Carter Oak Shopping Center

Mini Technical Assistance Panel | ULI Atlanta Center for Leadership | May 2018

Agenda

1.The Team2.The Project

- Overview
- Process
- Context
- Precedent Studies
- Program Components

3.The Outcome

- Conceptual Ideas
- Criteria for Comparison
- Feedback
- Reflections



The Team

Jason Manners, P.E., LEED AP •-----

Kimley-Horn Structural Engineering / Parking Consultation

Andrew Pearson, LEED AP

Seven Oaks Company Development and Asset Management

Advisors: Angela Abraham, Novare Group Erin Hewitt, Burr and Forman LLP •----• Sheba Ross, AICP, LEED AP, CDT, Int'I AIA HKS Architecture and Urban Design

Clara Kwon, PLA •--

City of Atlanta, Dept. of Parks & Recreation Parks Design and Landscape Architecture To create an inclusive CATALYTIC DEVELOPMENT that enhances pedestrian connectivity and provides adequate vehicular parking for a unique and diverse experience in Gwinnett County.

Owner





Client









Context



INB

Context



Context



BACKGROUND

- •1960's mall (North Hills Mall, 535K SF on 31-acres) located in Raleigh, NC.
- •Outside of City core but with good vehicular access. Located adjacent to I-440 (i.e. Raleigh's 285) and Six Forks Road.
- •Center of activity for several decades but new ownership neglected physical structure.
- High-income surrounding neighborhoods.

REDEVELOPMENT

- •Mall demoed in '99. Redevelopment of mall and adjacent land took place over the course of 20 years.
- Initial vision of developer was to create a local gathering place. Site expanded from 31- to 94 acres.
- Now 1M SF of office, 920 residential units, 366 hotel rooms, and just under 1M SF of mixed retail.
- •Focus on green space, community events, and gatherings. North Hills hosted >500 events in 2015.
- Vibrant 24/7 mixed-use community.

TAKEAWAYS

- •Strong central core with retail-lined streets. Focus on central green / gathering spaces(s).
- •Create walkable retail area. Sensibly position parking deck to encourage "park and walk" shopping experience.
- Densification over period of time is to be expected.
 Sensibly plan and build core area today to allow for more vertical, mixed-use development in the future.

ORIGINAL SITE CONDITION



REDEVELOPED SITE CONDITION



Precedent Study – Square One Shopping Centre

BACKGROUND

 Built in 1970's on farmland in Mississauga, a suburb of Toronto, Canada and Canada's 6th largest city

Currently approx. 2.2M SF

Mall was sited close to major highways

 Mississauga City Hall was located close by in the 1980's which spurred development in the area and creating a new suburban center

REDEVELOPMENT

 Major expansion and renovations began in 2013 with infill development and façade upgrades.

 New outdoor gathering spaces have been built in recent years

•Square One Shopping Centre is part of a larger redevelopment of this part of Mississauga into a suburban center that began in the 1990's with high-rise residential, college campus, transit hub and cultural institutions.

TAKEAWAYS

•Expansion of the mall and adjacent parcels now fall into a grid pattern

•Design quality has become a core value in the renovation and expansion of the mall

 As a transit hub with residential density, exterior plaza spaces have been designed to enhance the pedestrian experiences

ORIGINAL SITE CONDITION



REDEVELOPED SITE CONDITION



Program Components



Program Components

2-bay parking garage Parkable ramps provided on both parking bays 9' x 18' parking stalls

Design should maintain openness for natural ventilation and reduced cost Future Proofing: Allows for conversion to leasable floor area in the future



Focus on i) Professional Services (including 2nd Story office component of new build) and ii) General Retail with focus on lifestyle retail that will draw new customers and keep existing customers onsite longer:

Spa

Technology Taproom / Beer garden Boutique Clothing Vitamin Shoppe / Juice Bar Cooking Class Venue REI / Sports-focused Store Travel Agency Small Home Furnishing Store Brush and Bottle Art

Conceptual Vision Options

Boulevard Scheme Identity Scheme FACE EVARD BOUI ************** ************** H.....

