 |
| Mental health drug treatment facility | 11 |
| Nightclub / Bar / Food Market | 1 |
| No rentals apartments | 1 |
| No Tiny Condos | 1 |
| Shopping | 1 |
| Stores and Retail | 1 |

End of the Property Opinion Survey Results & Summary





● Reservoir Hill - 2001 Park Avenue - Property Opinion Survey - Neighborhood Respondent Locations ●

ATTACHMENT FOLLOWS - PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY
REGARDING 2001 PARK AVENUE, MOUNT ROYAL, AKA
THE “NORWEGIAN SEAMAN’S HOME”

PROPERTY OPINION SURVEY

REGARDING 2001 PARK AVENUE, MOUNT ROYAL, AKA THE "NORWEGIAN SEAMAN'S HOME" LOCATED IN THE MOUNT ROYAL TERRACE HISTORIC DISTRICT OF HISTORIC RESERVOIR HILL

March 15, 2019

1928 Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, MD 21217 or send to mrthistoricdistrict@gmail.com

BACKGROUND




In mid-2018, Councilman Pinkett established a Survey Task Force to solicit and process neighborhood input and involvement in finding a buyer and awarding the property. The neighborhood welcomes input from interested Reservoir Hill residents, property owners, and those from adjoining neighborhoods. The Survey is being hand-delivered to Reservoir Hill properties and is available on the Internet via Nextdoor.com, web sites of RHIC and Bolton Hill, and on neighborhood posting boards. Absentee owners of the Historic District will receive a hard copy by U.S. mail. Survey results will be distributed via email to those who reply and will be available on the Internet.

The property, on the hill at Park Avenue and Reservoir Street, includes the original mansion built in 1792 by the Birkhead family as a summer retreat after purchasing the land from Charles Carroll of Carrollton,

Maryland's representative at the Continental Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence. Following fire damage in early 1976, the building was renovated to serve as a community multi-purpose center and Mayor's Station. (See for more info.: <https://www.reservoirhill.net/reservoir-hill-history/> and <https://mht.maryland.gov/secure/medusa/PDF/BaltimoreCity/B-49.pdf>)

The approximately 14,500 square foot building (~11,500 sf above-grade) sits on nearly 2 acres. Baltimore City owns the property and is seeking a buyer (will consider a lessee) to restore the historic exterior and renovate it to productive use. The site is the oldest property and second-largest lot in Reservoir Hill and requires significant infrastructure improvements and consistent maintenance. Deficits include steep grade uphill site access and limited parking. Renovation costs include new infrastructure (such as HVAC, electric, plumbing, fire protection, and sprinkler system), ADA compliance, security, historical exterior preservation (possibly interior, if desired), and landscaping. Attributes include building and site size, historic significance, original stone exterior portions, well-maintained housing on adjacent blocks, a pre-school playground area on-site, and "dell" the earlier use of which is being researched and could potentially be used as a community park and garden.



the earlier use of which is being researched and could potentially be used as a community park and garden.

The City plans to have a fact sheet available for prospective buyers and to publish a Request for Proposals ("RFP") to attract buyers who will collaborate and team with preservation contractors and architectural firms with historical preservation experience.

THE SURVEY

1. Parking Permits: With hopes to attract a buyer whose use has minimal traffic / parking impact on the neighborhood, how do you feel about parking permits, if needed? (CIRCLE ONE): COMFORTABLE OPPOSED NO OPINION
2. Historic Exterior Preservation: Maintain and preserve the visible exterior regardless of use? (CIRCLE ONE) YES NO NO OPINION
3. Community Park: Would you favor a park feature in the Property's "dell"? (CIRCLE ONE) YES NO NO OPINION
4. Property Vehicle Entry & Exit Condition: Maintain existing one-way traffic pattern from the Park Ave entrance to the corner exit at Park Ave. & Reservoir St.? (CIRCLE ONE) YES NO NO OPINION

(Continue to page 2)

5. Prospective Buyer: If you know, or are yourself, a prospective buyer and/or tenant, please provide contact information:

6. Lease / Rental: State your opinion, if any, regarding rental to an occupant under a long-term lease vs. sale to a buyer?