Conceptual Vision Options

Boulevard Scheme Identity Scheme 彼梦 BNILSIX DNILLSING BNILLSING BNILLSING Contraction of the second seco o. ATTENDED OF ATTACK OF THIT HIIIII PARKIDUG Internet Imm A THINH HALL PARKING Chillianinini CHILINGHILING T T

Conceptual Vision – Boulevard Scheme



Conceptual Vision – Identity Scheme



Conceptual Ideas 17 **BOULEVARD SCHEME** IDENTITY SCHEME Pedestrian Retail Screens Vision for Renewal Sustain-Interaction ability Experience Gardens

Conceptual Ideas - Experience

• Outdoor living rooms





IDENTITY SCHEME

Conceptual Ideas - Pedestrianization





BOULEVARD SCHEME





Conceptual Ideas - Retail



BOULEVARD SCHEME





Conceptual Ideas - Sustainability

- Green infrastructure
 - Park space
 - Permeable pavers
 - Bio-infiltration beds





Conceptual Ideas – Parking Gardens



BOULEVARD SCHEME

8.4.27

IDENTITY SCHEME



Conceptual Ideas – Interaction



Conceptual Ideas – Parking Screens

BOULEVARD SCHEME

IDENTITY SCHEME



Financial Analysis – Boulevard Scheme

SOURCES AND USES SCHEDULE (Development)



PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS AND RETURN SUMMARY

General Assumptions		Parking Deck Assumptions			Yea	ar 1	Year 2		Ye	ear 3	
				Proforma	Half 1	Half 2	Half 1	Half 2	Half 1	Half 2	TOTAL
Outparcel, 1st Level	7,000 RSF	Number of Spaces			1	2	3	4	5	6	
Outparcel, 2nd Level	0 RSF	Add: Net New Hong Kong Market	0	DEVELOPMENT		****					
Interior Parcel, 1st Level	29,000 RSF	Add: New Density, Req'd Parking	200	Retail / Office Development Costs	\$(3,325,000)		\$(1,312,500)		Ş -	Ş -	\$ (8,750,000)
Interior Parcel, 2nd Level	14,000 RSF	Add: Replace Spaces Lost to Dev. / F	250	Parking Development Costs Infrastructure / Stormwater	(2,254,350) (1,710,000)	(2,788,275) (2,115,000)	(889,875) (675,000)		-	-	(5,932,500) (4,500,000)
Total Square Feet	50,000 RSF Less: Net Surface Added (North		-75	Total Development Costs	(7,289,350)	(9,015,775)					(19,182,500)
		Less: Single Load Along HK	<u>-36</u>	Less: TAD Credits	728,935	901,578	287,738	-	-	-	1,918,250
Development Period (Months)	15 Months	Number Spaces to Construct	339	Net Development Costs	(6,560,415)	(8,114,198)		-	-	-	(17,264,250)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				OPERATIONS / STABILIZATION							/
Financing Assumptions		Blended Avg. Cost per Space:	\$17,500	Occupancy	0%	0%	28%	78%	96%	96%	
		.		Outparcel Rent	-	-	36,094	101,719		129,780	397,147
Construction Debt		Parking, Total Cost	\$5,932,500	Interior Parcel, Ground Floor	-	-	99,688	280,938	357,818	358,440	1,096,883
Loan to Cost	60%	0,	, - , ,	Interior Parcel, Second Floor			38,500	108,500	138,192	138,432	423,624
Interest Rate	5.00%	Return on Cost Metrics			-	-	174,281	491,156	625,564	626,652	1,917,654
Origination / Closing	2.00%			REVERSION			491,156				
- 0 ,		Revenue (Stab.) \$ 1,216,800	\$24.34 / SF	Net Sale Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-	21,192,326	21,192,326
Market Revenue Assumptions		Cost (Post TAD) \$ 17,264,250	\$345.29 / SF	UNLEVERAGED CASH FLOW	(6,560,415)	(8,114,198)	(2,415,356)	491,156	625,564	21,818,978	5,845,730
Outparcel	NNN Rent	Return on Cost	7.05%	Unleveraged IRR	12.87%	Į					
1st Story Retail	\$37.50 / SF			Unleveraged Multiple	1.34x						
2nd Story Retail / Office	N/A	Exit Assumptions		LEVERAGED RUN							
, ,	,			Debt Proceeds / Paydown	4,373,610	5,409,465	1,726,425	-	-	(11,509,500)	-
Interior Parcel	NNN Rent	Month of Sale	36	Origination	(230,190)	-	-	-	-	-	(230,190)
1st Story Retail	\$25.00 / SF	Exit Cap	6.00%	Recurring Interest	(34,529)	(177,918)	(269,994)	(287,738)	(287,738)	(287,738)	(1,345,652)
2nd Story Retail / Office	\$20.00 / SF	Cost of Sale	1.50%	LEVERAGED CASH FLOW	(2 451 524)	(2.002.050)		202 440		10 021 744	4 200 007
	920.00 / SI		1.50%		(2,451,524)	(2,882,650)	(958,925)	203,419	337,827	10,021,741	4,269,887
Future Rent Escalation	3.00%	Sale	\$21,515,052	Leveraged IRR Leveraged Multiple							
Vacancy Factor	4.00%		\$430 / SF		1.08	1					

Financial Analysis – Identity Scheme

27

SOURCES AND USES SCHEDULE (Development)



28

PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS AND RETURN SUMMARY

General Assumptions		Parking Deck Assumptions				Ye	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
					Proforma	Half 1	Half 2	Half 1	Half 2	Half 1	Half 2	TOTAL
Outparcel, 1st Level	5,000 RSF	Number of Spaces				1	2	3	4	5	6	
Outparcel, 2nd Level	5,000 RSF	Add: Net New Hong Kon	g Market	0			¢(4,000,050)	¢(4,200,250)	<u>^</u>	<u>~</u>	<u>,</u>	(0.575.000)
Interior Parcel, 1st Level	27,000 RSF	Add: New Density, Reg'	0	196	Retail / Office Development Costs Parking Development Costs	\$(3,258,500) (1,795,500)	\$(4,030,250) (2,220,750)	\$(1,286,250) (708,750)	Ş -	\$-	\$ - ;	(8,575,000) (4,725,000)
Interior Parcel, 2nd Level	12,000 RSF	Add: Replace Spaces Lost to Dev. / F		175	Infrastructure / Stormwater	(2,090,000)		(825,000)	-	-	-	(5,500,000)
Total Square Feet 49,000 RSF		Less: Net Surface Added (North Pad		-75	Total Development Costs	(7,144,000)	<u> </u>	(2,820,000)				(18,800,000)
i otal oquale i eet	45,000 1151	Less: Pave Green Space	•	<u>-26</u>	Less: TAD Credits	714,400	883,600	282,000	-	-	-	1,880,000
Development Period (Months)	15 Months	Number Spaces to Constru		270	Net Development Costs	(6,429,600)	(7,952,400)	(2,538,000)	-	-	-	(16,920,000)
Development renou (wonths)	15 10011115	Number spaces to constitu		270	OPERATIONS / STABILIZATION							
Financing Assumptions		Blended Avg. Cost per Spa		\$17,500	Occupancy	0%	0%	28%	78%	96%	96%	
		Bielided Avg. Cost per spa	ice.	\$17,500	Outparcel Rent, Ground Floor	-	-	24,063	67,813	86,370	86,520	264,765
Construction Debt		Darking Total Cost		¢4 725 000	Outparcel Rent, Second Floor	-	-	17,188	48,438	61,693	61,800	189,118
	60%	Parking, Total Cost		\$4,725,000	Interior Parcel, Ground Floor	-	-	92,813	261,563	333,141	333,720	1,021,236
Loan to Cost		Determs and Cost Mathies			Interior Parcel, Second Floor			<u>33,000</u> 167,063	<u>93,000</u> 470,813	118,450 599,653	118,656 600,696	363,106
Interest Rate	5.00%	Return on Cost Metrics				-	-	107,003	470,813	599,053	600,696	1,838,224
Origination / Closing	2.00%	- (REVERSION	_						
		Revenue (Stab.) \$	1,166,400	\$23.80 / SF	Net Sale Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-	20,314,538	20,314,538
Market Revenue Assumptions			16,920,000	\$345.31 / SF	UNLEVERAGED CASH FLOW	(6,429,600)	(7,952,400)	(2,370,938)	470,813	599,653	20,915,234	5,232,762
Outparcel	NNN Rent	Return on Cost		6.89%	Unleveraged I	RR 11.89%	,					
1st Story Retail	\$35.00 / SF				Unleveraged Multip	ole 1.31x						
2nd Story Retail	\$25.00 / SF	Exit Assumptions			LEVERAGED RUN							
					Debt Proceeds / Paydown	4,286,400	5,301,600	1,692,000	-	-	(11,280,000)	-
Interior Parcel	NNN Rent	Month of Sale		36	Origination	(225,600)		-	-	-	-	(225,600)
1st Story Retail	\$25.00 / SF	Exit Cap		6.00%	Recurring Interest	(33,840)	(174,370)	(264,610)	(282,000)	(282,000)	(282,000)	(1,318,820)
2nd Story Retail / Office	\$20.00 / SF	Cost of Sale		1.50%	LEVERAGED CASH FLOW	(2,402,640)	(2,825,170)	(943,548)	188,813	317,653	9,353,234	3,688,342
Future Rent Escalation	3.00%	Sale		\$20,623,896	Leveraged I		-					
		Saic			Lveraged Multip	ole 1.60>						
Vacancy Factor	4.00%			\$421 / SF								