7. Historic Architectural Appearances: Provide your considerations or suggestions, if any, regarding the exterior historic role / significance in the renovated appearance.

8. Business Hours: Provide your feelings about operating hours – indicate any restricted hours of operation.

9. Neighborhood Business Center: Many neighborhoods enjoy added pedestrian activity, interest, and convenience of businesses in the center of their neighborhood. For Example; “B Bistro”-Bolton, “Park Pharmacy & Park Café”-McMechen, “On the Hill”-John St.; “Roland Park Shopping Center”-Roland Ave. Would you want interactive businesses for this site to be actively pursue or avoided? (CIRCLE ONE) PURSUE AVOID

10. Write a number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) beside each item below, reflecting your opinion about these as possible owners or tenants and, if you know contacts at the institutions/businesses, indicate on a separate sheet: Rank 1 = least desirable to 5 = most desirable

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community museum | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment training center |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Library / computer learning center | <input type="checkbox"/> Incubator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community meeting place | <input type="checkbox"/> Shared office space |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MICA | <input type="checkbox"/> Educational facility for children, elderly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coppin State University | <input type="checkbox"/> Single-Family Home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other local nearby universities & colleges / partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> Condos |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance facility | <input type="checkbox"/> Business Headquarters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-profit – able to support itself through grants | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural center or artist’s cooperative |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hotel, café, hotel | <input type="checkbox"/> Restaurant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Programs: education, recreation, social, cultural | <input type="checkbox"/> Day care center or school |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult gym with yoga and health-oriented option |

11. The R-7 permitted and conditional uses are currently listed as follows:

- | | |
|--|---|
| a Day-care Home: adult or child | n Place of worship |
| b Dwelling, single or multi-family (attached, det., semi-det.) | o Community managed open space farm or garden |
| c Fraternity or sorority house | p Park or playground |
| d Home occupation | q Urban agriculture |
| e Residential care facility (16 or fewer residents) | r Lodge or social club |
| f Residential care facility (17 or more residents) | s Neighborhood commercial establishment |
| g Rooming house (10 or fewer units) | t Alternative energy system-community based |
| h Rooming house (11 or more units) | u Electric substation |
| i Community center | v Parking garage or lot |
| j Cultural facility | w Telecommunications facility |
| k Educational facility (primary, secondary, or post-secondary) | x Utilities |
| l Government Facility | y Wireless communications services |
| m Hospital | |

Which of the R-7 permitted uses above would you like for this property? Indicate your 3 preferences.

Which of the uses that are not currently included in the R-7 permitted and conditional uses (Item #10 suggestions listed above the Item #11 R-7 list) would you like for this property? Please add any of your suggestions.

What property use would you NOT like permitted?

Which of the R-7 permitted uses above would you NOT like for this property? Indicate your 3 preferences.

Exhibit G Sample Sources and Uses Budget

| USES OF FUNDS | SOURCES OF FUNDS |
|--|--------------------------|
| Acquisition of building _____ | |
| Construction/Renovation Costs | |
| Demolition of old walls _____ | Cash _____ |
| Electrical _____ | Grants _____ |
| Plumbing _____ | Donations _____ |
| Heating/ventilation _____ | Loan 1 _____ |
| Roof _____ | Loan 2 _____ |
| Drywall and painting _____ | |
| Carpet _____ | GRAND TOTAL _____ |
| Windows _____ | |
| Fixtures and fit-out _____ | |
| Site work _____ | |
| Total Construction _____ | |
| Hard Cost Contingency (10 to 20%) _____ | |
| Total Hard Costs _____ | |
| Soft Costs | |
| Architect _____ | |
| Project manager _____ | |
| Engineering _____ | |
| Insurance during construction _____ | |
| Appraisal, environmental studies, soil reports, plan and cost review, property condition report, other third-party reports _____ | |
| Closing costs (title, survey, recording, etc.) _____ | |
| Legal fees (school's and lender's) _____ | |
| Financing fees (loan origination fee, etc.) _____ | |
| Interest during construction _____ | |
| Inspection fees _____ | |
| Accountant _____ | |
| Total _____ | |
| Soft Cost Contingency (5 to 10%) _____ | |
| Total Soft Costs _____ | |
| GRAND TOTAL _____ | |

Exhibit H
Sources and Uses Statement

Operating Proforma

Year
1 through
10

Gross Potential Income

(Vacancy)

Effective Gross Revenue

Other Gross Income

Gross Operating Income

(Operating Expenses w/o Real Estate Taxes)

(Real Estate Taxes)

Net Operating Income (NOI)

(Annual Debt Service)

Before Tax Cash Flow

Before Tax IRR (w/out sale)

Before Tax IRR (w/sale)

NPV

Cash on Cash

Exhibit I

Awards Procedures

- A. **Information by Respondent:** Real Estate is not limited solely to the information provided by the Respondent, but may utilize other sources of information useful in evaluating Respondent's ability to perform.
- B. **Presentations:** Respondents may be required to make a presentation or presentations, at a mutually convenient time, to community stakeholders to obtain feedback prior to final approval by Real Estate. The respective community stakeholders may submit written comments about the Project to Real Estate, to which the Respondent may be required to respond in writing within ten (10) business days. Oral presentations to the Review Panel or Real Estate (or any committee thereof) may be required, for the purposes of clarifying the proposal.
- C. **Finalist Round.** The City may, at its sole discretion and as part of the evaluation process, enter into negotiations with highest ranked proposers and invite "best and final offers" as deemed in the best interest of the City. The City may ask the proposers to respond to additional questions and provide additional information. However, the City is not obligated to negotiate, and may make the award based on the initial evaluation or negotiated "best and final offers" as determined by and at the City's sole discretion as in the City's best interest. Proposers are advised not to prepare their proposal on any assumption that negotiations will take place. Proposers are advised to respond full at the time of proposal submission.
- D. Real Estate reserves the right, (at its sole discretion,) to accept or reject any and all proposals received as a result of this RFP, to waive minor irregularities, and to conduct discussions with all responsible Respondents in any manner necessary to serve the best interest of DHCD and the City of Baltimore.
- E. Real Estate reserves the right to request additional information from any or all Respondents if necessary to clarify statements or data contained in the proposals.
- F. **Exclusive Negotiating Privilege:** Real Estate, on behalf of the City, or another appropriate designee of the City, shall issue an Exclusive Negotiating Privilege (ENP) to the selected Respondent. The Term of the ENP shall be determined by Real Estate. The ENP will specify the terms and conditions under which the City will negotiate with the selected Respondent, the requirements and the deadlines for commencing and completing said negotiations, and the terms and conditions under which the City will consider entering into a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) for the development of the Property.

A fee shall be charged for the ENP. If negotiations have not been completed prior to the termination of the ENP, then the ENP shall expire. Real Estate may extend the ENP time period if it finds that negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

Should the parties fail to agree upon the terms and conditions for the redevelopment of the Property within the time frame specified in the ENP including any extensions thereof, Real Estate

may cancel negotiations with the first selected Respondent and proceed to negotiate with the next acceptable Respondent, re-solicit for new proposals, or abandon the RFP process.

In consideration for a grant of the ENP, the selected Respondent shall pay to the Director of Finance, upon the execution of this agreement, a nonrefundable fee of \$300.00 for the base ENP and an additional fee of \$100.00 for extensions.