Criteria for Comparison

Boulevard Scheme



- Additional SF 50,000 SF
- Structured Parking Spaces Needed 339
 - Parking:
 - Lost 150 spaces + 75 spaces
 - Add 75 spaces through restriping
 - Added 110 / floor = 330 spaces through deck (3 floor deck)
 - Added 36 spaces in single loaded spaces
- Return on Cost 7.05%
- Leveraged Return 22.68%

Identity Scheme

- Additional SF 49,000 SF
- Structure Parking Spaces Needed 270
 - Parking
 - Lost 80 spaces + 75 spaces +20 spaces
 - Add 75 spaces through restriping + 26 in median
 - Added 69 / floor = 278 spaces through deck (4 floor deck)
- Return on Cost 6.89%
- Leveraged Return 20.51%

Criteria for Comparison



Boulevard Scheme



- Traffic circulation
- Parking
- Additional Leasable space
- Aesthetics
- Flexibility for activities and events
- Sustainability
- Customer experience
- Financial Return Metrics

Feedback



The information is excellent and the details are very valuable to continue the development of this catalytic and transformational opportunity. -Marsha Bomar, Executive Director Gateway 85

I am excited about the design possibilities. I never thought of it this way. This gives me hope now that I see the options and financial analysis.

-Ben Vo, Owner MPI Development Group

Reflections

What worked: NGAGE

- Enjoy the process
- Early client engagement
- In-depth discussions with program type experts (Retail, Parking, etc.)
- Envision big ideas in the beginning before narrowing down the possibilities
- Leverage multiple perspectives and strengths
- In-person work sessions to dynamically iterate and test options
- Learn from precedents
- Prioritize the mTAP opportunity
- The motivation of a deadline

Challenges:

- Work-Class balance
- Putting pen to paper
- Focusing the effort to a reasonable and achievable scope

Carter Oak Shopping Center

Mini Technical Assistance Panel | ULI Atlanta Center for Leadership | May 2018