- G. **Right-of-Entry:** Real Estate, on behalf of the City, or another appropriate designee of the City, may issue a Right-of-Entry (ROE) to the selected Respondent setting forth the terms and conditions by which the Respondent may access the Property during the ENP period. The selected Respondent shall pay to the Director of Finance a \$200.00 non-refundable fee upon execution of the ROE. Real Estate may extend the ROE time period if Real Estate, in its sole discretion, finds that negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily. Pursuant to the ROE, the selected Respondent, its employees, agents, and representatives, shall be granted entry into the Property for the purposes of generating information on the Property to include, but not be limited to:
- Environmental analysis.
 - Parcel surveys, plats, and subdivisions, as applicable.
 - Soil boring data and analysis.
 - Architecture and engineering studies.
- H. **Land Disposition Agreement and Board of Estimates Approval:** After successful completion of the ENP, the City shall enter into a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) establishing the terms and conditions of the Property's sale, development, and completion according to the selected Respondent's Proposal. Upon the successful completion of negotiations pursuant to the ENP, Real Estate, on behalf of the City, or another appropriate designee of the City, who shall present the LDA to the City's Board of Estimates (BOE) setting forth the terms and conditions of sale, respectively, and redevelopment of the Property and any modifications thereto, if required. Decisions regarding the award, sale and redevelopment of the Property shall be made by Real Estate, or another appropriate designee of the City, and recommended to the Board of Estimates for the City's official approval. Final acceptance of any redevelopment proposal and disposition of the Property is subject to the approval of the Board of Estimates of Baltimore City in its sole discretion.
- I. **Execution of LDA:** Upon execution of the Land Disposition Agreement, the Respondent may be required to provide the City with a Purchase Price Deposit. The Deposit shall be credited towards the Purchase Price at Settlement. The Deposit shall be retained by the City, should the Respondent fail to settle on the Property due to no fault of the City.

- J. **Development Oversight:** The selected Respondent shall agree to the review and guidance of the Department of Real Estate and the Department of Planning in the preparation of plans for the Project's development, new construction / rehabilitation in compliance with CHAP, the Zoning Ordinances, the subdivision requirements, Mount Royal Terrace Historic District, other applicable codes, and ordinances of the City of Baltimore. During all stages of the Project, any proposed changes shall be submitted to the Mount Royal Terrace Historic District and CHAP and shall provide adequate time for review.
- K. **Reversionary Interest.** The City of Baltimore shall retain a reversionary interest in the Property that shall be triggered by a use of the Property that is inconsistent with the selected Respondent's proposed use or failure to complete the Project within three years.

**CITY OF BALTIMORE
COUNCIL BILL 22-0239
(First Reader)**

Introduced by: The Council President
At the request of: The Comptroller (Department of Real Estate)
Introduced and read first time: May 16, 2022
Assigned to: Ways and Means Committee

REFERRED TO THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES: The City Solicitor, Department of Planning,
Department of Housing and Community Development, Department of Transportation, Baltimore
City Parking Authority, Department of Finance, Board of Estimates, Department of Real Estate

A BILL ENTITLED

1 AN ORDINANCE concerning

2 **Sale of Property – 2001 Park Avenue**

3 FOR the purpose of authorizing the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to sell, at either public
4 or private sale, all its interest in certain property that is located at 2001 Park Avenue
5 (Block 3448; Lot 030) and is no longer needed for public use; and providing for a special
6 effective date.

7 BY authority of
8 Article V - Comptroller
9 Section 5(b)
10 Baltimore City Charter
11 (1996 Edition)

12 **SECTION 1. BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE**, That, in
13 accordance with Article V, § 5(b) of the City Charter, the Comptroller of Baltimore City may
14 sell, at either public or private sale, all the interest of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore in
15 the property located at 2001 Park Avenue (Block 3448; Lot 030), also known as the Brickhead
16 Estate, the Bond House, Mount Royal, Norse Hill Home, and the Norwegian Seaman’s
17 Merchants Home, containing 1.835 acres, more or less, and improved by a 3 story building
18 containing 15,194 square feet, more or less, this property being no longer needed for public use.

19 **SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED**, That no deed may pass under this Ordinance
20 unless the deed has been approved by the City Solicitor.

21 **SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED**, That this Ordinance takes effect on the date it is
22 enacted.

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS indicate matter added to existing law.
[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.